

Pragmatic Perspectives
on Language and Linguistics

Volume II:

Pragmatics of Semantically-Restricted Domains

Pragmatic Perspectives
on Language and Linguistics

Volume II:

Pragmatics of Semantically-Restricted Domains

Edited by

Iwona Witczak-Plisiecka

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

Pragmatic Perspectives on Language and Linguistics Volume II:
Pragmatics of Semantically-Restricted Domains,
Edited by Iwona Witczak-Plisiecka

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2010 by Iwona Witczak-Plisiecka and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-2063-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-2063-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Pragmatics of Semantically-Restricted Domains Iwona Witczak-Plisiecka	
Part One: Pragmatics, Politics and Ideology	
Chapter One	3
Axiological Proximation Piotr Cap, University of Lodz	
Chapter Two	21
Going <i>Nuke</i> lear: On Manipulation in Bush's and Ahmadinejad's Legitimation of Nuclear Power Agnieszka Sowińska, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń	
Chapter Three	51
Personalization in Political Discourse: Its Pragma-Linguistic Realizations and Potential Persuasive Effects Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska, Opole University	
Chapter Four	65
In-Group and Out-Group Markers in the Service of Political Legitimation: A Critical-Methodological Account. Anna Wiczorek, University of Lodz	
Chapter Five	79
Strategic Use of Forms of Other Reference in Political Speeches Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova, Masaryk University, Brno	
Chapter Six	101
Language Use in Venezuelan Politics: A Research Agenda for Analysis of the Ideological Discourse of <i>Chavism</i> Gabriela Hoffmann, University of Paderborn	

Chapter Seven.....	127
Aspects of Conduct in Polish and British TV News Interviews with Politicians	
Joanna Szczepańska-Włoch, Jagiellonian University	
Part Two: The Pragmatics of Humour, Power and the Media	
Charter Eight	149
The Linguistic Forms of Modesty in the Hungarian Language or The Pragmatics of Compliment Response	
Katalin Szili, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest	
Chapter Nine.....	165
Politeness to Self and Impoliteness to Other – Can They Co-occur?	
Anna Wiechecka, Warsaw University	
Chapter Ten	175
Friend or Foe? Chandler’s Humour from the Metarecipient’s Perspective	
Marta Dynel, University of Lodz	
Chapter Eleven	207
Gender Identity Construction via Conversational Humour: Are We Really that Different?	
Katarzyna Sielicka, Warsaw University	
Chapter Twelve	219
Playing the Power Game in Mamet’s <i>Oleanna</i>	
Agata Klimczak, Warsaw University	
Chapter Thirteen.....	233
(In)Directness in German and Japanese Verbal Expressions: A Case Study of Soccer Players’ Discourse	
Sylvia Waechter, Berlin University of the Arts	
Chapter Fourteen	247
‘Injurious Speech’: Gendering Verbal Violence in Media Discourse	
Katarzyna Poloczek, University of Lodz	

Chapter Fifteen	261
Gestural and Verbal Reference to Categories and Exemplars in Expository Utterances	
Monika Wachowska, Warsaw University	

Part Three: Focus on Textual Properties

Chapter Sixteen	275
A Few Comments on the Pragmatics of Billboard Posters	
Anita Schirm, University of Szeged	

Chapter Seventeen	297
Cultural and Perlocutionary Equivalence in the Polish and German Versions of 'Shrek'	
Anna Pałczyńska, University of Lodz	

Chapter Eighteen	311
Pragmatic Aspects of Scientific Technical Text Analysis	
Larisa Iljinska and Tatjana Smirnova, Riga University	

Chapter Nineteen	339
Language Use: Translation of English Environment-Related Terminology	
Marina Platonova, Riga Technical University	

Chapter Twenty	359
Narrative vs. Informational Patterns across Legal Discourse	
Stanisław Goźdz-Roszkowski, University of Lodz	

Chapter Twenty-One	377
Metaphors, Particles, Terminology: From Objectivist to Pragmatic- Cognitivist Approach in Physics and Linguistics	
Hanna Pułaczewska, Lodz Academy of International Studies, Poland & University of Regensburg	

Annex A	393
Table of Contents (Volume I)	

Contributors.....	397
-------------------	-----

Index	403
-------------	-----

PREFACE

PRAGMATICS OF SEMANTICALLY-RESTRICTED DOMAINS

This collection, the second volume of *Pragmatic Perspectives on Language and Linguistics*, entitled *Pragmatics of Semantically-Restricted Domains*, gathers papers which partly complement and develop the first volume—*Speech Actions in Theory and Applied Studies* (CSP, 2010). Most of the texts collected in this volume result from the Fourth Symposium on “New Developments in Linguistic Pragmatics”, organized at the University of Łódź, Poland, in May 2008; they have been supplemented with a few relevant contributions to widen the spectrum of contemporary research in pragmatics.

Accepting the inevitable failure of any attempt to pose a strict and clear-cut division between the research area of semantics and that of pragmatics, the volume focuses on pragmatics-oriented analyses of data which are best described as “semantically” limited. While Volume One concentrated on speech as a type of action, the present volume, without denying the inherently actional nature of language use, concentrates on limited contexts. Pragmatic phenomena in semantically-restricted domains are addressed from a variety of both theoretical and applied perspectives.

Part One—“Pragmatics, Politics and Ideology”—gathers seven papers centered on issues pertaining to political linguistics. Piotr Cap’s opening article, “Axiological Proximisation”, presents the author’s novel model of political interventionist rhetoric analysis which uses three main categories, viz. space, time and axiology (hence STA model). Elaborating on an earlier framework by Paul Chilton, Cap argues that political rhetoric can be viewed as a balanced interplay between these three notions, which directly effect (or at least aim to effect) an envisaged response on the part of the audience. This methodology is applied in a discourse-pragmatic study of the American involvement in Iraq, from March 2003 onwards. George W. Bush’s rhetoric also provides data for analysis in the next text, Agnieszka Sowińska’s “Going *Nuke*lear: On Manipulation in Bush’s and Ahmadinejad’s Legitimation of Nuclear Power”, which investigates

various aspects of neo-Orwellian “nukespeak”. Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska’s paper, “Personalization in Political Discourse: Its Pragma-Linguistic Realizations and Potential Persuasive Effects”, identifies and analyses the emancipatory and empowering role of salient pragma-linguistic devices that serve to implement personalization in political discourse. The data for the study of elements salient in creation and maintenance of a political celebrity have been collected from U.S. presidential contender Hillary Rodham Clinton’s official campaign web site over a period of several months prior to the 2008 election. Next, Anna Wieczorek’s “In-Group and Out-Group Markers in the Service of Political Legitimation: A Critical-Methodological Account” applies Piotr Cap’s views on the mechanics of political discourse, which are further subjected to a tentative extension. The next contribution, “Strategic Use of Forms of Other Reference in Political Speeches” by Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova, is another discourse-pragmatic study based on a corpus of thirty speeches delivered by the last three Directors-General of UNESCO at the opening of international conferences and meetings. In the following paper, “Language use in Venezuelan Politics: A Research Agenda for Analysis of the Ideological Discourse of *Chavism*”, Gabriela Hoffmann sets out an agenda for analysis of political discourse in contemporary Venezuela. The section is concluded by Joanna Szczepańska-Włoch’s article, “Aspects of Conduct in Polish and British TV News Interviews with Politicians”, which through its focus on mediated political discourse and the notion of politeness, as well as its contrastive approach, links this “political linguistics” section with the second section, which concentrates on aspects of power and humour in mediated discourse.

In Part Two—“The Pragmatics of Humour, Power and the Media”—there are eight papers. “The Linguistic Forms of Modesty in the Hungarian Language or The Pragmatics of Compliment Response” by Katalin Szili continues the topic of politeness discussed in the previous section, but the analysis is based on everyday conversation and concentrates on intercultural differences between native English speakers and the native Hungarian. In “Politeness to Self and Impoliteness to Other—Can They Co-occur?”, Anna Wiechecka briefly argues for a theory of “self-politeness”, while in “Friend or Foe? Chandler’s Humour from the Metarecipient’s Perspective”, Marta Dynel puts forward a multi-layered model for analysis of film audiences and their scalar, although basically dyadic, classification, from lay recipients to meta- and expert ones. Katarzyna Sielicka’s “Gender Identity Construction via Conversational Humour: Are We Really that Different?” investigates gender-related issues in processing humour. Statistical analysis is also employed in “Playing the

Power Game in Mamet's *Oleanna*", where Agata Klimczak identifies, measures and analyses the dynamicity of power in a complex and tense teacher-student, male-female interaction as presented in the drama. In the next text, "Directness and Indirectness in German and Japanese Verbal Expressions", Sylvia Waechter gives a succinct account of intercultural differences exhibited in German and Japanese soccer players' verbal reactions to failure and success in sport. Katarzyna Poloczek's "'Injurious Speech': Gendering Verbal Violence in Media Discourse" explores Judith Butler's framework for analysis of actional nature of speech in relation to gender issues and discrimination of women. Finally, in "Gestural and Verbal reference to categories and exemplars in expository utterances" Monika Wachowska argues for an integrated pragmatic study of simultaneous verbal and non-verbal elements in interaction.

Part Three—"Focus on Textual Properties"—concentrates on text, excluding political discourse. The first text, by Anita Schirm, provides a linking thread to the previous section by its concentration on entertainment and a form of mediated communication by offering "A Few Comments on the Pragmatics of Billboard posters". The next paper, "Cultural and Perlocutionary Equivalence in the Polish and German Versions of 'Shrek'" by Anna Pałczyńska, also evokes elements of humour, but simultaneously brings problems of translation to the foreground. The topic of translation is also highlighted in the following two texts—"Pragmatic Aspects of Scientific Technical Text Analysis" by Larisa Iljinska and Tatjana Smirnova, and "Language Use: Translation of English Environment-Related Terminology" by Marina Platonova. The technical, professional aspect is further elaborated in "Narrative vs. Informational Patterns across Legal Discourse" by Stanisław Goźdz-Roszkowski, who convincingly discusses aspects of legal language as a LSP (language for specific purposes), a consistent specialized variety and its pragmatically-motivated narrative strategies. Finally, Hanna Pułaczewska offers comments on "Metaphors, Particles, Terminology: From Objectivist to Pragmatic-Cognitivist Approach in Physics and Linguistics", showing how pragmatic strategies and non-literal expressions permeate the language of science.

The texts gathered in this volume differ in scope and level of expertise. They have been authored by recognized researchers and students, at the dawn of their professional career. Many texts included in this volume, through their content, cross-cut the themes of the sections delineated for this collection; for clarity, the allocation of a particular text in a section has been motivated by research focus exercised by the author, whether thematic or methodological. The linking thread through the volume is a

committed pragmatic approach to linguistic data, i.e. a truly functional perspective. Hopefully, together with Volume One, the collection is representative of today's research in pragmatics and its prospective developments.

Many thanks go to John Crust of the University of Łódź, Poland for proofreading a large part of this volume material.

Iwona Witczak-Plisiecka

PART I

PRAGMATICS, POLITICS AND IDEOLOGY

CHAPTER ONE

AXIOLOGICAL PROXIMIZATION

PIOTR CAP,
UNIVERSITY OF ŁÓDŹ

1. Introduction

Proximization, one of the most effective strategies in accomplishing legitimization effects in political (interventionist) discourse,¹ is a pragmatic-cognitive strategy whereby the speaker presents the events on the discourse stage as directly affecting the addressee, in negative and threatening ways. In Cap (2006, 2008) I have defined three types of proximization, spatial, temporal and axiological, which set up different conceptual relations between the entities localized inside the *deictic center*

¹ I take legitimization in the CDA-favored sense of linguistic enactment of the speaker's right to be obeyed (cf. e.g. Chilton 2004, 2005; Fairclough 2000, 2006; Fairclough and Wodak 1997; Van Dijk 1998; Weiss and Wodak 2003; Wodak and Chilton 2005). The claim to rightness and the resulting enactment of legitimization mean that the speaker's rhetoric is grounded in his implicit claim to inhabit a particular social or political role, and to possess a particular authority (cf. Van Dijk 1998, 2005; Martin and Wodak 2003). The possession of authority, usually accompanied by the asserted absence thereof in the audience or in the adversary, provides argumentative rationale (cf. e.g. Van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2004; Dedaic 2006) for listing reasons to be obeyed. Listing such reasons usually involves a symbolic assignment of different ideological principles to different parties on the discourse stage (cf. e.g. Reisigl and Wodak 2001; Chilton 2004), assertion of the addressee's wants in the moment of crisis (cf. e.g. Graham, Keenan and Dowd 2004; Martin and Wodak 2003; Hodges and Nilep 2007; Lakoff 1996), and construal of charismatic leadership matched against an emerging threat (cf. e.g. Chilton 1996; Chilton and Lakoff 1995; Chouliaraki 2007; Hodges and Nilep 2007). All these goals and techniques are addressed in the present paper, which organizes them into a formal discussion of how cognitive and especially axiological aspects of legitimization can be studied through lemma patterns.

(cf. Chilton 2004) of the stage (speaker, addressee, the so-called *IDCs*) and the alien, outside-the-deictic-center entities (*ODCs*). The spatial type of proximization involves construal of the ODC-instigated events as physically endangering the IDCs, i.e., the addressee and the speaker. The temporal type involves presenting the events as momentous and historic and thus of central significance to both the addressee and the speaker. The axiological type, which this paper concentrates on, involves a clash between the system of values adhered to by the speaker and the addressee on the one hand, and, on the other, the values characterizing the ODCs. The process of proximization consists in the construal of the ODC entities impacting the discourse stage in such a way that the IDC elements become threatened, either physically or ideologically or both. The expected rhetorical effect of proximization is legitimization of policies the political speaker wants to enact to neutralize the ODC threat. The pursuit of legitimization via the application of proximization strategies follows the speaker's assumption that his audience are more likely to approve the pre-emptive actions against the threat if they construe it as personally consequential.²

2. The STA proximization model

The Spatial-Temporal-Axiological (STA) model of proximization proposed in Cap (2006, 2008) presupposes the constancy of the macro function of the speaker's performance within a defined timeframe – if, as a result of external factors, one strategy of proximization is downplayed or abandoned, the overall balance is restored by an increase in the salience of another strategy.

This compensatory character of proximization has been tentatively verified in Cap (2006, 2008), in pilot corpus studies on the language of the US administration during the Iraq war, between March 2003 (commencement of the allies' military operations in Iraq) and June 2004 (delegation of select executive powers to the new Iraqi interim government). The analysis has corroborated the existence of the IDC-ODC divide, the IDC camp involving entities such as the US, the allies, etc., and the ODC camp

² Since this paper uses data from the American political rhetoric, one could draw a working analogy between the IDC-ODC dichotomy and the traditional, post-isolationist 'Us vs. Them' divide (cf. e.g. Huntington 2004). In the process of proximization the ideological as well as physical distance between 'Us' and 'Them' is construed as shrinking, which eventually produces a clash. To prevent the clash, the speaker solicits legitimization of pre-emptive actions, which are thus in direct, personal interest of his audience ('Us', i.e. IDCs).

grouping all the antagonistic entities on the discourse stage (Iraq, terrorists, dictatorships, etc.). I have analyzed the total of 64 presidential addresses within the two functionally distinct phases of the period: "Phase One," March–November 2003 (34 speeches), and "Phase Two," December 2003–June 2004 (30 speeches).³ The conclusions have been that while the former sees as the major premise for war the alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) by the Saddam's regime, the latter is dominated by compensatory rhetoric, aimed at keeping the legitimization of the Iraqi intervention in place despite the already evident failure of the WMD argument.⁴ The changes in the extralinguistic reality i.e. in the geopolitical context of the conflict have shown to affect the proximization pattern applied throughout the entire war period.

It has been postulated that in Phase One texts there is a dominance of spatial-temporal proximization, which follows from the US administration's easy access to the WMD premise for legitimization of the pre-emptive strike in Iraq (cf. Silberstein 2004). The discourse stage is thus construed in predominantly spatial-temporal terms; for instance, the analogy to 9/11 events is built to invoke the aura of physical danger closing in to impact the IDC entities (i.e. America, its allies, the "democratic world"). Examples such as "On a September morning, threats that had gathered for years, in secret and far away, led to murder in our country on a massive scale" or "The danger is clear: using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons, obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country" (cf. Cap 2008) prove that in Phase One the US administration solicit legitimization of the war in Iraq by constructing a network of material, tangible threats from the ODC agents (Iraq, terrorists, etc.), which need to be neutralized in a pre-emptive strike. However, the later loss of the main argument for going to war (i.e. the alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction by the Hussein's regime) means a gradual redefinition of the

³ The 64 presidential speeches on the Iraq war, covering the period March 2003–June 2004, were downloaded, in July 2004, from the official White House site <http://www.whitehouse.org>. All 64 speeches on Iraq available from the site in July 2004 were used in analysis, there were no left-out cases.

⁴ Similar points are raised in a number of journalistic texts on the Iraq war. They indicate a gradual change of the rhetorical stance, from emphasizing the closeness and immediacy of physical threat, to ideological juxtapositions and boundary-making. The change is, however, attributed not only to the WMD factor, but also to Bush's attempts at softening his rhetoric in general, to save the dwindling approval ratings. See, for instance: *USA Today*, Nov. 23, 2003; *Washington Post*, Nov. 2, 2003; *Boston Globe*, Jan. 2, 2004.

pro-war rhetoric and hence a change in the overall proximization pattern. What happens in Phase Two is thus a decline in the spatial-temporal proximization, and a corresponding increase in the more universally appealing axiological proximization (cf. Pomeroy 2005). The latter's principal function is to broaden the geopolitical spectrum of the Iraqi conflict and to deepen its ideological anchoring (cf. Chang and Mehan 2006), thereby claiming legitimization on a more global scale. At the same time the collapse of the original argument is downplayed and the WMD intelligence failure is construed in terms of an isolated incident in a series of successful operations governed by irrefutable ideological tenets (cf. Cap 2006, 2008).

In what follows I take a closer look at how axiological proximization takes over the legitimizing role in the Iraq war. First, I present and describe its textual manifestations in Phase Two of the war. Next, the textual regularities are captured in a lexical framework ("axiological proximization framework") defining the categories of items which have been most typically used, at phraseological and syntactic levels, in the service of axiological proximization. The categories yield lexical counts showing the continual increase in the intensity of axiological proximization throughout the entire legitimization period, i.e. both phases of the war. Altogether, we arrive at a refined form of the STA proximization model, accounting in conceptual and lexical terms, for rhetorical adjustments following the changes in the extralinguistic reality, such as the loss of the WMD argument in the Iraq war.

The aspiration to refine the STA model as described above is thus an attempt to contribute to the formalization of the dialogue between the conceptual and the lexical constituents of legitimization. This means that the paper tackles, in a necessarily tentative way, a much broader methodological question of *how cognitive constructs can be studied through the analysis of lexical configurations*. Handling this question involves a number of issues which the model of proximization takes for granted in its own composition: the construal of crisis situation, symbolic distancing, ideological categorization, threat inflation, and more.

3. Axiological proximization in Phase Two of the Iraq war

Most of the textual examples of the Phase Two axiological proximization reveal the following regularity. First, there is a description of the ideological composition of the IDC parties. Then, a temporarily static juxtaposition is built against the rather vague category of ODCs—after all, with the WMD premise and the 9/11 analogy both missing from

the argument, the invoked antagonistic values can only occasionally be ascribed to concrete countries or groups. Finally, in line with the essence of the concept of proximization as such, the ODC-related values are construed as dynamic, in the sense of potentially prompting actions which could involve a physical IDC-ODC clash. This is where the future-oriented argument ends. At the same time, however, a stance of legitimization of the IDCs' activity is maintained retrospectively through multiple references to the ideologically alien (if not just plainly abhorrent) past actions of the principal ODC (i.e. the Iraqi regime) in and before Phase One of the war:

The work of building a new Iraq is hard, and it is right. And America has always been willing to do what it takes for what is right. But as democracy takes hold in Iraq, the enemies of freedom will do all in their power to spread violence and fear. [...] Let me repeat what I said on the afternoon of December the 14th: the capture of Saddam Hussein does not mean the end of violence in Iraq. We still face terrorists who would rather go on killing the innocent than accept the rise of liberty in the heart of the Middle East. (January 20, 2004)

America and all freedom-loving countries are fighting on the side of liberty—liberty in Iraq, liberty in the Middle East and beyond it. This objective serves the interests of the Middle East, of the United States and of the whole democratic world. As the greater Middle East increasingly becomes a place where freedom flourishes, the lives of millions in that region will be bettered, and the American people and the entire world will be more secure. [...] As the June 30th date for Iraqi sovereignty draws near, a small fraction is attempting to derail Iraqi democracy and seize power. In some cities, Saddam supporters and terrorists have struck against coalition forces. In other areas, attacks were incited by a radical named Muqtada-al-Sadr, who is wanted for the murder of a respected Shiite cleric. Al-Sadr has called for violence against coalition troops, and his band of thugs have terrorized Iraqi police and ordinary citizens. These enemies of freedom want to dictate the course of events in Iraq and to prevent the Iraqi people from having a true voice in their future. They want America and our coalition to falter in our commitments before a watching world. In their aspirations, they are a threat to all democratic people and to the people in our own country. (April 10, 2004)

In these two excerpts, the axiological composition of IDCs involves i) a full and unfaltering commitment to universally acceptable norms and values (“democracy,” “freedom,” “liberty,” the economic well-being of the people salient in “the lives of millions in that region will be bettered,” etc.), and ii) a commitment to steadfast, continual enactment of these

values (“has always been willing to do what it takes for what is right,” “are fighting on the side of,” etc.—note the use of progressive forms). Antithetical to this groundwork is the ensuing description of the ODCs’ ideology which involves the rule of dictatorship (“a small fraction [...] want to dictate the course of events in Iraq”) giving rise to “violence” and “fear.”⁵ The ODCs are then construed as potentially invading the IDCs’ (operational) territory (“will do all in their power to spread [violence and fear],” “is attempting to derail Iraqi democracy and seize power,” “are a threat to all democratic people and to the people in our own country”) in a manner analogous to the (anticipated) workings of Saddam Hussein’s regime. Finally, throughout the entire account, painful memories of the latter (“would rather go on killing the innocent,” etc.) are invoked (whether directly or, as above, by setting up a past-vs-present activity link), in order to strengthen the legitimization of the ongoing US involvement in Iraq as a whole.

3.1. The axiological (A) proximization framework

The goal of the axiological proximization framework is to provide a set of criteria and categories whereby one can define the lexical components of axiological proximization, in order to measure the axiological proximization (balancing) effects between different phases of the entire legitimization process, i.e., in our case, between Phase One and Phase Two of the Iraq war. The axiological proximization framework draws on the ingredients/stages of the IDC-ODC axiological conflict as described in the

⁵ The way Bush builds up the ideological opposition between the IDC “good values” and the ODC “bad values” illustrates Capone’s (2008) and Duranti’s (2006b) ideas of shifting responsibility for adopting a particular course of action, from the political speaker, to the addressee. The speaker portrays himself as acting “on behalf of” the addressee and defines the addressee’s beliefs and ideals as prime motive for the proposed policies. In building up the IDC-ODC opposition, Bush makes use of the American people’s predispositions, “in order to show that he correctly represents the needs and sentiments of his nation, thus being entitled to represent them as a political leader and to do what is good for them” (Capone 2008: 88). In a broader perspective, most of the communication of ideology in Bush’s speeches on the Iraq war (especially in Phase Two) is also congruent with what Duranti (2006a) refers to as a complex *translocutionary act*, an attempt to construe messages “jointly” with the addressee. Such a goal often involves using intrinsically vague concepts in order to get the addressee to exercise the authorial rhetorical work. In invoking such notions as “threat” or “danger” (see 3.2. below), Bush relies on his audience to fill in the exact meanings and thus co-assume responsibility for the effects these meanings might have on the unfolding policies.

textual analysis above: the conflicting ideological characteristics of IDCs and ODCs, and the possibility of the ODC-related antagonistic values materializing within the deictic center. Altogether, we arrive at the following four categories of the framework:

- 1) Noun phrases (NPs) expressing abstract notions conceptualized as values and/or value sets / ideologies of IDCs;
- 2) Noun phrases (NPs) expressing abstract notions conceptualized as values and/or value sets / ideologies of ODCs;
- 3) Verb-phrase(VP)-framed phrases, sentences or cross-sentential discourse chunks involving
 - 3a) Ctg. 2 NP, embedded in or elaborated on by a “departure VP” (VP1), to produce the *remote possibility* script,
 - 3b) NP expressing (effect of) IDC-ODC physical contact (conflict), embedded in or elaborated on by a “destination VP” (VP2), to produce the *actual occurrence* script, whose combination in a linear discourse sequence 3a-3b results in *realis enhancing modality* of the text whereby a value set / ideology of ODCs *materializes* in the form of IDC-ODC physical contact (conflict);
- 4) NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as effects of IDC-ODC physical contact (conflict), NOT embedded in or elaborated on by a “destination VP” (VP2).

Admittedly, the composition of some of the categories, esp. 3), is complex enough to require a thorough text explanation. The following excerpts come from President Bush’s Whitehall Palace address of November 19, 2003. This speech can be considered an overture to the Phase Two rhetoric in the Iraq war:

[...] The greatest threat of our age is nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons in the hands of terrorists, and the dictators who aid them. This evil might not have reached us yet but it is in plain sight, as plain as the horror sight of the collapsing towers. The danger only increases with denial. [...]By advancing freedom in the greater Middle East, we help end a cycle of dictatorship and radicalism that brings millions of people to misery and brings danger and, one day, tragedy, to our own people. By struggling for justice in Iraq, Burma, in Sudan, and in Zimbabwe, we give hope to suffering people and improve the chances for stability and

progress. [...]The stakes in that region could not be higher. If the Middle East remains a place where freedom and democracy do not flourish, it will remain a place of stagnation and anger and violence for export. And as we saw in the ruins of the towers, no distance on the map will protect our lives and way of life [...]

The categories 1), 2) and 4) are, compared to 3), relatively straightforward and thus we shall illustrate them first. Category 1) involves lexical items whose collective function is to define, in terms of a set of value-positive abstract concepts, the ideological groundwork of the IDC agents. In the text above these are, chronologically, the lexemes such as “freedom,” “justice,” “stability,” “progress” and “democracy.” Opposing this groundwork are the ODC-related lexemes which make up a set of value-negative concepts captured in the second category—“threat,” “evil,” “danger,” “dictatorship,” “radicalism,” “anger” and “violence.” The last NP-based category, 4), involves items such as “horror,” “misery” and “tragedy,” which lexicalize conceptualizations of physical contact between IDCs and ODCs. Of course, there is a certain degree of simplification and fuzziness involved, as conceptualizations of e.g. “threat” and “danger” are at the same time construals of elements of the antagonistic ideologies as such and construals of potency these elements exhibit in terms of materialization (cf. Pomeroy 2005; Hartman 2002) within the IDC territory. Furthermore, the fourth category must include not only the concepts which come explicitly in the form of the corresponding lexical items, but also the ones that need to be worked out inferentially in a manner similar to recovering implicatures (cf. e.g. Levinson 2000). Take, for instance, the closing excerpt “no distance on the map will protect our lives and way of life”—while no lexicalization of the effect of the IDC-ODC physical contact occurs explicitly, we do get enough data to recover the *loss of life* implicature which adds to the count alongside all the other NP-based concepts that fill in the category.

To account for the remaining third category with due precision coupled with an adequate body of data, we might want to break the text down into three separate excerpts (i, ii, iii), with each one offering a specific example of the VP-NP interface:

- (i) The greatest threat of our age is nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons in the hands of terrorists, and the dictators who aid them. This evil might not have reached us yet but it is in plain sight, as plain as the horror sight of the collapsing towers. The danger only increases with denial.

- (ii) By advancing freedom in the greater Middle East, we help end a cycle of dictatorship and radicalism that brings millions of people to misery and brings danger and, one day, tragedy, to our own people. By struggling for justice in Iraq, Burma, in Sudan, and in Zimbabwe, we give hope to suffering people and improve the chances for stability and progress.
- (iii) The stakes in that region could not be higher. If the Middle East remains a place where freedom and democracy do not flourish, it will remain a place of stagnation and anger and violence for export. And as we saw in the ruins of the towers, no distance on the map will protect our lives and way of life.

In (i) the ctg. 2 NP is primarily “This evil,” but one may in fact enrich it with concepts such as “terrorism” and “dictatorship” since they get subsumed under the cover concept of “evil” via a clear anaphoric link. The NP is used to initiate the *remote possibility* script which is further enacted by VP1 (“might not have reached us yet”). The modality of VP1 is such that it makes the addressee embark on merely the *departure stage* of the IDC-ODC conflict scenario (hence naming the VP1 a “departure VP”), without yet construing the antagonistic concepts in terms of tangible threats. Later, however, the *destination stage* of the scenario has the conflict fully materialize within the IDC territory (viz. analogy to “the collapsing towers”). The construed materialization of the conflict comes in the *actual occurrence* script which involves, first, a “destination VP” (VP2–“is in plain sight”) which enhances the probability of the conflict and, second, the NP (“the horror sight”) expressing its devastating effects. Thus, altogether, the (axiological) proximization of the ODC impact is dependent on the (ctg. 2 NP–VP1)–(VP2–NP-of-effect) segments operating in a linear sequence involving a gradual shift from an ideological conflict to a physical clash. In this very example the sequence starts and finalizes within one complex sentence, but we shall see from (iii) that its segments could operate over two adjacent sentences as well.

Meanwhile, let us deal with (ii). Here, the remote possibility script is initiated by “a cycle of dictatorship and radicalism” (ctg. 2 NP), which combines with “brings millions of people to misery” (VP1) to encourage construal of the ODC values as breeding social chaos, unrest and, conceivably, violence which might be spreading beyond the ODC territory. Following this formula is again the ODC impact (actual occurrence) script whereby the effect marker (“tragedy”) is embedded in a verb phrase (VP2) which materializes (via the “danger”-to-“tragedy”

route) the gathering threat. Compared to (i), the current realis enhancement is not just the matter of a conceptual shift from “the abstract” to “the concrete,” esp. at the superior level of the verbal framework. It also consists in an act of geopolitical specification salient in a premeditated choice of nominal phrases—the remote possibility script involves reference to “millions of people,” while the actual occurrence script has this broad concept narrowed down to “our own people.”

While example (iii) conforms to the design of the third category in the general terms of its elements and their relations, it involves two interesting deviations from the layouts in (i) and (ii). First, the sequence of the verb phrases (VP1 vs. VP2) develops not within one sentence, but over two adjacent sentences; second, the actual occurrence script in the latter sentence involves an implicitly communicated NP of effect. The presence of these “irregularities,” with all the distinctive features of the category otherwise met, counts as an incentive for a corpus search more extensive than the former examples would prompt.

Looking closer, the ctg. 2 NP is “a place of stagnation and anger and violence for export,” a phrase possessing not only the expectable ideological load, but also a considerable potential for suggesting its impact (viz. “for export”). The construal of the impact is at this stage in hypothetical terms, though the verbal embedding—“it will remain [...]”(VP1)—makes its due contribution to seeing the threat as gathering. Thus the remote possibility script is concluded and the proximization mechanism continues in the next sentence. There, the actual occurrence script takes on an implicit form and the consequences of the ODC impact need to be worked out inferentially. Since, given the continuity of the threat leading to its final materialization within the IDC territory (the latter worked out from “the ruins of the towers”), there is “no distance” that could “protect our lives,” the NP-of-effect is calculated from the conception that the ODC entities will be *crossing the distance* to annihilate the IDC entities. Thus, the NP-of-effect is *loss of life* on the part of the IDCs. Interestingly, this final inference relies on the former conceptualization of the ODC movement (*crossing the distance*) which is itself communicated indirectly. Altogether, what we deal with here is an (actual occurrence) script in which the verbal component (VP2) possesses a status comparable to an explicature (cf. e.g. Carston 2002) whose successful recovery ensures that the implicature (NP-of-effect) is worked out correctly.

The composition of the third category of the axiological proximization framework reflects the essence of axiological proximization as a conceptual mechanism. It accounts for the phenomenon of the continual

narrowing of the distance between two different and opposing ideologies (ODCs' vs IDCs'), and treats the eventual axiological conflict in terms of a trigger for the actual occurrence of events construed within the spatial-temporal domain. In so doing, it integrates the proximity potential of entities classed in the other categories, esp. the 2nd category which holds lexicalizations of concepts constituting the ideological groundwork for the ODC impact.

By now we have been looking at axiological proximity as primarily a self-contained mechanism and we have not made a systematic attempt at showing its potential for restoring the macro function of legitimization (of the Iraq war), in view of a vanishing contribution by another proximity strategy (i.e. spatial-temporal). This methodological aspiration entails that we approach the particular categories of the axiological framework in lexical terms, providing corpus counts for the most representative members of each category. Then, for a complete picture of the compensation, we shall analyse the cross-phasal (Phase Two vs. Phase One) occurrences of the particular lexemes (in the case of categories 1, 2, 4) as well as the lexicogrammatical sequences (in the case of 3).

3.2. Counts from the A framework

The following table includes counts of the key lemmas representing categories 1, 2 and 4 of the A framework, as well as counts of syntactic forms which reflect the design of the third category. The corpora have been again, as indicated in 2., the 34-text Phase One corpus and the 30-text Phase Two corpus:

Table 1. Phase differences in the number of lemmas and syntactic forms (ctg. 3) defining axiological framework of the Iraq war rhetoric

Category	Key Lemma or Syntactic Form (ctg. 3)		Phase One		Phase Two	
1.	freedom		100		221	
	democracy		76		150	
	peace		31		50	
	justice		12		19	
	progress		7		34	
	other IDC values		16		21	
	TOTAL category 1		242		495	
2.	dictatorship		44		71	
	radicalism		27		71	
	terrorism		154		90	
	threat	with reference to WMD (marker of ODC-IDC impact)	95	127	12	52
		without reference to WMD (marker of ideology operating within the ODC camp)	32		40	
	danger	with reference to WMD (marker of ODC-IDC impact)	70	96	13	51
		without reference to WMD (marker of ideology operating within the ODC camp)	26		38	
	other ODC values		16		21	
	TOTAL category 2		464		356	
	3.	realis enhancing syntactic or discourse form ((ctg. 2 NP–VP1 _{departure})– (VP2 _{destination} –NP-of-effect))		9		63
	TOTAL category 3		9		63	
4. ⁶	tragedy		60		55	
	misery		24		67	
	horror		32		49	
	murder		40		33	
	other NPs-of-effect		11		18	
	TOTAL category 4		167		222	

⁶ Although many of the fourth category lemmas are also part of the realis enhancing form captured in the third category, their frequency hits in the fourth category are “free hits”, i.e. separate from those which contribute to the *actual occurrence* script.

There are, apparently, two basic conditions under which these category counts corroborate the legitimization-restoring capacity of the A framework. First, the Phase Two counts should be generally higher than the Phase One counts, as the emerging axiological proximization must be given a lexical backup substantial enough to make up for the lexical losses incurred by the diminishing role of the spatial-temporal proximization (see Cap 2008 for exact figures). Second, within the first and the second category, the IDC counts in Phase Two should be higher than the ODC counts, as the rising role of the ideological aspect entails that IDCs are endowed with a multitude of values to broaden the source of comparison and contrast and thus increase the odds that the obviously antithetical values spotted in ODCs are automatically rejected. The accompanying rationale is, of course, that Phase Two sees a minimized contribution from the WMD premise, a concept originally associated with the activity of the ODC entities.

It doesn't take long to see that both conditions are largely met, though only a deeper look yields a number of interesting analytic observations, some of which have to do with the S/T-A conceptual and lexical borderline.

Starting with the more general first condition, the first thing to acknowledge is the staggering cross-phasal increase in the lexical realization of the realis enhancing formula. Its Phase Two occurrence is in fact seven times (!) higher than the Phase One occurrence, which obviously corroborates the cornerstone role of the third category in the general layout of the axiological proximization framework. The very count, (9:63) might not impress when compared with the total counts yielded by the other categories, but it certainly does if one allows for the internal complexity of the third category which poses ultra-high qualification requirements. The dominance of axiological proximization in Phase Two is further substantiated by the Phase One – Phase Two ratios of the total counts in categories 1 and 4, while the 464-to-356 decrease in category 2 seems an exception, at least in bare quantitative terms. In actuality, it results from a twofold conceptual origin of the two member lemmas, “threat” and “danger.” Much as they contribute to the ideological constitution of the ODC camp as such, they are also exponents of the spatial impact which the ODCs might exert upon the IDC territory. Altogether then, the borderline status of “threat” and “danger” makes the second category of the A framework include both their physically and ideologically oriented readings since it is difficult to draw a clear boundary between the underlying concepts, especially considering the temporal extensiveness and geopolitical variability of the entire legitimization

process. Hence, of course, the seemingly large Phase One total count in the second category and its resulting dominance over the Phase Two count, but mark the fact that no such relation would hold if we were to disregard the evidently “WMD-related” readings. With no reference to WMD, both “threat” and “danger” duly increase in Phase Two. And finally, even if the ODC Phase One count (464) is apparently higher than its Phase Two counterpart (356), it is still smaller than the IDC Phase Two count (495), which keeps evidencing the primacy of the ideological *self*-description in the process axiological proximization.

Returning to the third category, let us note that the increase in the application of the *realis* enhancing form is only possible because of the increase in most of the lemmas carrying the ODC ideological load. Especially important are the growing occurrences of “dictatorship” (44:71) and “radicalism” (27:71) since these two lemmas are among the most frequent axiological constituents of the remote possibility script. In contrast, such a compositional contribution is much smaller in the case of “terrorism,” a lemma which addresses the past rationale for war and thus only occasionally appears in the *realis* enhancing structure.

The *realis* enhancing form further benefits from the Phase One – Phase Two increase in many of the NPs-of-effect, with the exception of those few which, again, bring back the past legitimization stance (viz. “murder”). In fact, the lemmas making up the fourth category of the axiological framework show an interesting re-orientation of focus as compared to the spatial-temporal proximization: they offer no clear picture of the physically devastating effects of the ODC-IDC clash, but only a vague indication of *some* kind of consequence, whether physical or not. Mark the presence of lemmas (“tragedy,” “misery”) which relate to physical impact only potentially and even if one does settle on the “physical” interpretation, the vagueness of these lemmas is such that the impact seems at least not necessarily WMD-related.

These observations prove the fulfillment of the first condition for the legitimization-redressing capacity of the A framework. That the less complex second condition is also met is evident from the comparison of the number of the IDC (category 1) and the ODC (category 2) hits in Phase Two of the war. The ratio, 495:356, is convincing enough but consider again the contribution to the latter figure from the “borderline lemmas,” i.e. “threat” and “danger.” Without this contribution, the picture gets even clearer.

4. Conclusion

Altogether, the readings from Table 1 indicate a compensatory mechanism of axiological proximization, which can make up for a decline in spatial-temporal strategies. The postulate for such a regularity is novel by itself but it bears relevance to a number of well established and widely applicable concepts: symbolic distancing in discourse, assignment of disparate values to discourse parties, projection of a crisis situation to solicit legitimization, etc. Thus, to corroborate the current findings, the S/T-A relation should be looked out for and analyzed in further case studies of interventionist rhetoric. Arguably, interventionist solicitation of legitimization is firstly reliant on material premises since these are initially easier to obtain and possess a more direct appeal to the audience, which can grant an immediate approval of the speaker's actions. Yet, the attachment to a material premise for intervention is, in the long run, disadvantaged by geopolitical changes and evolution of the discourse stage, which often have the initial premise disappear. Then, a compensation from ideological premises is nothing but natural, considering that axiological groundworks are, first, much less vulnerable to the impact of geopolitical changes and, second, they contribute to setting up discourses which are essentially abstract and involve less specific interpretations (cf. Hartman 2002; Lemos 1995). This does not mean that arrangements of the discourse stage which are based on axiological construals are incapable of generating more material premises in the long run. As we have seen from the Iraqi case, a material threat which was initially construed as "standing in the IDC doorstep," was later temporarily set aside, but only to accumulate (and, possibly, reappear in a similar form) as a result of the growing axiological conflict.

References

- Broder, David and Dan Balz. "Nation once again split on Bush: Voters split on handling of Iraq and economy". *Washington Post*, Nov. 2, 2003.
- Cap, Piotr. *Legitimization in Political Discourse: A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective on the Modern US War Rhetoric*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2006.
- . "Towards the proximization model of the analysis of legitimization in political discourse". *Journal of Pragmatics* 40/1 (2008): 17-41.

- Capone, Alessandro. "Barack Obama's South Carolina speech". *RASK* 27 (2008): 87-122.
- Carston, Robyn. *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Chang, Gordon and Hugh Mehan. "Discourse in a religious mode: The Bush administration's discourse in the War on Terrorism and its challenges". *Pragmatics* 16 (2006): 1-23.
- Chilton, Paul. *Security Metaphors*. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.
- . *Analysing Political Discourse. Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- . "Missing links in mainstream CDA: Modules, blends and the critical instinct". In *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Paul Chilton, 19-51. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2005.
- Chilton, Paul and George Lakoff. "Foreign policy by metaphor". In *Language and Peace*, edited by Christina Schäffner and Anita Wenden, 37-60. Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1995.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie. (ed.) *The Soft Power of War*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2007.
- Dedačić, Mirjana. "Political speeches and persuasive argumentation". In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Vol. 9*, edited by Keith Brown, 700-707. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006.
- Duranti, Alessandro. "Narrating the political self". *Language in Society* 35 (2006a): 467-97.
- . "The social ontology of intentions". *Discourse Studies* 8/1 (2006b): 31-40.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- . "Genres in political linguistics". In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Vol. 5*, edited by Keith Brown, 32-38. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006.
- Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak. "Critical discourse analysis". In *Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Vol. 2*, edited by Teun van Dijk, 20-45. London: Sage, 1997.
- Graham, Phil, Thomas Keenan and Anne Dowd. "A call to arms at the end of history: A discourse-historical analysis of George W. Bush's declaration of war on terror". *Discourse and Society* 15/2-3 (2004): 199-222.
- Greenway, Henry. "Bush rides high as 2004 begins". *Boston Globe*, Jan. 2, 2004.