



Volume 8, Issue 2 - 2020 · ISSN 2534-9538

STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS, CULTURE AND FLT



Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen
Department of English Studies



STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS, CULTURE AND FLT

Volume 8, Issue 2 - 2020
Exploring English Studies:
Aspects of Language, Culture and the Media



Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen
Department of English Studies



This eighth issue of *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT* is the end result of the work of the Department of English Studies, Faculty of Humanities, *Konstantin Preslavsky* University of Shumen.

Editorial Board*:

Editor-in-chief: Prof. Roumyana Todorova, PhD (Bulgaria)

Co-Editor-in-chief: Assoc. Prof. Desislava Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva, PhD (Bulgaria),

Editors:

Assoc. Prof. Carol Griffiths, PhD (UK), Prof. Dr. Habil. Anna Bączkowska (Poland), Prof. Peter Gärdenfors (Sweden), Assoc. Prof. Irina Ivanova, PhD (Bulgaria), Dr. Antonia Navarro Tejero (Spain), Prof. Dr. Birsen Tütünlü (Turkey), Prof. Dr. Habil. Berrin Aksoy (Turkey), Prof. D. Litt. Maya Pencheva (Bulgaria), Joanna Mikosz, PhD (Poland), David Mossop, PhD, Mary Sinéad Fallon (Spain), Assist. Prof. Mira Bekar, PhD (The Republic of North Macedonia),

Prof. Dr. Tatiana P. Karpilovitch (Belarus)

SILC is indexed and watched by EBSCO, CEEOL, Scribd, Google Scholar, Directory of Research Journals Indexing (DRJI), ROAD – Directory of Open Access Scholarly Resources, The Journals Impact Factor (JIFACTOR), Systematic Impact Factor (SIF), Directory of Periodicals and MLA International Bibliography and RINZ

SILC is archived in CEEOL (full texts, electronic), Bulgarian National Library St. St. Cyril and Metodius (full texts, print and electronic)

* The Editorial Board bear no responsibility for the content or accuracy of the articles.

© Individual contributions: respective authors

© *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT*

© Asenevtsi Publishing, Sofia

SJIF 2020 = 5.892

ISSN 2534-9538

ISSN 2534-952X

DOI: 10.46687/SILC

Contents

PREFACE.....	5
THE SOCIO-COGNITIVE ASPECT OF VERBALIZATION OF JOURNALISTIC DISCOURSE <i>Alesia Shevtsova</i>	7
ASPECTS OF MEDIA PRESENTATIONS ON RUSSIANS: YET ANOTHER SPY STORY IN THE MEDIA <i>Desislava Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva</i>	19
AUTHORITY LEGITIMATION IN CAMPAIGN DISCOURSE OF AMERICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES <i>Boryana Kostova</i>	52
THE LIMITS OF TRANSLATING POSTCOLONIAL EXPERIENCE INTO A FOREIGN CULTURE <i>N. Berrin Aksoy</i>	85
EXPLORING SMELL FROM A COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE IN ENGLISH AND BULGARIAN (A CORPUS STUDY) <i>Svetlana Nedelcheva</i>	95

PREFACE

The second issue of volume 8 of *SILC* “Exploring English Studies: Aspects of Language, Culture and the Media” features five papers dealing with different aspects of media studies, applied linguistics, as well as contrastive studies and translation.

The issue opens up with a paper by Alesia Shevtsova titled “The Socio-Cognitive Aspect of Verbalization of Journalistic Discourse”. The focus of study are news headlines from the British and the Russian media and the way they employ the mental and contextual models of readers and journalists. Some of the findings of the analysis show that unlike the Russian-language headlines which avail themselves of ethno-specific contextual models and use propositions with an implication and an abstract level of description, the high-quality UK press shows a very serious approach to the presentation of information in their headlines. The latter use “a clear description indicating specific agents and patients of the communicative event, and also represent fairly explicit propositions”, which can easily be understood by applying the shared knowledge of “the British epistemic community” (ibid.).

Another research conducted on a comparative basis, this time between articles in English, Russian and Bulgarian, focuses on the topic of spies and more specifically on the different aspects of Skripal’s poisoning that the newspapers in the three countries foreground. Desislava Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva concludes that the different papers differ in their tone as well as in the information that they foreground in their articles, however, they all touch on four main topics which metaphorically may be described as Flexing Muscles, Expansion and scare, the Blame game, and last but not least the Life of a spy.

Boryana Kostova discusses the speeches of four presidential candidates in the USA with an emphasis on authority legitimation which in the analysed media discourse can be obtained in several ways but mostly through intertextuality. The author finds that “that the most common source of intertextuality is the voice of the political opponent, while the most salient functions are elevating one’s moral standing and credibility, solidarity building and downgrading opposing points of view” (ibid.).

These first three papers are followed by a research on the limits of translating post-colonial experience into a foreign culture. In her paper, Berrin Aksoy analyses the challenges she has experienced and the approaches she has used in translating Ben Okri’s *The Famished Road* into Turkish. The author argues that the challenges are mostly due to the fact that postcolonial experience is not

shared by the target audience, i.e. by the Turkish readers, and is, therefore, a new concept that they are not familiar with.

The second issue of volume 8 of *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT* finishes off with a corpus-based study on *smell* in Bulgarian and English by Svetlana Nedelcheva. The author applies the cognitive approach in her analysis and argues that “cross-linguistic analogy in polysemous meanings may rely not only on universal cognition, but also on the universal experiences of social interaction” (ibid.).

THE SOCIO-COGNITIVE ASPECT OF VERBALIZATION OF JOURNALISTIC DISCOURSE¹

Alesia Shevtsova²

Abstract: *The paper focuses on the differences in the English and Russian headlines referring to the mental and contextual models of readers and journalists. The article considers the tendencies in the verbalization of the models under the influence of a concrete linguistic culture. The analysis reveals that the Russian-language headlines of articles to a greater extent actualize the ethno-specific contextual model. The title is represented by a proposition with an implication and an abstract level of description. Unlike the Russian-language headlines, the high-quality UK press is still characterized by a rather “serious” approach to presenting information in the genre of news articles. The headlines of the articles have a clear description indicating specific agents and patients of the communicative event, and also represent fairly explicit propositions. Based on the socially shared knowledge of the British epistemic community, the author actively forms a dynamic contextual model of the recipient reader by introducing new knowledge about current events and realities of modern life.*

Key words: *journalistic discourse, mental (semantic situational) model, contextual (pragmatic) model.*

Introduction

Journalistic (or publicistic) discourse is one of the most popular and widely spread types of discourses belonging to the wider category of media discourse. Though it is the oldest and most traditional discourse, it is still the most dynamic and variable one. It always reflects the current tendencies in a specific society or in the world in general. This discourse can be viewed upon as a result of the real events through the prism of the journalist personality. Journalistic discourse is quite influential, as it can affect the recipient and persuade him or her of the perspectives chosen by the author-journalist.

1. The research was carried out within the framework of the research and development program “Trends in the development and functioning of the Belarusian-language media discourse in the context of globalization and intercultural dialogue” (State registration No. 20161437) of the subprogram “Belarusian language and literature” of the state program of research “Economy and Humanitarian Development of the Belarusian Society” for 2016-2020.

2. Assoc. Prof. PhD. Department of Romance-Germanic philology, Mogilev State University named after A. Kuleshov, Mogilev, Belarus, e-mail: shevtcova@msu.by, ORCID: 0000-0002-3041-6862

According to the modern discursive linguistics (Cuhna, 2015; Dijk, 2016; Filiettaz & Roulet, 2002), any language phenomenon can only obtain a complete description if it is analyzed taking into account the peculiarities of its use, all discursive aspects. This tendency of linguistic research predetermined the key role of discursive analysis and defined its position as one of the central sections of modern linguistics. At the same time, it should be noted that discourse is the object of an interdisciplinary research, including philosophy, psychology and sociology. The analysis of journalistic discourse, in particular, involves a number of extralinguistic factors: ethnocultural characteristics, social conditions of production and functioning of discourse, the focus of the journalistic discourse on a specific group of recipients, ways of managing new knowledge, which the producer adapts and integrates into their discourse, taking into account the old knowledge already possessed by the members of the epistemic community.

The socio-cognitive approach to the linguistic research emphasizes the role of knowledge in the realization of discourse. In this article, we do not consider knowledge as a universal phenomenon common to all people. We view knowledge in a narrower sense – as the knowledge of one epistemic community, which may seem to be the right or wrong opinion for another.

Previous research in the field

The factors mentioned above (ethnocultural features, social conditions for the production and functioning of discourse, the focus of journalistic discourse on a specific group of recipients, ways of managing new knowledge) relate to the main models of discourse activity proposed by T. A. van Dijk. In the course of creating journalistic discourse, there is a fact of transferring new knowledge. However, the same knowledge can be transmitted differently so that a subjective approach is observed.

As T. A. van Dijk sees it, knowledge is contextual, because “that which was accepted as the knowledge today can be rejected tomorrow as a false opinion or superstition” (Dijk, 2013, p. 6). In addition, knowledge is “assumed and taken for granted in the public discourse of the community”, which is “one of the fundamental relations between discourse and knowledge” (Dijk, 2013, p. 6).

When analyzing the headlines of English-language newspaper articles, we will refer to the declarative social knowledge of the British epistemic community, according to the typology of knowledge by T. A. van Dijk. Following the aforementioned authoritative scholar, we will approach the understanding of discourse as an interpretation of the speaker’s mental models, and “discourse planning means interpreting the mental model of the corresponding communicative speech activity” (Dijk, 2013, p. 7). As a part of the interpretation of newspaper headlines, there is a close interaction between the mental and

contextual models of the author-journalist and readers. The ways of representing these models are determined by the specific pragmatic goals that the author sets.

According to T. A. van Dijk (Dijk, 2008; Dijk, 2016), the subjective situational model of the event is updated, as the addressee makes a strategic selection of the relevant information. It happens “according to the context model in the current communicative situation and taking into account the specific audience” (Dijk, 2013, p. 9). The present algorithm is implemented both in case when the texts of articles are being written and in the process of newspaper headlines creation.

Under the general influence of the context model and on the basis of the situational model, the selected relevant information is added into the semantic module, which allows to produce a significant discourse. This module mainly allows us to understand macropropositions that define the general themes of discourse and can directly influence the production of headlines (Dijk, 2013, p. 10).

The models suggested by T. A. van Dijk (2013) correlate with the modular approach to discourse analysis, the current version of which is being developed by A. Grobet (2002), L. Filliettaz and E. Roulet (2002), G. Cuhna (2015). In one of his studies G. Cuhna (2015) focuses on the complex nature of the discursive production in the case of journalistic discourse. Through the analysis, it is possible to see the complexity of decisions that a journalist must make, when he/she represents the discourses of other agents in his/her discourse. According to Simon and Nolke (as cited in Filliettaz & Roulet, 2002), the study of complex systems is a modular methodological approach, which aims to describe the organization of the discourse and not the functioning of the mind. As G. Cuhna states

According to this methodology, initially we identify the modules entering in the composition of the discourse. A module is defined as a basic information system, which should provide a description of a specific field of discursive organization. In this approach, each dimension of the discourse is constituted of modules. Thus, lexical and syntactic modules compose the linguistic dimension; the hierarchical module constitutes the textual dimension; and the interactional and referential modules constitute the situational dimension (Cuhna, 2015).

T. Hanitzsch (2017) advances an understanding of journalistic roles as being discursively constituted and builds on the notion of journalism as a discursive institution. As the researcher states,

journalistic roles are negotiated in a relational structure – the discursive field – where journalists, news outlets, and media organizations struggle over discursive authority in conversations about journalism’s identity

and locus in society. Journalistic roles are articulated and enacted on 2 distinct levels: role orientations (normative and cognitive roles) and role performance (practiced and narrated roles). The process model of journalistic roles proposes a circular structure, where normative, cognitive, practiced, and narrated roles are connected through processes of internalization, enactment, reflection, normalization, and negotiation (Hanitzsch, 2017, p. 104).

So as we can see, the socio-cognitive approach to discourse analysis can be applied from different perspectives and it suggests a certain scope of variations, however in this particular analysis we will use the theory of socio-cognitive discourse studies suggested by T.A. van Dijk (Dijk, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2016). This research line indicates a systematic discourse analysis involving many of the typical media features, such as its characteristic overall organization, its (political) topics, or the argumentative or rhetorical strategies employed to persuasively present this ‘view’ to the readers (Dijk, 2016, p. 1). Alongside with the socio-cognitive approach T.A. van Dijk singles out the critical discourse studies that “typically goes beyond such a classical study of the structural properties of text or talk, and relates these structures to social structures. It may begin to identify the author(s) of the text as editors of a newspaper as a powerful media organization” (Dijk, 2016, p. 2), able to influence the opinions of hundreds of thousands of readers. However, the critical discourse studies are narrower in scale. According to T.A. van Dijk,

Sociocognitive Discourse Studies (SCDS) more broadly relates discourse structures to social structures via a complex sociocognitive interface. As in Cognitive Linguistics, it critically describes the cognitive aspects of the use of some concepts or metaphors (e.g., as expressed in inflow of foreign nationals). But more broadly, SCDS deals with the ongoing communicative Common Ground and the shared social knowledge, as well as the attitudes and ideologies, of language users as current participants of the communicative situation and as members of social groups and communities (Dijk, 2016, p. 3).

Research Questions

In the framework of this study we will focus our attention on the analysis of the headlines of newspaper articles, as they appear to be macropropositions, in which both the mental (semantic situational) model – a meaningful component of discourse, and the contextual (pragmatic) model – taking into account socially significant factors, old knowledge of recipients – are clearly realized. It should be noted that the context model of the producer and recipient in the journalistic discourse may differ. However, when creating headlines, the author focuses more on the contextual model of his/ her potential readers who, by applying general

social knowledge, will be able to interpret the subjective situational model of the particular discourse. Special attention is paid to the communicative style of the information presentation. The hypothesis put forward is that the communicative styles in the two linguistic cultures under analysis – British and Russian – can differ and obtain specific features due to the instability of the contextual models of the recipients.

Methodology and methods

Following T. A. van Dijk (2012), we can assume that knowledge is expressed by a number of discourse structures so they possess cognitive underlying structures which should be taken into account when we analyze and describe specific properties of discourse, such as “all implicit and presupposed knowledge, as well as interactional and contextual management of old and new knowledge” (Dijk, 2011, p. 478). So, to carry out the research there is a need to use methods of discourse analysis through the lens of discursive psychology. Besides the study of cognitive personal parameters, we should consider more general social factors which predetermine our communicative behavior.

This is a truly interdisciplinary approach as for the realization of such a study we need to combine methods traditional for a linguistic research (the method of logical and comparative analysis, the elements of quantitative analysis as well as contextual analysis) with discursive techniques, independent cognitive analysis and methods of social psychology. All these are very close to the concept of critical discourse studies that relates structural properties of text to social structures (Dijk, 2016; Fairclough, 2014). N. Fairclough (2013) states that there should be 3 main aspects of analysis mapped into one another: analysis of language texts, analysis of discourse practice (text production, distribution and consumption) and analysis of discursive events as instances of socio-cultural practice.

Data Analysis

The corpus for the analysis consists of newspaper headlines from the British (*The Times*, *The Guardian*) and the Russian quality press which according to E.A. Toropova (2010) includes *Kommersant*, *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, and *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. 200 English and 200 Russian language headlines have been used to study the socio-cognitive characteristics focusing on the dominant level of description semantics.

A typical feature of some headings is the presence of a subheading – a semantically narrower sentence that concretizes and details the short but capacious heading that precedes it. At the same time, both the headline and the

subheading can be characterized by a fairly clear description of the highlighted event. Using the terminology proposed by T. A. van Dijk (2008, 2012, 2016), in the indicated case the headlines are distinguished by a clear or medium granularity (level of description): the event is presented specifically enough by using insignificant implications or explicit propositions of the situational model, which are actualized in the journalistic discourse. At the same time some headlines can also be characterized by a rough granularity: the event is presented in a very abstract way, using implications, or implicit propositions of the situational model, which do not find direct actualization in the journalistic discourse.

The analysis of the types of description levels and peculiarities in the excerpted newspaper headlines is based on the modern approach towards the understanding of communicative styles and the difference in the information delivery in Western and Eastern cultures. T. Larina offers the term “national style of verbal communication” (Larina, 2009). This national-specific type of communicative behavior is formed under the influence of socio-cultural relations, cultural values, norms and traditions. The most important style-forming extralinguistic factor is the type of culture – British–Western or Russian–Eastern. In the construction of the utterance, in the choice of communicative strategies and language means, the speaker always finds his or her own view of the world (Larina, 2005, p. 26).

Currently, researchers are making interesting attempts to highlight communicative styles (Clyne, 1994; Gudykunst, 1990). Thus, W. Goodikunst proposed reducing all national characteristics of communication to four styles based on a dichotomous contrast: direct vs indirect, elaborate vs short (succinct), personal (personal) vs contextual (instrumental) vs affective (affective). Direct / indirect style is related to how fully and clearly in the speaker’s message his / her intentions are reflected. Using a direct style of communication, the speaker expresses his / her intentions directly, while using the indirect one, on the contrary, his or her intentions are veiled, expressed indirectly (Goodikunst, 1990, pp. 27-28). Thus we can conclude, that these styles are tightly connected with the granularity (the level of description) as suggested by T.A. van Dijk.

Key Findings

As the analysis has revealed the British and Russian lingua-cultures have different semantic granularities. Most of the selected British headlines are distinguished by a clear or medium granularity (level of description): the information is stated quite clearly by using minor implications or explicit propositions of the situational model, which are actualized in journalistic discourse. Most of the selected Russian headlines are distinguished by their rough granularity: information is presented in a very abstract way, using a variety of implications, or implicit

propositions of the situational model, which do not find direct actualization in the journalistic discourse. Since our study is comparative, it will be convenient to consider some examples of headlines in the two languages in parallel.

For example, BREXIT: UK SET FOR DECEMBER POLL AS CORBYN LIFTS LABOUR OPPOSITION TO EARLY ELECTION BILL (*The Guardian*, 29 Oct 2019). The article states that Jeremy Corbyn has confirmed that the Labour party will support an early election, saying the party is “totally determined” to win, to applause from members of the shadow cabinet around him. The reason for the decision was that a no-deal Brexit had been taken off the table. The title of this article is quite specific. It contains a minimum number of implications and high-level descriptions, it is informative and aims to inform the public about recent events in the political life of Great Britain. When creating this headline, the author expects the recipient to apply the general knowledge socially shared by the British epistemic community and he/ she will adequately interpret the headline presented above - for example, the proper name Jeremy Corbyn (the Labour leader). It should be noted that the headline above contains quite specific agents (the name of a specific political party) and patients (the proper name). Such a clear description contributes to the formation of clear and specific mental models. This happens if the pragmatic goal of the author-journalist is to convey accurate information to readers and inform them objectively about an event or action. This conclusion correlates with the traditional attitudes and characteristics of the quality UK press. As T.A. van Dijk notes, “accurate descriptions not only contribute to more accurate mental models of the situation, but also signal to recipients that the current fragment of the discourse is important or relevant, as if slowing down the reading and providing the deeper processing of the proposed information” (Dijk, 2013, p. 19).

The Russian example ТОМАХАВК ВЕРНУЛСЯ БУМЕРАНГОМ. Испытания наземной крылатой ракеты средней дальности в США подвели черту под историей ДРСМД (‘ТОМАХАВК CAME BACK AS A BOOMERANG. Tests of the medium-range ground cruise missile in the USA have drawn the line under the history of the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty’³ – *Kommersant* No. 149 (6629). As in the Russian language the phrase “to come back as a boomerang” has a traditionally redefined meaning: “come back to bite/ to become a bigger problem in the future because you have not dealt with it”. At the same time, a tomahawk and a boomerang have much in common in the way they look and function. So the readers at first may feel the semantic paradox and become intrigued by the headline. The English spelling of the word “tomahawk” implies that this object is somehow connected with an English-speaking country. So the general idea of the main headline is rather rough and serves as a trap to catch the reader’s attention. The subheading

3. All translations of Russian examples into English are done by the author.

following the main headline contributes to the correct interpretation of the latter by the recipient. The headline and subheading are of a local coherent sequence of propositions that are related both at the level of semantic structures and formal attributes. The abstract and even mysterious for the reader “tomahawk” is replaced by the detailed and concrete description “the medium-range ground cruise missile”. The recipient’s contextual model after reading the subheading is activated by the set-phrase “to draw the line” and the abbreviation “ДРСМД” widely spread in the current Russian journalistic discourse which means the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. The analyzed headline contains contextually new information at the end of the proposition, thus constructing the focus using the abbreviation which presents the knowledge shared by the representatives of the Russian community. At the same time the headline and even a longer and more detailed subheading are rather vague and difficult for perception by individuals from a different epistemic community. In addition to formal indicators of the local connectivity of propositions, we can establish a referential (see Givón, 2017) semantic connectivity indicating the identity of the agents and patients of a particular discourse event.

Let us discuss a few more examples: EU BEGINS PLANNING FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS AFTER UK AGREES TO BREXIT EXTENSION (*The Guardian*, 28 Oct 2019). The given headline of a newspaper article is quite specific and very informative. It does not contain any emotive words or stylistically colored means. Moreover, the author takes a neutral stand as an observer, a transmitter of factual information. The journalist makes a strategic choice of the most important relevant information in accordance with the context model in this communicative situation, addressing new knowledge to the intended circle of recipients. The target audience has a certain contextual model, which contributes to the correct “reading” of the new information. So, to interpret the above mentioned headline, you need to have an idea of the main political events in the UK, its decision and the actions being taken to exit the European Union, called Brexit. Readers are able to do this as a result of “updating the relevant elements of general social knowledge, clarifying and applying it to a specific event” (Dijk, 2013, p. 10).

It should be noted that even the most impartial author regulates the focus of a discourse event. As a rule, the focus coincides with the rheme and is placed in the final part of the headline THE RISK OF NUCLEAR WAR IS INCREASING; INVESTMENTS TO CUSHION AFRICAN COUNTRIES AGAINST CLIMATE SHOCKS NOT ENOUGH (*The Times*, 27 Sept 2019). In the example EXPERTS WARN WORLD “GROSSLY UNPREPARED” FOR FUTURE PANDEMICS (*The Guardian*, 18 Sept 2019) the headline presented summarizes the essence of the highlighted event with the rheme in the second half of the headline. The global monitoring board says that there exists a dire risk of a virulent flu pandemic which is compounded by climate

crisis, urbanization and lack of sanitation. The author details the news, using emotionally colored lexical units (grossly unprepared, warn, pandemics). At the same time the journalist appeals to the words of the Global Preparedness Monitoring Board about the horrible scenario which is entirely plausible and efforts by governments to prepare for it are “grossly insufficient”. At the moment everybody is aware of the virus COVID-19, that is, this knowledge is included in the general contextual model. Contextually, the new knowledge will be presented as an official statement about the situation in the world. Despite the stylistic expressiveness of the above headline, it is characterized by a clear description and focus on the transfer of the new knowledge to the recipient in a rather specific unambiguous form.

In some cases, the headlines of the British newspapers are so informative and specific that it seems difficult to single out one focus. For example, BRAZILIAN AMAZON DEFORESTATION SURGES TO BREAK AUGUST RECORDS (*The Guardian*, 27 Aug 2019). This title is intended to adjust the dynamic contextual model of the recipient – to bring new knowledge into it. Within the framework of this headline, three main epistemic blocks are semantically distinguished: there exists such a global problem as the Brazilian Amazon deforestation, it is increasing in scales, there was the highest level of it in August. All three named blocks are verbalized quite explicitly. The observation data obtained as a result of the analysis of the headlines of news articles in the British high-quality press confirm the existing traditional opinion about the “seriousness” of the information content of publications in this category of newspapers.

Let us discuss some more Russian examples: БЕНЗИН ВЫПУСТИЛ ПАР. Рост цен на топливо замедлился серьезно, но ненадолго. (‘PETROLEUM HAS LET OFF STEAM. The rise in fuel prices has slowed down seriously, but not for long’ – *Rossiyskaya Gazeta* No. 184 (7942)). The main headline of the article is based on the contextual model shared by the representatives of the Russian community with the traditional phraseological unit “to let off steam”. It is combined with the word “petroleum” that is not usually associated with the phrase mentioned above. The recipients feel a semantic paradox: How can gasoline let off steam? The subheading is actually reduplicating the main proposition with some extra explanations – giving the extended interpretation of the idiom under discussion: the rise in fuel prices has slowed down, but not for long. The members of the Russian epistemic community realize that when a person lets off steam, it does not mean that he or she has calmed down – it may be a temporary condition before a new emotional explosion. This type of verbalization stimulates the emotional component of the situational semantic model, intriguing the reader and encouraging him / her to read the text of the article. When creating this headline, the author expects the recipient to apply the general knowledge socially shared in the Russian-speaking epistemic

community and adequately interpret the above headline. The reader is supposed to keep in mind that the problem of fuel prices is a really burning one and frequently discussed in Russia. The rheme here is as well as in the English examples presented in the final part of the headline and the subheading, however the level of description is quite rough.

In the Russian newspapers we find a series of headlines which contain implications based on phraseological units, anti-proverbs activated due to the existence of contextual models in the reader's mind: ИНФЛЯЦИЮ ПУСТИЛИ В РАСХОД ('INFLATION IS THROWN UNDER THE BUS' – *Kommersant* No. 176), В ЗДОРОВОМ ДЕЛЕ ('IN A SOUND BUSINESS' – *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*, No. 184 (7942)). Another example is СПЕЦНАЗ ОХРАНЯЛ БИЗНЕСМЕНА КАК ВЕЩЬ. Его командир получил в приговоре скидку за “Норд-Ост” ('SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES STOOD GUARD OVER A BUSINESSMAN AS DEAD WOOD. The commander got a verdict discount for “Nord-Ost” – *Kommersant* No. 149). To understand this headline the reader should know a traditional redefined meaning of the word combination “как вещь” – “as a useless thing/ as dead wood”. The same may be assumed about the proper name “Норд-Ост”. There is an implicit reasoning in the subheading. Without the social knowledge of the historical context about the 2002 Nord-Ost siege and participants of the hostage rescue operation, the reader will not be able to understand the whole idea about the verdict discount in the subheading. So we can conclude that the key parts in the headline and subheading (which coincide with the rheme) are included in the contextual model of the Russian-speaking society and can only be deciphered by those recipients who possess a rich contextual model and are original representatives of the Russian epistemic community (Shevtsova, 2019). For a more complete construction of the mental model of the first and second propositions, the recipient needs to share a certain contextual knowledge, actualized in the discursive fragments in the final parts of the headline and subheading. Two propositions are characterized by some semantic connectors – markers that can be in cause-effect relation: special operations forces – the commander, to stand guard over a businessman as dead wood – a verdict discount. Thus, for the fullest possible interpretation of both propositions, the recipient needs to possess the general social knowledge.

Conclusion

We can conclude that the Russian-language headlines of articles to a greater extent actualize the ethno-specific contextual model. The title is represented by a proposition with an implication and an abstract level of description. Unlike the Russian-language headlines, the high-quality UK press is still characterized by a rather “serious” approach to presenting information in the genre of news articles. The headlines of the articles have a clear description indicating specific

agents and patients of the communicative event, and also represent fairly explicit propositions. Based on the socially shared knowledge of the British epistemic community, the author actively forms a dynamic contextual model of the recipient reader by introducing new knowledge about current events and realities of modern life.

Implications

The paper is a part of a bigger study embracing data from several typologically different languages: English, Russian and Belarusian, French. The implications for future research in this field can be to extend the analysis to a greater number of other languages including Belarusian and French. An interesting perspective for the complex research will be the presentation of common and specific features in different linguo-cultures – the way the knowledge is presented, and the respective contextual and mental models activated. It will also make sense to extend the number of the excerpted materials for analysis. In this case the results would sound more convincing and significant.

References:

- Clyne, M. (1994). *Inter-cultural communication at work. Cultural values in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuhna, G. (2015). The multiplicity of voices in the journalistic discourse: study of polyphony in Journalism in light of a modular perspective of discourse organization. *Intercom, Rev. Bras. Ciênc. Comun*, 38(2). São Paulo. Retrieved from https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S18095-8442015000200159&script=sci_arttext&tlng=en.
- Dijk, Teun A. van. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dijk, Teun A. van. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.). *Methods for critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63-85). London: Sage.
- Dijk, Teun A. van. (2011). Discourse, knowledge, power and politics. Towards critical epistemic discourse analysis. In Ch. Hart (Ed.), *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition* (pp. 27-63). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dijk, Teun A. van. (2012). A note on epistemics and discourse analysis. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 51, 478-485.
- Dijk, Teun A. van. (2013). Diskurs i znanye. *Nauchnye vedomosti*, 13(156).
- Dijk, Teun A. van. (2016). *Sociocognitive discourse studies. Handbook of discourse analysis*. New York: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Sociocognitive%20Discourse%20Studies.pdf>.

- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2014). *Language and power*. New York: Routledge.
- Filliettaz, L., Roulet, E. (2002). The Geneva model of discourse analysis: An interactionist and modular approach to discourse organization. *Discourse Studies*, 4(3), 369-393. Thousand Oaks.
- Givón, T. (2017). *The grammar of referential coherence as mental processing instructions. The story of zero*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Grobet, A. (2002). *L'identification des topiques dans les dialogues*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Duculot.
- Gudykunst, W. (1990). Culture and interpersonal communication. *Interpersonal communication-8*. Sage Publications.
- Hanitzsch, T. (2017). Journalistic roles and the struggle over institutional identity: The discursive constitution of journalism. *Communication Theory*, 27(2), 115-125.
- Larina, T. (2005). Natsionalnyi stil verbalnoy kommunikatsii: postanovka problemy, *Vestnik RUDN*, 7. Moskva: RUDN.
- Larina, T. (2009). *Kategoriya vezhlivosti i stil kommunikatsii: sopostavlenye angliyskih i russkih lingvokulturnyh traditsiy*. Moskva: Rukopis.
- Roulet, E., Filliettaz, L., & Grobet, A. (2001). *Un modèle et un instrument d'analyse de l'organisation du discours*. Berne: Lang.
- Shevtsova, A. (2019) Sotsyo-kognitivnyi plan verbalizatsiyi russkoyazychnogo publitsisticheskogo diskursa. *Sovremennyyi diskurs-analiz*, 3(24), 38-44.
- Toropova, E. (2010). *Kachestvennaya pressa kak factor formirovaniya imidzha Rossii*. Moskva: MGU imeni M. Lomonosova.

ASPECTS OF MEDIA PRESENTATIONS ON RUSSIANS: YET ANOTHER SPY STORY IN THE MEDIA

Desislava Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva¹

Abstract: *The paper presents some aspects of media presentations on a particular ethnic group which in the western psyche brings up associations with Socialism, Cold War Era, wealth, as well as of criminals, and last but not least, as the deadliest secret agents. In particular, the paper dwells on the cases of poisoning of Russian ex-spies in the UK as reflected in the media. The focus is on the way a Bulgarian, a British and a Russian newspaper present the case of the attempted murder of Sergey and Yulia Skripal with Novichok in Salisbury paying attention to the main topics put forward in the media discourse on spies. Some of the coverage of the Bulgarian trace, i.e. Emilian Gebrev, in the case is also analysed.*

Using CDA as the main method of analysis, the paper looks into the language used to present the whole case, the voices that get heard on the case, the focus of presentation of each media discourse along with the effect all these have on the general population. The paper argues that although articles on the topic are mostly informative and familiarize the general public with the life of spies with all its enchantment, setbacks, and negative or positive consequences, they also reveal the ongoing struggle for political dominance between today's super powers, the existing ethnic/national and social stereotypes, and finally stir panic, as despite some overt activities the whole activity remains largely clandestine and spies look just like normal people.

Key words: *spies, media discourse, CDA, Skripal, Novichok*

Introduction

Cases of espionage, or the act of obtaining information in a clandestine manner, have been known ever since there have been populated areas and drive for new conquests. Records of spies are found even in the Bible², Ancient China³, Ancient Egypt, etc. (see also Yuen, 2014). It is believed, for example, that if Julius Caesar had read the list of conspirators which was given to him minutes

1. Associate Professor, PhD, Department of English Studies, Shumen University, Bulgaria, e-mail: d.stoycheva@shu.bg, ORCID: 0000-0003-0433-8087.

2. Moses was the first one to send spies to Israel and then Joshua did the same, however, the destination was Jericho (see Dubov, 2017).

3. Sun Tzu is quoted saying: "One who knows the enemy and knows himself will not be endangered in a hundred engagements" (Yuen, 2014, p. 110).

before he was murdered, he would have survived (Ehoward, 2016). As Ehoward summarises it, “[t]he intelligence business is as old as civilization itself, and once the steps in the process have been identified, they can be traced in almost any civilization that left historical records” (ibid.).

Almost everyone has heard stories of spies who were so skillful in their art that it was difficult to tell them apart from common people. And if there might be people who have not been aware of the extensive use of such individuals during the world wars and the Cold War afterwards, there is probably not a single individual who has not heard or watched a spy movie, the James Bond ones being particularly famous. The pervasiveness of the image of the spy has affected even children’s literature and more specifically the *Harry Potter series* where the teacher of Durmstrang Igor Karkaroff is presented using the features of the “typical” Eastern-European spy – cold blue eyes, treacherous, and possessing dark powers (see Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva, 2017).

Regardless of the media, there is a trend that is frequently followed in the presentation of spies, namely, if the agent comes from the West, he/she is usually presented as the good guy who always wins as he/ she usually fights for or defends a noble cause. Eastern spies are generally the bad guys the West should defeat, as they pose a threat to the existence of the latter. The polarity is not accidental and is reflective of the Us – Them presentations where the left part of the dichotomy is associated with everything good and own, while the right part – with everything negative and other, even foreign. Nowadays, however, with the free passage of people and goods, as well as due to politics, the spaces traditionally occupied by own and foreign are transformed and the foreign can frequently be found residing within the confines of the own. The same is pertinent to the topic at hand, as foreign spies who have become double agents seek refuge and protection in countries previously considered their targets, or simply put “enemies”. Thus, Russian double agents and spies migrate to the West in search of security and sometimes a new life trying to get out of the Kremlin’s reach.

In 2006 the media worldwide broke the news of the Polonium poisoning of Mr. Litvinenko by the former KGB officer Andrei Lugovoi. Two years afterwards, there was another story of the alleged poisoning of a double agent, Gordievsky⁴, who claimed he was poisoned by the Kremlin, and Lugovoi caught the media attention in 2008 and again in 2012 (see Ivanov & Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva, 2012). In 2018 there was yet another spy story in the media, this time associated with Sergei and Yulia Skripal, in which both the father and the daughter had been poisoned with a nerve agent called Novichok in their home in Salisbury, UK.

4. For more information on Gordievsky’s story see Macintyre, B. (2019). *The spy and the traitor: the greatest espionage story of the Cold War*. UK: Viking.

The short recapitulation of media coverage on spies shows the ongoing activity of Russian intelligencers and the actions undertaken against them by other Russian secret agents. As scare and negative news sell, media pick up on these and publish long stories detailing every single aspect of a case. The additional interest in such spy stories is provoked by the statements issued by the authorities of the countries involved – after all, it is all about politics.

In the context of the above discussion, this paper marks an attempt at critical discourse analysis of media publications on the Skripals looking at the language used and the effect these media presentations have on the public.

The corpus of this study is comprised of a total of 156 publications in the British (*The Independent* featuring 36 articles), the Bulgarian (*Dnevnik* – 80 articles) and the Russian (*The Moscow Times*⁵ – 40 articles) media published in 2018 and the beginning of 2019.

Previous Studies

Although the topic is quite intriguing, there is not much research on the discourse on spies in the media. There are some references to the image of Russian spies and their stereotypical presentations (see Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva, 2017; Ivanov & Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva, 2012; Mercouris, 2016) as well as an analysis of the conceptual metaphor US-RUSSIA FOREIGN POLICY IS COMMERCIAL TRANSACTION (Arcimaviciene, 2013, p. 14), along with some analyses on the involvement of US journalists as spies for Russia during WWII and the Cold War (Lovelace, 2015). The latter, however, marks a historical account of the involvement of such American spies, and does not trace the way the issue has been presented in the media.

A very informative account of the story of the Skripals has been presented by the journalist Mark Urban (2018) in his *The Skripal files: The life and near death of a Russian spy* which he wrote as a result of his interviews on espionage with Sergei Skripal, a former Russian spy for MI6. As stated by Urban himself (2018, p. vii), a pivotal place in the narrative was dedicated to the 2010 spy swap at Vienna airport. The same event was mentioned by Arcimaviciene (2013, p. 15) who quoted some of the headlines from the British media that qualified the event as a

‘Cold-war style prisoner exchange’ (BBC News, 9 July 2010; CCN News, 10 July 2010) and ‘a spy scandal’ (The Guardian, 10 July 2010), and noted its significance for its novelty (the first public spy swap in for more than

5. The Moscow Times is an opposition-leaning newspaper issued in English which deals with investigative journalism.

25 years) and oddity (the 10-for-4 spy exchange) (Arcimaviciene, 2013, p. 15).

Though scarce, the existing research provides a frame that can be applied to the corpus at hand and help draw conclusions on the spy discourse used in the analysed sources.

Looking at the frame theory (Carter, 2013) and acknowledging the conventional nature of cognitive patterns (Fillmore & Baker, 2009), it can be hypothesized that the spy frames employed by the analysed newspapers will be similar⁶ and will generally include a person sent by his/ her home country to work undercover in another country in order to obtain information that can be of significance for the former. In addition to the undercover agent(s), there are two countries which are also involved, i.e. the issuing one and the target one, which can metonymically also refer to the real heads of state or MPs responsible for the involvement of the spies. The extended spy frame, as in the case of Skripal, can involve different types of spies: double agents, ex-spies, active spies, as well as weapons or types of attacks, and family members. The interesting difference that is sought, however, is in the foregrounding of different parts of the spy frame in the presentation of the event by the three different newspapers as these slight nuances in the delivery of information will show the differences in perceptions which will be triggered by the differences between the three cultures.

Analysis

The event which has been reiterated in the various media publications on the topic can be summarised as follows: Sergei Skripal, a former Russian spy for the GRU⁷ has turned double agent in 2004 and has subsequently been revealed as such by Russia and sentenced to 13 years in prison. In 2010 he was pardoned by the then president Medvedev and had been part of the spy swap between the US and Russia at Vienna airport and relocated to the UK where he settled in Salisbury. On March 4, 2018 he and his daughter were poisoned with Novichok, a nerve agent allegedly developed by Russia. Soon after the Skripals were found, the UK blamed Russia for the attack and using information from CCTV footage and intel by Bellingcat, The Insider and Fontanka (independent information

6. Ehoward (2016) gives an account of four stages of modern information gathering: targeting, collection of data, analysis, and dissemination.

7. GRU - abbreviation for (Military) (formerly) the Soviet military intelligence service; the military counterpart of the KGB [from Russian 'Glavnoye Razvedyvatelnoye Upravleniye' - Main Intelligence Directorate]; while KGB stands for The intelligence and internal security agency of the former Soviet Union. [Russian, from K(omitet) G(osudarstvennoï) B(ezopasnosti): komitet, committee + gosudarstvennoï: genitive of gosudarstvennyï, of the state + bezopasnosti, genitive of bezopasnost', security.] (Collins, 2014)

agencies), two GRU agents had been named as responsible for the attack. Subsequently, there had been three more collateral victims, one of whom died. The event gave UK and its allies the reason to send Russian officials out of their countries and Russia reciprocated, thus marking a new stage in the international relations between the country and the West.

Applying the above sketched frame to the corpus of articles from *The Independent* (I), *The Moscow Times* (MT) and *Dnevnik* (D), the agents who can be singled out are the victims Sergei and Yulia Skripal (the latter believed to be a collateral victim, Sergei being deemed the primary target); Russia and the UK – the former as the original spy issuing country, the latter as the target with a swap of their places in 2004 when the primary target turned a double agent selling information on Russia to MI6; three more collateral victims, named as DS Nick Bailey, Dawn Sturgess, and Charles Rowley; initially two suspects, both of whom decorated GRU agents, i.e. Alexander Petrov and Ruslan Boshirov, subsequently a third perpetrator has been named as Ruslan Fedotov; weapon – the nerve agent Novichok. The frame has been additionally extended to involve the agencies that named the culprits: Bellingcat, Insider, and Fontanka as well as some scientists who worked on Novichok and therefore provided further information on its use and possible sale and/ or transportation outside Russian labs.

It is natural that the main agent of a frame, as the pivot of the whole event, will be foregrounded and the information thus made more salient. True to its strategy of highlighting important information right in the title of its articles, *The Independent* used a well-established structure, i.e. a noun phrase or a personal name denoting the event as the Theme in most of its titles related to the case. Thus, the noun phrase used in initial position becomes a catch phrase of a kind which is easily discernible for the readers.

Sergei Skripal's name occupies the initial position in 7 of the headlines, and in another 2 his personal name appears along with that of his daughter. Yulia Skripal is the subject of 2 headlines which makes a total of 11 (or 30%) headlines introducing the main subjects as Themes. The interesting point here is that the function of the foregrounded catch phrases differs: e.g. [1] *Sergei Skripal: Former spy was in 'regular contact with Russian embassy', ex-Kremlin officer claims* /h/ (In/ 07.03.2018; *emphasis mine*); [2] *Sergei Skripal: Police officer poisoned by 'very rare' nerve agent named as Detective Sergeant Nick Bailey* /h/ (In/ 07.03.2018). As example [1] clearly shows the connection between the catch phrase and the information that follows is established by the use of units of the same nominative chain, e.g. Sergei Skripal, former spy, and the extended lexico-thematic field of espionage, e.g. spy, ex-Kremlin officer, Russian embassy, therefore, it provides information related to the main subject. Example [2], however, actually shows another aspect of the puzzle related to the

poisoning of the ex-spy, namely the extension of the spy frame with collateral victims. Unlike example [1], the headline in [2] bears no direct link to Skripal, therefore, the catch phrase serves as an attention grabber, or a hook, to hold public attention and deliver additional information on the case in general.

The event, specified through the place where the poisoning has taken place, is the subject of 9 (or 25%) headlines, e.g. [3] *Salisbury spy poisoning: Yulia Skripal says she is 'lucky to have survived' and would one day like to go home to Russia* /h/ (In/ 23.05.2018), while the poison is the subject of 2 headlines, e.g. [4] *Salisbury novichok attack: The most implausible claims made by Russian men accused of attempted assassination of Sergei Skripal* /h/ (In/ 13.09.2018). Similar to the two examples above, the catch phrase can be linked either to the subjects and the main agents in the spy poisoning frame or to some additional perpetrators, thus, forming a kind of a thematic field. An interesting switch in the terminology used is the change of *poisoning* with *attack* which changes the charge and the associations as the former can be unmediated, however, the second is not and is generally associated with imposed force.

In another group of articles, Russia and its president Putin are explicitly mentioned and given first position in 5 (or 13%) of the headlines, e.g. [5] *Vladimir Putin calls poisoned Russian spy Sergei Skripal 'simply a traitor and a scumbag'* /h/ (In/ 03.10.2018). The choice of foregrounding the main elements in the spy frame unequivocally shows the focus of the British newspaper primarily on the people and places involved in the event. Combined the titles focused on the main elements of the spy frame come to 68% or more than half of all analysed content-intense structures. In addition, *The Independent* uses easily recognizable Themes in order to attract readers' attention and gives the new information related to the whole event as the Rhemes⁸.

Looking at the choice of headlines in *The Moscow Times* we can notice a difference in the focus of presentation. There are no established patterns of headlines, however, the information that the newspaper chooses to foreground in 14 (or 35%) of the headlines is related mostly to Russia, e.g. [6] *Kremlin on Skripal Suspect Identification: 'Many People Look Alike'* /h/ (MT/ 28.09.2018). Even when Skripal is featured in the headline, he is presented through his relation to Russia "former Russian spy scandal", "Russian ex-spy", etc., or as a modifier "Skripal suspect identification", while his name denoting the person behind it is not explicitly mentioned in the headline in initial position. This peculiarity can be attributed to the Russian roots of the newspaper as well as to the general position of defence and detachment from the whole case that

8. Looking at some of the pragmatic functions of newspaper headlines, Ivanova (2020) makes the observation that the use of a nominal group followed by a colon is mostly used to draw the attention of the audience to the new information added to an already familiar topic – a goal achieved through the distribution of familiar Theme and a new Rheme.

Russia has undertaken. What is more, Russia is a very powerful country and its president is known for his resolution and firm politics and as shown in one of the headlines above, the attitude exhibited by Putin to Skripal is very indifferent and he even allows himself to insult the former spy calling him a “scumbag” and a “traitor”. Thus, although *The Moscow Times* tries to sound independent and publish various opinions on the matter, the editors seem to unconsciously back their president by refraining to give substance of the “traitor” directly in the headlines describing the event. The focus seems to be more on the ruling elite presented metonymically through the use of *the Kremlin* in initial position or on the opinion of the head of the country, however, it is difficult to define a particular pattern in the structure of the headlines that have been published.

The Bulgarian *Dnevnik* does not have a clearly set headline structure either. However, Russia related information on the case is foregrounded in 14 (or 17%) of the headlines, e.g. [7] *Кремъл приема за недопустими обвинения по случая “Скрипал”* /h/ (*Kremlin views the accusations on the Skripal case as unacceptable*⁹ – Dn/ 06.09.2018), while Skripal is the Theme of 9 headlines, e.g. [8] *Скрипал може да е отровен с химическо оръжие на НАТО, обяви Лавров* /h/ (*Skripal might have been poisoned with NATO’s chemical weapon’, Lavrov announced* – Dn/ 14.04.2018) and the Bulgarian link to the whole case is made salient in 5 of the headlines, e.g. [9] *България е солидарна със съюзниците по случая Скрипал, каза зам.-министър пред руския посланик* /h/ (*Bulgaria shows solidarity with its allies on the Skripal case, said the deputy minister in front of the Russian ambassador’* – Dn/ 30.03.2018).

This initial analysis of the structure of the headlines chosen by the three newspapers reflects in a way the stance of each country in the matter. The UK as the country that has provided shelter for Skripal and as the location of the attempted assassination of the agent is naturally focused on the information on the victims, the place the alleged poisoning took place as well as on the possible identity of the perpetrators. Russia, on the other hand, undertaking the role of the accused, as the assumed culprits had received their orders from Putin, takes it upon itself to defend itself and play the UK counterpart in the blame game.

The stance of Bulgaria is somewhere in-between. The country has also been affected by the alleged clandestine activities of Russia and a Bulgarian businessman, Emilian Gebrev, involved in the production of weapons in a Bulgarian factory called Emko, has also been poisoned with an agent similar to novichok. Additionally, one of the suspects associated with Skripal’s attempted murder, i.e. Sergey Fedotov, was named as the perpetrator of the attempted poisoning of Gebrev. However, it seems that Bulgaria cannot distance itself from the long-time influence of Russia and although an ally to the UK in NATO and

9. Translation of Bulgarian examples into English is done by the author.

the EU, it cannot take a firm stand as can be seen from the choice of information to foreground on the topic.

Looking at the content of the articles on the matter there appear to be two major patterns in the presentation of the case: the first one is closely related to the person affected and developed through *The Life of the Spy*, and the second, to international politics presented through the subtopics of *The Blame Game*, *Flexing Muscles*, and *Expansion and Scare*.

The Life of the Spy

The first major thematic group of articles reflects the general activities, services, and agents involved in the work of the spy. People might expect a resemblance with Agent 007, however, in most of the cases they remain disappointed.

In many of the articles in both the British and the Bulgarian media one can read parts of the general outline presented above, i.e. the fact that Sergei Skripal was a Russian spy turned double agent who was sentenced to 13 years in prison and then pardoned by Medvedev and exchanged for other agents at the Vienna Airport. After the exchange he did not change his identity and lived in Salisbury. The details mentioned in some of the articles talk of a humble existence, nothing of the James Bond flashy style, e.g. [10] Mr Skripal appears to have lived *a quiet life in a semi-detached home in Salisbury*, but a former associate, Valery Morozov, believes *he had not completely retired from espionage*. (In/ 08.03.2018). The assumption voiced by Morozov is actually reiterated in other articles as well:

[11] Радиото се позовава на източници в чешките служби. По това време Скрипал се срещнал с офицери от местните служби и им предал информация за възможни агенти на руското разузнаване, работещи в страната. ('The radio relies on sources from the Czech services. At that time Skripal met with officers from the local services and gave them intel on possible agents from Russian services working in the country' – Dn/ 10.10.2018); see also [15].

and leads to the conclusion that “Once a spy, always a spy” and that there is no such thing as an ex-spy. This also provides the motive for the attack – the continuous activity of the double agent and the disclosure of information on his homeland. The latter is further supported by the accounts of continuous surveillance including the general bugging technology on the Skripals prior to the poisoning:

[11] Ex-spy Sergei Skripal and daughter were ‘*under Russian surveillance*’ months before Salisbury poisoning /h/ Phone belonging to double agent’s

daughter reportedly searched for malware which could have tracked her movements /sh/ (In/ 05.07.2018).

The feeling created is of constantly being watched, never feeling secure which is applicable not only to those actively involved with the clandestine activity but to their close ones as well. What is more, the Skripal case itself has been a sort of a wake-up call to other defectors: [12] Mr Skripal, a former military intelligence colonel, had been living openly under his real name after being handed over in a 2010 spy swap and *the attempted assassination increased fears held by other defectors*. (In/ 18.05.2018). Added to the other cases of dead ex-spies, e.g. Litvinenko, Berezovski, etc., this account contributes to the understanding of what happens to people who are viewed as a threat, or at least a nuisance, to Russia. The strong hand that Russia uses in its dealings with “traitors” is felt in the way the Russian president talks about Skripal and the whole case:

[13] Mr Putin said coverage of the Salisbury poisoning *had distorted who Mr Skripal really was*. “I see that there is this theory that Skripal was almost some kind of human rights activist,” he said. “He’s just a *spy who betrayed his people*. A national traitor, that’s who he is. He’s just *scum*.” Using the derogatory term “*shpion*” (spy) rather than “*razvedchik*” used for Russian agents serving the motherland, the president went on to compare Mr Skripal’s actions with prostitution. “Jiggery-pokery between special services hasn’t just appeared just now. Spying, like prostitution, is one of the most important professions in the world.” (In/ 03.10.2018); [14] Mr Morozov also said he was sure that Russian President Vladimir Putin had nothing to do with the alleged poisoning. “Putin can’t be behind this. I know how the Kremlin works, I worked there. *Who is Skripal? He is nothing for Putin. Putin doesn’t think about him*”, he said. “There is nobody in Kremlin talking about *former intelligence officer who is nobody*. There is no reason for this. It is more dangerous for them for such things to happen.” (In/ 07.03.2018).

As stated above, the vocabulary used by Putin totally corresponds with his self-esteem as the head of one of the world-powers and one of the most powerful men globally. Only a person with such status can allow himself to use negatively charged language for someone who possesses the skills and knowledge to destroy them. The use of the derogative “*shpion*”, along with *traitor*, however, shows the contempt for someone who has chanced to give intel on his own people and might also show some concern: if the so-called ex-spy and scum is really nothing, why bother explain one’s own stand towards that individual? Mark Galeotti – a journalist for *The Moscow Times* provides more information that contradicts the descriptors used by Putin:

[15] *Skripal was not just any spy, though, but a former insider, a GRU officer who allegedly blew the cover of some 300 Russian agents*. Although

Moscow has a *particular grudge* against former insiders who turn, that is not in itself usually enough to go to the effort and potential risks of “wet work”— a killing, in their slang. (by Mark Galeotti MT/ 06.03.2018).

Furthermore, it is obvious that the comparison with prostitution used by Putin in [13] tries to belittle the significance of the event and even present it as something normal which has been in existence for a long time, while simultaneously leading the public attention away from Russia as a possible perpetrator. The statements made by Morozov in [14] have a similar purpose, distraction and showing indifference to a person, considered a nothing. In addition, it is easy to see that his expose reiterates the very descriptors used by the Russian president, so it is not clear whose opinion he voices. The last sentence of [14] as well as in [15] suggests the possibility that it truly might not be Russia who is responsible for the attack on Sergei Skripal, however, the array of cases of murdered defectors actually hints on the opposite.

Nobody can be sure of the motives behind the statement of president Putin but his words do convey his resentment of Skripal and such emotions can be a trigger for further actions against him. Thus, the fact that he uses similar lexis, i.e. *scum*, for the collateral victims as well, could not be considered a mere coincidence. In this way, Putin tries to show his indifference to the whole case and at the same time, his contempt for the UK in general. The latter could be attributed to the fact that the attack did achieve something, even if it was to but show the British agents that despite their efforts and all the intel they have gathered on the state, the “razvedchiki” can carry out their tasks and get a hit at their targets.

The fear at what might follow, i.e. a subsequent murder attempt, is also voiced and it sounds even more credible as the person quoted is a former military intelligence officer:

[16] “Mr Skripal will almost certainly be moved location,” Philip Ingram said. “He might well be offered a new identity. “These sorts of things are not straight forward, but it is work the intelligence services are used to doing and can set that up.” (In/ 18.05.2018).

Such accounts do not only introduce the general public to the established practices in the world of secret agencies, but the mere fact that they are needed, suggests the possibility of an ongoing surveillance, threat and possibly further assassination attempts. The importance of the order and the fact that Skripal was not really a nobody is in a way confirmed by the reports on the identity of the possible assassins and the fact that it was not only one man sent after the ex-spy, but three “decorated” agents, as it turns out eventually.

It is important to note that two information agencies, i.e. The Insider and Bellingcat with the assistance of a Russian one, Fontanka, were those who

managed to uncover the identity of the operatives involved in the case. The latter information is mostly included in the Bulgarian *Dnevnik* in relation to the Bulgarian link in the case of Skripal, i.e. the Bulgarian businessman Emilian Gebrev who was poisoned with a chemical substance similar to the one used in the case of Skripal.

The details on the assassins widen the frame of espionage: lacking evidence of the existence of such people, fake identity, lack of personal belongings, such as some property, a car, a mobile phone, a criminal or court record or presence in the social networks, a passport number very close to the numbers of those registered at 76 Horoshevskoe shosse which is the address of the headquarters of GRU (see Dn/ 08.02.2019). It also creates the idea that there truly is something fishy about the people who claim to be only visitors in the UK, and leads the readers to believe that the suspects are agents and that they really had the task to kill their target. Why would they otherwise track him for such a long time and use fake identities to travel around?

[17] *Руските агенти “Боширов” и “Петров” следили Скрипал в Чехия през 2014 г. /h/ Обвинените от Великобритания за покушението срещу бившия разузнавач Сергей Скрипал руски граждани са били в Чехия през 2014 г., за да го наблюдават по време на негово съобщение. [...] Според информацията Чепига и Мишкин пристигнали със същит есамоличности в Прага, но на различни дати: първият – на 11 октомври, а вторият след 16 октомври, като трите дни преди това прекарал в Острава, третия най-голям град в Чехия. (‘The Russian agents Boshirov and Petrov tracked Skripal in the Czech Republic in 2014 /h/ The Russian citizens accused by the UK for the attack on the ex-spy Sergei Skripal were in the Czech Republic in 2014 so that they could watch him secretly during his report [...] According to the information, Chepiga and Mishkin arrived in Prague using the same identities, but on different dates: the first one on October 11th and the second one after October 16th, having spent the three days before in Ostrava, the third largest city in the Czech Republic.’ – Dn/ 10.10.2018); [18] The British government previously said *Russia had been spying on the Skripals for at least five years*. In a letter to Nato, the national security adviser, Sir Mark Sedwill, said *the pair were the subject of “interest” from the Kremlin’s security services since 2013*. (In/ 05.07.2018); [19] “Ако някой шпионира, защо британските служби не са се оплаквали”, каза той пред репортери, цитиран от “Ройтерс”. “Те винаги се оплакват, ако нещо се обърка. Не видяхме никакви знаци, никакви насоки от британска страна, че те са недоволни от начина, по който живеят (Сергей и Юлия) Скрипал в Солсбъри”, каза още Яковленко. (‘If someone has been spying, why haven’t the British services complained,’ Reuters quoted him telling reporters. “They*

always complain if something goes wrong. *We did not see any signs, any suggestions from the British side that they were dissatisfied with the way (Sergei and Julia) Skripal lived in Salisbury,*” Yakovlenko added.’ – Dn/ 13.04.2018)

As one can easily see, the period of observation mentioned is between 4 and 5 years. This speaks of the perseverance in the spying job. There is probably no one who can say with certainty why they needed such a long time of preparation before they could carry out their wet job but if Skripal was really nothing for the Russian secret services, then why would they spend so many resources on tracking him abroad. The arguments provided by Yakovlenko on the spying activities are merely pathetic as gathering information on foreign activities in one’s country is not something that is openly discussed. Furthermore, the suspicion of the agents set on the task and their alleged innocence is increased through the information on the strategy they would frequently employ in order to avoid being tracked [19] билет за обратен полет, който не се използва, и извършване на отклонение, този път през Сърбия. (‘a return flight ticket, which is not used, and a diversion, this time through Serbia’ – Dn/ 08.02.2019). The very fact that they talk about a strategy, means that it is an established and repetitive pattern, a practice frequently followed whenever there is a task to be carried out, and not just a whim or a chance occurrence (see also e.g. [23]).

The parallel with the Bulgarian case as well as with the one of Litvinenko and of other defectors does confirm the fact that Russian assassins and the Kremlin manage to carry out the task they set themselves on. So their *modus operandi* seems to be working better than the British one. Or is it the fact that only such cases get voiced?

Some of the doubts and the weak points in the analysis of the attempted murder of Skripal have been raised by Mary Dejevski, a long-time correspondent for *The Independent* and *The Guardian* in Russia, in an article published in *The Independent* on 7 March 2018 titled [20] Sergei Skripal is not Litvinenko – and this is what that really means /h/ (In/ 07.03.2018). She confirms that “Russians in the UK seem disproportionately accident-prone”, however, she also states that it is very easy to jump into conclusions when one does not know the truth as is the case with the information provided by intelligence services. In a way the journalist hints on the political games that lie behind all actions and words used by said agencies. The example she gives is with the information on the Litvinenko case and the fact that Russia has not done anything to harm two other high-level defectors who have been speaking openly about their work in their home country for years. As Dejevski concludes “Many of the “whats” and the “whys” remain elusive” (In/ 07.03.2018). At the same time, taking the account of the three cases of poisoned or attacked spies mentioned here along

with the array of other cases of poisoned dissidents publicly known, the odds are against the defectors who have turned sides.

Based on everything said so far, it can be concluded that no one else but the people directly involved, know what has really happened and what is the actual state of affairs. Everything else is speculations based on the information provided in the media. Common people, however, base their opinion on what they hear and read, as generally they do not have a direct contact with people from the secret services. That is why common people are usually subjected to the ideology upheld by the particular media presenting the case, which in publications on internationally significant events is usually reflective of the political stand of the country the media originates from.

The media very frequently employ metaphors in order to present in a more vivid way the problems they deal with. And, as Arcimaviciene (2013, p. 15) quoting Lakoff and Chilton (1989) states, “it is right to claim that metaphors, as one of the primary means of conceptualising the world and reflecting ideologies, shape and justify political behaviour and decisions”. In the matter at hand, the media in all three countries have extensively resorted to the use of metonymic representation of the countries standing for the top officials who fight with each other for superiority and try to show their dominance. Thus, countries are personified and presented as competitors in a kind of a contest. The employment of said metaphor is not strange as competition has always existed and has been the preferred way of showing one’s power – an observation which has also been supported by Arcimaviciene (2013, p. 15), who states that “[t]he most widely-spread metaphors in the language of politics are of human nature and competitive character.”

In the field of international politics, it is all about power, prestige and reputation. Therefore, it is not surprising that one of the major topics analyzed is on the question of guilt and who is to blame.

The Blame Game

As stated above, through the metonymic employment of the name of the whole country to stand for the decision makers, the whole debate around the Skripal case is presented as a blame game between the UK and Russia – two of the most powerful countries in the world and also two of the countries that are still mindful of having been world empires, though with past glory. As such, they would not shy away from standing their ground, defending themselves, or accusing the one they see as a culprit. Words in political discourse are the weapons that speak of power.

Corresponding with the centre-periphery presentations, Russia is portrayed as an oligarch who is merciless and who never forgets or forgives infidelity.

Stereotypically the people from the East are fierce and endowed with all negative qualities – they are cruel, uncivilized or primitive, treacherous, vindictive and blood thirsty (see Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva, 2017; Kostova, 1997). This description is very well presented through the comparison of Russians with cornered rats. Regardless of the time passed, the grudge is there and it can be taken as the motive for the poisoning:

[21] “*These guys have a grudge, and like the rat in a corner, being poked with a stick, they will fight back.*” (In/ 14.02.2019); [22] We have a motive: *Russia would always want to punish a traitor, wouldn't it? [...] the Skripals need protection from a state that tried to kill them; the UK has a duty to ensure their safety.* (In/ 04.03.2019); [23] Russian spy: Poisoned Sergei Skripal's wife and son were murdered, alleges Conservative MP /h/ Putin determined to ensure ‘*those who betray him know there is a cost to betrayal*’, warns chairman of the Foreign Affairs Select Committee /sh/ [...] Mr Tugendhat pointed to “*threats*” made by Vladimir Putin against Colonel Skripal and said the method of the attack was “remarkably similar” to the killing of Alexander Litvinenko. “We are beginning to see, not only a very strong pattern, but a very strong centre to that pattern—and that centre appears very strongly to be the Kremlin,” he said, in a podcast for The Spectator magazine. (In/ 08.03.2018).

As the examples clearly show, the British MP puts on Russia's bill the deaths of the other family members of the double agent, and following the dichotomy good-evil, protector-attacker, presents the UK as the only haven and protector of the ex-spy. The UK is the place where Sergei Skripal has been able to lead a peaceful existence. The comparison of Russians with rats in [21] shows the contempt the British hold against them and the associations with “vicious, unclean, parasitic animals” (Wikipedia/EN) further highlight the negative qualities attributed to Russians, while at the same time hinting on their resolution.

An interesting observation that can be made on the language of the Russian officials, as observed in e.g. [23] above, is the fact that Skripal is not referred to with his military rank in any of the statements made by Putin. This is not surprising given the grudge they hold against him (as presented in e.g. [15] and [21]). British officials, however, do use *colonel* when they refer to Skripal which on the one hand, shows their esteem for the person, while on the other, can be taken as a strategy employed to irk Russia as the use of *colonel* strongly contrasts with *scum* or *nobody* used by Putin and the other interviewed Russian informants. In addition, the parallel drawn with Litvinenko both confirms the idea that those who betray Russia do not walk out of it unharmed, thereby confirming the stereotype of merciless attitude to defectors, and present this

as a trend in Russia's politics and a reason to lay the blame for the attack on that country. The two conclusions reached as a result of the analysis on the above noted excerpts from *The Independent* have interestingly been confirmed by some articles published in the Russian *The Moscow Times*:

[24] The Skripal Case: Another Example of *Russia's Poisoned Politics* (Op-ed)¹⁰ /h/ Russia's long history of *liquidating defectors and enemies of the state* is ruining its reputation /sh/ Russia has inherited from the Soviet Union *a reputation for being a state with intelligence agencies that repeatedly silence defectors and enemies of the authorities while denying involvement in their murders*. (by Pavel Aptekar, Ivan Prosvetov, and Maria Zheleznova was originally published in the Vedomosti business daily MT/ 15.03.2018); see also [68], [69].

In this particular article the headline itself employs a modifier which associates the modus operandi with the weapon used against the former spy. The phrase used can be interpreted in two different ways: first, as politics which is corrupted or generally harmful, and second, as filled with poison or resorting to the use of poison. The ambiguity is skillfully upheld in the subheading, as "liquidating defectors" refers to the second interpretation presented above, while "ruining its reputation" to the first. The excerpt also summarizes the usual behaviour exhibited by the Russian state whenever the murder of a defector is voiced. Bearing in mind that Putin is an ex-intelligencer and being aware of the firm single-handed approach he applies in governing the country of which he is the head, probably it should be no surprise that the language used to describe his politics is from the field of secret services.

The usual modus operandi in case of a spy job being brought in the open is discussed in several other articles as well. For example, Henry Collins in an interview for the Konrad Adenauer Organization in Sofia, Bulgaria, states that:

[25] Когато бъде извършено нарушение на международните норми, виновникът обикновено използва 4-те О-та (*отхвърляне, объркване (на информацията), опорочаване (на вниманието на обществото) и обезсърчаване*), за да се покаже като невинен и да все съмнение с активна кампания, каза той, давайки пример с нападението в Солсбъри. ('Whenever there is a breach in international norms, the culprit usually resorts to the 4 Ds – *dismiss, distort (information), distract (public attention) and dismay* to show up as innocent and instill doubts with an

10.Op-ed ('opposite editorial') - Of or being a newspaper page, usually opposite the editorial page, that features signed articles expressing personal viewpoints. (see American Heritage Dictionary)

active campaign' he said giving Salisbury attack as an example' – Dn/ 23.05.2018).

The example actually continues the blame game by providing a frame of the actions undertaken by the party considered the culprit. As Collins is an aide to the British Prime Minister against the Russian propaganda in the case, it is not surprising that the Ds described above fit nicely into the actions undertaken by Russia. At the same time, there are some other codes of behaviour that are presented as applicable to the strategy employed by the British state:

[26] Using a formula of “*capability, intent and motive*” the UK has said it is “highly likely” that Russia was responsible for the Salisbury attack. Questions persist over each part of that formula. An investigation by Russian independent media has already shown that *novichok stocks were sold to organised criminals* in the 1990s – indicating groups other than the state theoretically have the capacity to kill using such a nerve agent. A widely mistranslated phrase, *allegedly* uttered by the Russian president – “traitors will kick the bucket” – is regularly used to justify the second strand of the allegation, intent. Mr Putin actually said “traitors will kick the bucket without our help”. The Kremlin has formally denied having an assassination list. The third leg of the *troika*, motive, has puzzled many experts from the start. Mr Skripal was not, apparently, actively collaborating with British security services, and had been pardoned during the spy swap. (In/ 04.04.2018).

The blame this time comes from the British mainstream media trying to sound objective and find the truth about the case. The analysis of the presented formula focuses on the uncertainties showing how phrases and information taken out of context can lead public attention in a particular direction. The pro-Russian stance is also felt through the culturally specific lexis used in reference to the three elements in the mentioned formula, i.e. *troika* as well as through the use of *allegedly* showing the uncertainty of the whole blame giving. There is, however, a part of the whole equation that stands in contrast with the opinion voiced in e.g. [1] above, where it was stated that the agent was a “very rare one”, or with the statement made by a Russian scientist that: [27] Само Русия може да произведе “Новичок”, според един от създателите на оръжието /h/ (Russia is the only one capable of producing Novichok, according to one of the creators of the weapon' – Dn/ 18.03.2018).

The claim made here is that the substance has been sold illegally to Western European countries (the Czech Republic, Germany), so it is very likely that British intelligencers have carried out the job. The latter has been re-confirmed in other articles as well:

[28] “Experts tell us that *it may well be beneficial to the British special services*, who are known for their ability to act with licence to kill,” he said (In/ 11.04.2018); [29] Russia’s Foreign Ministry Suggests *Britain Might Be Behind Yulia Skripal’s Poisoning* /h/ (MT/ 21.03.2018); [30] U.S. and U.K. Developed ‘Novichok’ Nerve Agent Linked to Ex-Spy’s Poisoning, Russian Official Claims /h/ (MT/ 16.03.2018).

In addition to continuing the blame game, the examples here give some information on the image British spies have with their Russian counterparts. Similar to the way Russian agents are being described, the British ones are also endowed with deadliness as the example suggests that they bring their tasks to a lethal end. The spread of the possible owners of the poison gives the reason for Russia’s officials in their turn to blame Yulia Skripal’s poisoning on the British and even attribute the development of the poison to the USA and the UK, regardless of the fact that Russian scientists have publicly claimed to have created it, as was stated in e.g. [27] and [67]. The fact that remains unclear is why would the UK want to dispose of an ex-spy who has actually collaborated with them.

Several of the articles published in *The Moscow Times* foreground the response Russian officials gave to the accusations made by the UK:

[31] Britain’s Accusations Against Putin in Nerve Attack Are ‘*Shocking*,’ Kremlin Says /h/ (MT/ 16.03.2018); [32] Boris Johnson’s Comparison of Russia’s World Cup with Nazi Olympics *Unacceptable*, Kremlin Says /h/ [...] Johnson told lawmakers on Wednesday that President Vladimir Putin would try to bolster Russia’s image through hosting the World Cup in much the same way as Adolf Hitler used the 1936 Olympics in Nazi Germany (MT/ 22.03.2018).

The feelings expressed by Russian officials are actually milder compared to the definitions provided by the British on the act perpetrated by the Russians (cf. e.g. [44] – [47] below). At the same time, the parallels drawn to the Nazi Olympics of 1936 and an arsonist investigating own fire (in e.g. [33]) are telling of the opinion British officials have of Putin. As is well known Hitler used the Olympic games in 1936 to present Germany as tolerant and peaceful and thus try to promote his ideology (see United States Holocaust Memorial Museum). The comparison with Putin brings associations with his firm rule and presents the image of an oligarch, also viewed by many as a dictator, who would not tolerate traitors even though he states otherwise. The articles also make a reference to the Soviet-era (e.g. [35]) when novichok was developed, and the reason for that is mainly to confirm the statement that once an assassin, always an assassin, or, in Putin’s case, once an agent, always an agent, thereby the means employed remain the same. The latter has been voiced once again in the comparison used by a UK ambassador: [33] UK ambassador to UN: Russia’s

request to play part in Salisbury nerve agent probe like arsonist 'investigating own fire' (In/ 17.04.2018).

The blame game continues and as a powerful country would never acknowledge its defeat as long as there are some uncertainties and the presumption of innocence, Russia in its own turn tries to transfer the blame to the UK. As stated above, the accusations are voiced in milder terms than the language used by the British, and are presented mostly as claims, implications, and talks attempting to show that the origin of the nerve agent is not Russian:

[34] Salisbury attack: Russia *claims* Skripals were poisoned using toxin possessed by UK and US /h/ Foreign minister Sergei Lavrov says Swiss lab found substance that was not novichok nerve agent /sh/ (In/ 14.04.2018); [35] Four independent laboratories have concluded the chemical used in the attack was a novichok-class nerve agent, which were *originally developed by the Soviet Union*, the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons said last week. *Their conclusions match that of UK scientists at the Porton Down defence laboratory, which the government said proved Moscow was culpable for the attack after allegedly spying on the Skripals for at least five years.* The Foreign Office said there was "no alternative explanation about who was responsible – only Russia has the means, motive and record", and demanded the Kremlin "give answers". Russia continues to deny any involvement in the attack. (In/ 17.04.2018).

The two examples above are also telling of the way each country wants to show its dominance. Russia relies on the expertise of a European lab (although the fact that the Swiss scientists denied said statements, makes one wonder about the legitimacy of the claims made), known for its precision, while the British counter attack with the findings of four independent laboratories which show Russia as the culprit for the attack.

When the version of the American/ British origin of Novichok has been proven unsubstantiated, the Russian authorities fight back accusing the UK of breach of European laws, inhumane attitude to pets and an attempt to hide and/ or destroy important evidence.

[36] U.K. Is Breaking International Law by Withholding Data on Skripal's Daughter, Russia Says /h/ (MT/ 29.03.2018); [37] Russia *implies* UK destroyed poisoned spy Sergei Skripal's cat and guinea pigs to 'remove important witnesses' /h/ 'Is that what the UK usually does with pets? Is that normal practice?' /sh/ (In/ 06.04.2018).

The question used as a subheading in [37] in its turn suggests that this is an established practice in the way British deal with events that might have negative consequences for them. The goal of these statements is to create doubt about the actions undertaken and claims made by the UK. In a further stage of the blame

game the supporters of Russia use the trump card “intolerance towards Russia” and accuse the UK of staging of the whole attack and instilling anti-Russian sentiments:

[38] The Kremlin has repeatedly denied any involvement in the poisoning, *accusing British intelligence agencies of staging the attack to stoke anti-Russian hysteria*. But those denials have sometimes pushed the realms credibility in the face of an increasing body of evidence produced by internet researchers like Bellingcat, and its founder Eliot Higgins. (In/ 14.02.2019); [39] Britain Poisoned Double Agent Skripal to ‘*Nourish Russophobia*’ – Russian State Media /h/ [...] A Russian television host made headlines for breaking the fourth wall last week, warning “traitors” against settling on British soil due to the number of “strange incidents with grave outcomes.” Top Kremlin propagandist Dmitry Kiselyov seized on the warning in his weekly talk show on Sunday, calling London a “death trap for Russians.” “If you think hard about it, only Britain stands to benefit from the poisoning of the GRU colonel. *Simply to nourish its Russophobia*,” Kiselyov said during a segment on his flagship Vesti Nedeli news show on Channel One. [...] Another TV host on Channel One, Valery Fadeev, said that the poisoning “looks like a provocation, a covert operation against Russia.” “They use agents who are no longer needed, [who are] useless,” the host said in a Voskresnoye Vremya segment. (MT/ 12.03.2018); see also [50].

The Moscow Times gives an account of the coverage of the case in the mainstream media and the ideology some of the TV hosts are trying to sell to their viewers. As the examples show, the UK is presented as a place that is far from welcoming for Russian expats. The lexical use which is interesting to note here is that the people in question are referred to first with the generic *Russians* and then as *traitors* which would be insulting to the common people. One cannot but wonder why, if the hosts and the Russian officials consider these people traitors, would they care about their safety?

There are, however, supporters of Russian politics and behaviour even among the journalists in the UK. The account of the story in the article written by Mary Dejevski does hint on the existence of some gaps in the case which provide food for some thought, especially given the fact that Russia needs its reputation prior to the World Cup:

[40] Why would Russia risk its reputation so close to the World Cup, when it hoped to show a friendlier face to the world? Why would Vladimir Putin jeopardise future spy exchanges by signing off on the assassination of a swapped spy? Why would Russia take eight years to take its vengeance, and choose the very time when Skripal’s daughter was visiting? Other

than as a “*rogue*” operation, none of this made much sense a year ago, and those same doubts remain now. (In/ 04.03.2019).

Although the article does point to some of the weak points in the case, the attempt at attributing the attack to rogue agents is suspicious, especially given the fact that initially any possible Russian involvement was denied. In addition, the good reputation reason in a way harks back to the comparison with Nazi Olympics made by Johnson above. Why would someone be issued a business visa if they are not going on a business trip? And how would such a visa be issued without the necessary supporting documents, if not through the explicit order given by a high official?

[41] Salisbury novichok attack: The most implausible claims made by Russian men accused of attempted assassination of Sergei Skripal /h/ Russians say their visit to Britain ‘wasn’t a business trip’ but they arrived on business visas /sh/ (In/ 13.09.2018)

So, in a way, the wolf changes its coat, but not its disposition. And as far as the timing is concerned it may well be argued that it was only at that time that the agents had a direct access to their victim and had decided on the particular way to carry out their mission. Nobody can be sure about the reasons behind the choice of time but the discoveries made by information agencies in Russia itself cannot be refuted and actually make all the claims of non-involvement of Russia unsubstantial:

[42] Leaked passport files with old passport photos appear to show a young version of the same man British authorities have tied to the Skripal poisoning. “This finding starkly contradicts both this man’s statements, as made in a TV interview to Russia’s state-run RT network, and President Vladimir Putin’s assertions that the person in question is merely a civilian named Ruslan Boshirov,” Bellingcat said in its report. (MT/ 26.08.2018)

The facts stemming as a result of fieldwork conducted in the villages of the agents charged with the order to dispose of Skripal are indisputable and even the Kremlin has decided to remain silent claiming they would not get involved in “media discussions” (see MT/ 23.10.2018), which again marks an attempt on behalf of Russian authorities to belittle the importance of the whole case. The conclusion reached is that the spy scandals show that although the work of the spies might be mocked abroad and perceived as bunglers or sad sacks, the Russian army’s influence is growing and it is still actively carrying out its “black operations”:

[43] Espionage Scandals Show *Russian Army’s Growing Clout* /h/ Russia’s military spies *are being mocked abroad as bunglers* but the army’s influence over Kremlin foreign policy is growing and *there is little likelihood it will halt its “black operations”*. [...] Intelligence experts

say *the GRU has stepped up its activities including black operations*—covert missions that are not attributable to the organisation carrying it out—as tensions mount between Russia and the West, which has imposed sanctions on Moscow over the annexation of Crimea. “What Russia is doing is *operating by wartime rules* which means particularly that *the GRU has been let off the leash*,” said Mark Galeotti, a fellow at the European University Institute in Florence. [...] Putin, a former intelligence officer himself, sounds defiant. He said last week espionage was one of the world’s most important professions and dismissed Skripal as a traitor. [...] “The army’s influence will rise,” said R. Politik’s Stanovaya. “*Putin believes Russia is in a state of war.*” (MT/ 09.10.2018).

The last statement can provide the reason for the attack on Skripal as “everything’s fair in war”. If Putin believes that they are in a state of war, then any means is justified, even the use of illegal chemical weapon.

The accounts provided by the UK of the activities of Russia emphasize and support the stereotype of the state conducting merciless and cruel politics against anyone who has dared to oppose them:

[44] A government spokesman said the Skripals would still need ongoing care, adding: “The fact that all three victims of this incident have been discharged from hospital does not alter the fact this was a *brazen and reckless attack* – attempted murder – using an *illegal chemical weapon.*” (In/ 18.05.2018); [45] “I would add that the complex investigation into the attempted murders of Yulia and Sergei remains ongoing and detectives continue to sift through and assess all the available evidence and are following every possible lead to identify those responsible, for what remains a *reckless and barbaric criminal act.* (In/ 05.07.2018); [46] Sergei Skripal: Police officer poisoned by ‘very rare’ nerve agent named as Detective Sergeant Nick Bailey /h/ Home Secretary attacks ‘*brazen and reckless act...attempted murder in the most cruel and public way*’ /sh/ (In/ 08.03.2018); [47] Preliminary enquiries have focused on the former military intelligence colonel as being intended target with his daughter seen as a collateral victim. But the severity of the attack with the use of such a lethal ingredient showed a “*quite staggering ruthlessness,*” a Whitehall official said. (In/ 08.03.2018).

As the examples clearly show the most frequent descriptors used are *brazen, reckless, cruel* and *ruthless* – all negatively charged and confirming the stereotypical image of Russia in the West. As many of the analysts have pointed out, all this contributes also to the negative attitude towards Russia, and has resulted in political withdrawal of Western diplomats:

[48] The attack on the Skripals prompted the *biggest Western expulsion* of Russian diplomats since the Cold War, as British allies in Europe and

the United States sided with the view of the prime minister, Theresa May, that *Moscow was either responsible or had lost control of the nerve agent*. (In/ 05.07.2018); [49] Whether we can prove Moscow's involvement in the Skripal case or not is irrelevant /h/ *The poisoning is severing Russia's relationship with the West* /sh/ (In/ 04.04.2018); [50] *The Skripal poisoning has deepened Russia's international isolation. Britain accused it of using a military-grade chemical weapon on its soil* and Washington, rallying to London's support, has warned it will impose new sanctions on Russia. Moscow has denied any involvement in the Skripal poisoning, saying Western states are gripped by "Russophobia" and that British authorities have failed to produce any evidence. (MT/ 28.09.2018)

The act hints on the importance the Western world attributes to the whole case and the resolution they have at jointly stating their opinion, i.e. that such infringements on the activities and lives of UK citizens are not tolerable.

The position taken by Bulgaria is one of servitude. Bulgarian officials do not want to offend either of the two powers involved in the conflict, and even the fact that a Bulgarian businessman has been attacked in a manner similar to Skripal does not provoke any firm reaction. And while some politicians, such as Kostov define Russia's action as a "hybrid threat" (Dn/ 25.03.2019), others claim that Bulgaria's response is reasonable and working: [51] Според Илияна Йотова българската позиция по случая "Скрипал" е "разумна и работеща" /h/ ('According to Iliyana Yotova Bulgaria's position on the Skripal case is "sensible and working"' – Dn/ 31.03.2018). And still others claim that it is a proof that Russia's influence in the country is still very strong [52] Стефан Тафров: България затвърди убеждението, че руското влияние е много силно /h/ ('Stefan Tafrov: Bulgaria has strengthened the belief that the Russian influence over it is very strong' – Dn/ 02.04.2018).

Flexing Muscles

Rather than just blaming each other for the poisoning of the Skripals the two countries involved try to show their might expressed through the FLEXING MUSCLES metaphor.

In several of the articles, in all three of the analysed newspapers, it has been hinted and in some places even directly stated that if the perpetrators really were sent by Russia, the outcome would not have been positive:

[53] Speaking at a press conference alongside Angela Merkel in Sochi, Vladimir Putin wished Mr Skripal "good health" but suggested he would have "*died on the spot*" if novichok had been used. (In/ 18.05.2018); [54] Soviet Scientist Behind Nerve Agent Rules Out Russian Hand in Spy Scandal /h/ [...] "It's hard to believe that the Russians were involved, *given*

that all of those caught up in the incident are still alive,” he said. “Such outrageous incompetence by the alleged (Russian) spies would have simply been laughable and unacceptable.” (MT/ 20.03.2018); [55] All Would Have Died If Russia Was Behind Salisbury Attack, U.K. Novichok Victim Told /h/ (MT/ 07.04.2019);[56] “Толкова нескопосано изпълнение на операция не е характерно за руското военно разузнаване” “Това е една зле планирана, нискобюджетна и непрофесионално изпълнена операция, което не е характерно за руското военно разузнаване. Много от фактите говорят за солова акция. При “Скрипал” можем да намерим мотив, че руската държава е планирала и провела това, но при Гебрев – няма такъв мотив. Толкова нескопосано изпълнена операция, няма как да е дело на такова сериозно разузнаване. Ако беше проведена такава операция, тези хора нямаше да бъдат с руски паспорти, нямаше да пристигнат с полет от Москва, нямаше да отседнат в един хотел, нямаше да обикалят, дори нямаше да се срещат преди самата операция”, коментира Йовчев. (“Such a careless execution of an operation is not typical of Russian military intelligence”. “This is a poorly planned, low-budget and unprofessionally executed operation, which is not typical of Russian military intelligence. Many of the facts speak of a solo op. In Skripal we can find a motive for the Russian state to plan and carry out an attack, but in Gebrev – there is no such motive. Such a sloppily executed operation cannot be the work of such serious intelligence. If such an operation had been carried out, these people would not have had Russian passports, would not have arrived on a flight from Moscow, would not have stayed in a hotel, would not have toured, would not even have met before the operation itself;” Yovchev commented’ – Dn/ 11.02.2019)

All examples explicitly state that the Russian special services do not make mistakes and never miss their targets. Putin himself is quoted boasting in a way with the deadliness of Novichok, thereby the skill of his agents in its application. The reputation of Russian spies is actually voiced not only by the interviewed Russian scientists or analysts but also by Bulgarian officials as well as by the victims of the nerve agent. The deadliness of Russian agents is further highlighted by the fact that the failure to do away with Skripal for good is described as *incompetence*¹¹ – something which is not characteristic of secret services. It is even more disconcerting to read that the incompetence

11. The same lexeme though hyped up is used by Prof. Leonid Rink, one of the scientists who have worked on the development of Novichok, whose words have been quoted by the Bulgarian Dnevnik: [57] “Подобна скандална некомпетентност от предполагаеми руски агенти просто е смешотворна и неприемлива”, цитира думите му РИА “Новости”. (“Such scandalous incompetence of alleged Russian agents is simply ridiculous and unacceptable,” RIA Novosti quoted him as saying.’ – Dn/ 20.03.2018)

can be considered *laughable and unacceptable*. This coincides with the image Russians have of themselves as tough guys able to withstand everything, a stereotype which stands in contrast with the perception they have of the British secret services as described in [19] above, i.e. sissies who wane and complain every time something is not the way it should be.

At the same time, it is interesting to note that the lexis used in reference to the attack on the Bulgarian businessman Gebrev is similar to the one employed in the description of Russian spies, i.e. *an op carried out sloppily as well as operation which was ill-planned, low cost, and unprofessionally carried out*. The striking fact is that a similar approach as the one described in the case of Skripal is traced out, however, in the Bulgarian example the official claims that all this is uncharacteristic of Russian intel. Despite the observed difference in the attitude to the two cases, which is probably due to their significance (Skripal being considered of a higher profile than Gebrev) as well as self-esteem (Bulgarian officials show lower self-pride¹²), both examples stress on the infallibility in terms of planning and execution of a task by Russian secret agents.

Furthermore, some of the articles of the analysed newspapers feature direct threats foregrounded in their headlines: [59] Русия няма да признае разследването за “Новичок” и предупреди Лондон: Ще съжалявате /h/ (‘Russia will not recognize the Novichok investigation and warned London: You will be sorry’ – Dn/ 05.04.2018). In the last example the whole attitude of the UK and the West in general is described as “a propaganda war” and “theatre of the absurd” which bring different associations but hint on the inconsistency of British accusations. At the same time, “you will be sorry” sounds serious enough. The method of paying back is elaborated in another article published in Dnevnik:

[60] Кремъл ще продължи *боя без правила* със Запада /h/ [...] В очите на руската върхушка *всяко отстъпление е поражение*. Сигурен съм, че Москва обмисля вече т.нар. асиметричен отговор за Запада. Има си за тази цел и хакери, и пропагандни ресурси, а и въоръжени сили. Не става дума за студена война. В онази имаше все пак някакви правила. В новата война на Русия със Запада такива няма да има. (‘The Kremlin will continue *the free fight* against the West / h / [...] In the

12. This aspect has been suggested in an analysis published in the Bulgarian Dnevnik, titled [58] *Защо Москва не коментира (и няма да коментира) по същество случая “Геврев” /h/ [...] Няма и да го коментира по няколко причини, основната от които е, че българският случай е твърде, твърде “ниска топка” за Кремъл, за да му се придава тежест с официална реакция. (‘Why Moscow actually fails to comment (and will not comment) the Gebrev case /h/ [...] It will not comment on it for several reasons, the main one of which is that the Bulgarian case is too, too “low ball” for the Kremlin to give it any substance with an official reaction.’ – Dn/ 26.02.2019)*

eyes of the Russian elite, *any retreat is a defeat*. I am sure that Moscow is already considering the so-called an asymmetric response to the West. There are hackers, propaganda resources, and armed forces for this purpose. This is not about the Cold War. There were at least some rules in that one. In Russia's new war against the West there will be none.' – Dn/ 29.03.2018)

In addition to the generally belligerent character attributed to Russian people, this time suggested through the use of a *free fight*, the example also provides a glimpse at the thinking or psychology of the elite and the new means of war that they will employ against the West.

The UK in turn also does not hold back and uses threats against Russia. They are, however, of a different kind and rather than focusing on negative qualities as deadliness, present the UK as the noble knight in a shining armour who is going to save the rest of the world from the threat posed by the evil dictatorship of Putin:

[61] Britain is 'in the lead' in *trying to counter Vladimir Putin's threat*, Boris Johnson insisted /oh/ Boris Johnson threatens *fresh Russia sanctions* if Kremlin is responsible for Sergei Skripal 'poisoning' /h/ Foreign Secretary also suggests 'UK representation' at this summer's World Cup in Russia cannot 'go ahead in the normal way' /sh/ (In/ 06.03.2018) [62] Boris Johnson threatened fresh sanctions against Russia if it is proven to have poisoned a Russian double agent in Wiltshire, as he branded the country "*a malign and disruptive force*". (In/ 06.03.2018); [63] I know that Nato will remain seized of the need to confront *the increasingly aggressive pattern of Russia behaviour* of which the attack in Salisbury was an acute and recent example (In/ 13.04.2018).

Boris Johnson even allows himself to tarnish Russia, metonymically describing the whole country as *malign* and *disruptive*, as well as *aggressive*, qualities transferred from the image Putin has for the international audience. The measures taken against the country are also presented as more refined, though efficient on a bigger scale, i.e. sanctions that would affect not only the real perpetrators of the attack but the whole country, its image and its economy as well.

All three aspects of the case show the stand of the countries involved in the case as well as the perception they have of each other. At the same time, these aspects as they are highly aggressive are conducive to the feelings of scare and escalation of tensions caused by the case.

Expansion and Scare

Subsequently to the attack on the Skripals it became known that there have been collateral victims as well – people who just happened to touch a perfume bottle smeared with the substance (Dawn Sturgess and Charles Rowley) or people performing their duties, such as the police officer who was on the spot (Nick Bailey). The fact that the substance is invisible and has been transported in a way that would not provoke any suspicion raises questions on how many more people might have been affected had the phial of perfume been left in the open and not in the trash. This only supports further the claims made by Russian scientists, as well as by Putin, that the Novichok is very lethal and the dead could be a lot more, which naturally brings additional scare to the readers (see [53] - [55]). The same effect is obtained when all the places where spies are operative or have been spotted are mentioned. The reader is left with the impression of networks of spies operating globally:

[64] British officials have blamed agents using the names Alexander Petrov and Ruslan Boshirov for the Salisbury attack /oh/ Salisbury novichok attack: Bulgaria to investigate *third suspect in Skripal nerve agent poisoning* /h/ 45-year-old Russian agent linked to British and Bulgarian poisonings /sh/ (In/ 10.02.2019).

Looking into the possible mistakes made by the spies when they failed to kill their targets, people voiced the possible loss of control over the Secret services by Putin and the possibility of them taking up separate orders:

[65] Покушението срещу бизнесмена Емилиян Гебрев не е пряко свързано с опита за ликвидиране на бившия агент Сергей Скрипал, а евентуална руска връзка в българския случай по-скоро би означавала, че *Москва няма контрол над собствените си спецслужби и техните служители в момента се занимават и с частни поръчки*. ('The assassination attempt against the businessman Emilian Gebrev is not directly related to the attempt to liquidate former agent Sergei Skripal, and a possible Russian connection in the Bulgarian case would rather mean *that Moscow has no control over its own secret services and their employees are currently dealing with private orders.*' – Dn/ 11.02.2019); [66] “Ако се потвърди информацията за *частна поръчка, която е извършило руското разузнаване – това е доста опасно*. Това означава, че *Владимир Путин няма контрол върху системите за сигурност*. Има няколко фактора в подкрепа на тази теза – след случая “Скрипал”, той уволни 15 генерала”, каза Йовчев и допълни, че това не е първата чистка на руския президент в армията. (“If the information about a *private order carried out by the Russian intelligence is confirmed*, it is quite dangerous. This means that *Vladimir Putin has no control over security systems*. “There are several factors in support of

this thesis – after the Skripal case, he fired 15 generals,” Yovchev said, adding that this was not the first purge of the Russian president in the army.⁷ – Dn/ 11.02.2019); see also [43].

In addition to the increasing number of secret agents popping up in various parts of the world as a result of the investigation led by information agencies, the accounts of deadly substances being sold to unknown entities to serve unknown purposes also provokes fear:

[67] What the affair does show, however, was that in the crippling poverty of the Russian 1990s, *dangerous military-grade poisons did occasionally go walkabout*. And it is not likely that Professor Rink was the only scientist unable to resist criminal forces. [...] With the substance floating about on *the black market*, any number of *criminal and near-state groups* could potentially have that capacity. [...] “These suspensions are so *dangerous* that even the smallest mistake will result in *tragedy*,” says Mr Mirzayanov. “You’re bound to have a mistake if you have no experience. And it’s here that we’re clearly talking about a state or military level of expertise.” (In/ 13.04.2018).

Mentioning *dangerous military-grade poisons*, *criminals*, and *tragedy* in one and the same example is enough to stir some panic. The same goes for the frequent resort to the idea of a war going on between Russia and the rest of the world. As seen above Russia is accused of entering a state of war that is very different from the Cold War and is in different examples described as: *vicious shadow war*, *free fight*, or *the adoption of new rules of espionage* which are dangerous not only to selected high-profile targets but to the general public as well:

[68] Former Russian Spy Scandal Suggests the *Old Espionage Rules Are Breaking Down* (Op-ed) /h/ With Skripal’s hospitalization, *a vicious shadow war* may be looming /sh/ It is hardly surprising, though, that this is the suspicion. It’s also not surprising that Moscow’s hand is being seen in the incident, given not only the murder of defector Alexander Litvinenko in London in 2006, but *a string of mysterious deaths in recent years*. It seems to reflect *a breakdown in the old etiquette of espionage*, not only foreshadowing an even more vicious “*shadow war*” to come, but also challenging Western states to come up with new ways to respond to and deter these kinds of outrages. [...] Increasingly, though, the Federal Security Service (FSB), the main domestic security agency, is also active abroad. This is a very different service, *one of political policemen used to operating without rules, with impunity, and under the benevolent protection of the Kremlin*. They neither know nor care about the old etiquette. Their service is powerful enough not to care if its adventures cause problems for the foreign ministry and, indeed, unlike the GRU

and SVR, many FSB networks do not even operate outside embassies. They are *often amateurish, but aggressive*. (by Mark Galeotti MT/ 06.03.2018)

In that same article Mark Galeotti brings up the topic of different Russian groups that might be involved in the whole issue. As seen above, in addition to the familiar GRU, he provides information on FSB describing them as “operating without rules”, “with impunity”, “powerful enough”, as well as “amateurish, but aggressive” which actually fits the concerns voiced by some experts that the op was carried out sloppily. In a subsequent article the same journalist provides information on yet another agency operating in Russia, i.e. the Foreign Intelligence Service (SVR) (see MT/ 06.09.2018). This enumeration of various structures operating under the rule of the Kremlin leaves one wondering how many more structures there are doing whatever they want without being mentioned anywhere. And if one might think that it is probably a biased opinion of a journalist, there are also other articles that support the opinion voiced by Galeotti, such as:

[69] Putin’s *Swashbuckling Spies Are Hurting Him* (Op-ed) /h/ Russian President Vladimir Putin should be as concerned as Josef Stalin was in the 1930s about the *GRU’s excessive appetite for risk* /sh/ [...] Although no GRU officers have actually been arrested as a result of the failures, the string of mishaps resembles – at least in scale – the GRU’s nightmare period from the late 1920s to the mid-1930s. During those years, European intelligence services *rolled up one GRU-run spy network after another*. (by Leonid Bershidsky – MT/ 06.09.2018); [70] “Дейли телеграф”: Москва тревожи Лондон с опит да изгради нова шпионска мрежа /h/ Според два материала на изданието Службата за външно разузнаване (СВР) на Русия опитва да запълни вакуума, оставен от военното разузнаване, известно със съкращението ГРУ, след отравянето на бившия двоен агент Сергей Скрипал в Солсбъри през март миналата година (‘Daily Telegraph: Moscow worries London with an attempt to build new spy network /h/ According to two articles in the publication, Russia’s Foreign Intelligence Service (FIS) is trying to fill the vacuum left by military intelligence, known by the acronym GRU, after the poisoning of former double agent Sergei Skripal in Salisbury in March last year.’ – Dn/ 07.01.2019), see also [24].

The example unequivocally reiterates the fact that Russian spies are prone to taking risks and sometimes performing their tasks in a manner that is far from perfect. Resorting to past history Berdinsky implies the possibility of there being more than one GRU network. The implication is voiced once again in an article from the British *Daily Telegraph* published in the Bulgarian *Dnevnik* where the new service is named as the Foreign Intelligence Service which has been a

part of the KGB and has more resources and more freedom of action than GRU. Not much else is known apart from that though, and this is disconcerting. In addition to the uncertainties surrounding the real agencies sending their officers to do different wet jobs and carry out tasks, the general public is left in a state of panic as they do not know where such individuals might show up or what they could do. As reported by the Bulgarian *Dnevnik* Russian spies who have been caught have been accused not only of personal attacks against ex-spies but also of messing with elections and cyber-attacks, among other activities:

[71] Освен Чепига и Мишкин други девет служители на ГУ са санкционирани заради намесата си в избори в САЩ, а четирима – за кибератаки срещу Световната антидопингова агенция (WADA) и Организацията за забрана на химическите оръжия (ОЗХО) ('In addition to Chepiga and Mishkin, nine other GI officials have been sanctioned for meddling in US elections, and four for cyberattacks against the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW).' – Dn/ 20.12.2018).

Sometimes their activities in a place remain covered for a few years – a fact which was suggested through the link between the attempted poisoning of the Bulgarian businessman Emilian Gebrev and the Skripal's case. This information has given the reason for some journalists to speculate that because of its low profile on the international political scene as well as probably due to its past close relations with Russia, Bulgaria might have been chosen as a testing site for Russia's hybrid weapons:

[72] България – мястото, където Русия изпробва хибридни си оръжия /h/ [...] Да се върнем на Българската следа. Ако погледнем хронологията на събитията се вижда, че България е сред първите страни, станали обект на атаките. Случаят "Гебрев" също предхожда "Скрипал" с три години. Дали България не е своеобразен полигон за изпробване на руските (хибридни) оръжия? Защо обаче – за разлика от западните си колеги – българските служби се притесняват в продължение на години да посочат виновниците? ('Bulgaria – the place where Russia is testing its hybrid weapons / h / [...] Let's go back to the Bulgarian trace. If we look at the chronology of events, we can see that Bulgaria was among the first countries to be attacked. The Gebrev case also precedes Skripal by three years. Isn't Bulgaria a kind of testing ground for Russian (hybrid) weapons? However, why – unlike their Western counterparts – the Bulgarian services have been worried for years to identify the culprits?' – Dn/ 14.03.2019); [73] "Новичок", VX, VG... какви са тези отрови /h/ Понеже създатели на съветското оръжие твърдят, че то умишлено е направено така, че да се прикрива като пестицид за индустриални цели, ви представяме описание каква е

разликата между “новичок”, използвания неотдавна за покушение VX и защо е забранен “Амитон”. (“Novichok”, VX, VG ... what are these poisons / h / Because the creators of the Soviet weapon claim that it is deliberately made to disguise itself as a pesticide for industrial purposes, we present a description of what is the difference between “novichok”, VX which was recently used in an assassination attempt and why Amiton was banned’ – Dn/ 18.02.2019)

Although the article is meant to inform, so that people are aware of how different chemical weapons, i.e. poisons, work, the presence of such information combined with the possibility of a people used as guinea pigs is enough to stir panic and instill fear. In a succession of articles people are indirectly told that there are clandestine activities happening in their country, executed by unknown men, using lethal substances that are invisible and can easily be taken for something harmless. So rather than making them aware and providing them with information such articles instill fear.

Conclusions

The paper made an attempt at analysing media discourse on spies and most specifically the various aspects around the presentation of the poisoning of double agent Sergei Skripal in Salisbury, England. To that purpose the analysis covered articles published in the British *The Independent*, the Russian *The Moscow Times* and the Bulgarian *Dnevnik* so that three different perspectives on the case are presented.

Some of the main conclusions reached are as follows:

- The different newspapers frame the attack in a way corresponding to their stand in the case. Thus, the focus of *The Independent* is on the people affected, the place and the weapon of the attack and these elements of the spy frame have been foregrounded in the titles of its articles. *The Moscow Times* as a representative of the country being accused focuses mostly on its officials with Putin taking a leading role and the victim is only presented through his past relations with the Kremlin, however, being oppositionally-inclined, the newspaper does comment on and analyse Skripal’s significance. The Bulgarian *Dnevnik* focuses mostly on the Bulgarian link with the case and provides information on the alleged perpetrators expanding the network of spies involved in the case, giving information on the poison, however, refraining from blaming any victims or taking a firm stance on the matter.
- The tone of the newspapers is also different as the UK is trying to present itself in a positive light as the protector of Skripal and as a country that operates following civilized rules and the European laws. Russia is

presented as aggressive, defensive, and arrogant, which is actually the old dichotomy good vs. bad reflected in the West – East division in which everything that comes from the East is considered bad, uncivilized and scary, while the aspects associated with the West are just the opposite.

- The analysed articles thematically fall within four main groups presented in this paper as: The Life of a Spy, The Blame Game, Flexing Muscles, and Expansion and Scare. Each one of these groups presents a different aspect of the case, however, they frequently merge into one another and jointly instill fear and uncertainty in the general public. Thus for example, The Life of a Spy group mostly provides information on the specificities of the spying job with the possible errands that can be given, people involved, the actual method of operation, results and weapons. The Blame Game focuses on the language used to present one of the sides as the culprit, however, this usually involves the mentioning of more spies, secret services organizations, laboratories and the heads of the UK and Russia accusing each other of unfair politics and staging the whole case. The articles in this group very frequently resort to outlining the capability, intent and motive necessary for such an operation to be carried out which are also frequently used in the Flexing Muscles group and generally stir panic. The metaphoric expression is mostly related to the way the two countries try to show their power and influence and the ways they do that. As the analysis has indicated, both countries boast about the skill of their agents with Russia focusing on their impeccability and expertise which is generally linked to an array of dead targets, poisons, and other covert operations carried in various places all over the world. The last naturally leads to the idea of expansion of the case as it is never only a matter of single kill but a sequence of events and activities involving many people (not only the target and the perpetrators, but possibly some collateral victims or additional targets, such as family members, etc.) which logically leads to the piling up of fear in the general public of an enemy that is difficult to see and means difficult to tell.
- The language used, especially in the Blame Game and Flexing Muscles is reflective of the self-esteem both the UK and Russia have as world powers and former empires. Putin allows himself to use derogatory language when he refers to Skripal and to confront the UK in their accusations. The UK retort with strong words describing the activities of Russia.

Having said all that, it can be concluded that the paper makes a contribution to the media discourse on spies and the activities of secret services. Still, as its focus is only on one particular case presented in three newspapers, more conclusions might be reached should a more comprehensive analysis be carried

on several of the cases involving secret agents covered in a bigger number of newspapers.

References:

- Arcimaviciene, L. (2013). The US–Russia spy swap of 2010 in media discourse: What the commercial transaction metaphor implies. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 2, 14–21, Elsevier.
- Carter, M. J. (2017). The hermeneutics of frames and framing: An examination of the media’s construction of reality. *SAGE Open*, April–June, 1–12.
- Cheshmedzhieva–Stoycheva, D. (2017). Getting to know the Other: Igor Karkaroff – A key Bulgarian figure in J. K. Rowling’s “Harry Potter and the goblet of fire”. In V. Kambovski et al. (eds.), *KNOWLEDGE – International Journal*, 19(3 September), 1077–1081. GRAFOPROM – Bitola.
- Dubov, M. (2017, June 11). Rahab (“the Harlot”) and the Spies - For an informed reading of Joshua 2:1–24. Retrieved February 11, 2020, from https://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/3700192/jewish/Rahab-the-Harlot-and-the-Spies.htm
- Ehoward. (2016, August 9). Espionage in Ancient Rome. Retrieved February 11, 2020, from <https://www.historynet.com/espionage-in-ancient-rome.htm>
- Espionage. (2020, January 31). Retrieved February 11, 2020, from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Espionage>
- Fillmore Ch., & Baker, C. (2009). A frames approach to semantic analysis. Ch. 13. In B. Heine & H. Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis* (pp. 313–339). OUP.
- GRU. (n.d.) *Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition 2014*. (1991, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2014). Retrieved February 12, 2020 from <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/GRU>
- Ivanov, I., & Cheshmedzhieva–Stoycheva, D. (2012). “Russians in the Bulgarian and the British press”. *Savremenni aspekti v anglitsistikata v sapostavitelen plan*, 54–62. Shumen: Konstantin Preslavsky University.
- Ivanova, I. (2020). Pragmatic functions of interrogatives in media texts. *Media Linguistics Journal*, 7(4). Upcoming.
- KGB. (n.d.) *Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition 2014*. (1991, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2014). Retrieved February 12, 2020 from <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/KGB>
- Kostova, L. (1997). *Tales of the periphery*. Veliko Turnovo: Cyril and Methodius UP.
- Lovelace, A. G. (2015). Spies in the news: Soviet espionage in the American media during World War II and the beginning of the Cold War. *Journal of Slavic Military Studies*, 28, 307–327. Routledge: Taylor and Frances Group.
- Macintyre, B. (2019). *The spy and the traitor: The greatest espionage story of the Cold War*. UK: Viking.

- Mercouris, A. (2016). Western racism and the stereotyping of Russians. *The Duran*. 12 October 2016, <http://theduran.com/western-racism-and-the-stereotyping-of-russians/>
- Milton, G. (2014, May 4). These Are the Guys Who Invented Modern Espionage. Retrieved February 11, 2020, from <http://historynewsnetwork.org/article/155464#sthash.7MXUDisL.dpuf>
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. "Introduction to the Holocaust." Holocaust Encyclopedia. <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/introduction-to-the-holocaust>. Retrieved March 1, 2020.
- Urban, M. (2018). *The Skripal files: The life and near death of a Russian spy*. Henry Holt and Co.
- Yuen, D. M. C. (2014). *Deciphering Sun Tzu: how to read The art of war*. New York: Oxford University Press.

AUTHORITY LEGITIMATION IN CAMPAIGN DISCOURSE OF AMERICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Boryana Kostova¹

Abstract: *This article addresses legitimation in discourse seen as a complex and multifaceted concept. The specific focus is on authority legitimization which is understood not simply as ethos construction but rather as a claim to rightness, i.e. the claim to be normatively right to perform the speech act. Building upon work on legitimation by van Leeuwen and van Dijk, the article studies intertextuality as one aspect of authority legitimation. The presence of elements of one text in other texts can take various forms and degree of visibility and intensity. Therefore the main purpose of the article is to identify the types and functions of intertextuality. A framework within the scope of Critical Discourse Studies is proposed by which a small corpus of acceptance speeches of contemporary American political leaders is analyzed. The results from the quantitative and qualitative analysis have shown that speakers of different political backgrounds use intertextuality similarly. It is revealed that the most common source of intertextuality is the voice of the political opponent. The main functions of intertextuality in the analyzed speeches are solidarity and credibility building as well as downgrading opposing points of view.*

Key words: *legitimation, intertextuality, authority, political speeches, Critical Discourse Studies*

Introduction

The interest in legitimation arises from concerns expressed by both political scientists and linguists that we live in an era of post-truth and populism which is reflected in the way language is used by politicians, public figures or the elite to justify their actions or to construct their social identity. The election campaigns and referendums in the USA and Britain from the second decade of the 21st century can be taken as instances of the use of language that tends to be based on emotions rather than logos, and ethos that arises from pathos. Another example, taken from the corpus compiled for the purposes of the article, is the statement that “we cannot afford to be so politically correct anymore” (Trump, 2016). It is the evidence of a disturbing trend in using language in the public sphere as it allows verbal attacks and criticism, which are accepted and legitimate means of expression in politics, to spill into insults. Indeed, in

1. Senior Lecturer at Varna Free University, Department of Foreign Language Teaching, Varna, Bulgaria, e-mail: boryana.kostova@vfu.bg, ORCID: 0000-0002-6207-924X

contemporary multicultural societies, composed of voters of various cultural, social and political backgrounds, it is difficult to find common ground and to build solidarity outside emotions triggered by impoliteness.

Drawing on the understanding that social issues can be explained and possibly opposed by linguistic analysis, the article has two main purposes. It is an attempt to identify instances of legitimization through intertextuality in political discourse and to classify them. It also tries to find out how intertextuality is used by contemporary American politicians as a linguistic strategy to appeal to groups of socially different people, to compensate for the shortage of rational arguments and to legitimize the speaker.

Legitimation in discourse and politics

Legitimation is a complex phenomenon with three dimensions: socio-political, semiotic and discursive. This means that it works on three levels: (1) as a socio-political act or event, for example presidential elections; (2) as a style of behavior, appearance, space organization, multimodal technological resources; (3) as text and talk, discourse, language in use. There is always a complex interplay between these dimensions of legitimation.

In political sciences the term ‘legitimation’ is intricately connected with the term ‘legitimacy’ which explains what makes citizens of contemporary democratic societies acknowledge the authority, i.e. the legitimate power of a government and how a government can demand their obedience. The meaning of the term ‘legitimacy’ has evolved out of Max Weber’s classification of political legitimacy (Heywood, 2007, pp. 221-223). The legal-rational legitimacy, typical of contemporary societies, is verbally constructed. Therefore, in order to be legitimate, it is not enough that power is exercised according to established formal rules. Provision of justifications of the formal procedures is needed together with an expression of consent on the part of the governed. In this respect legitimation is a justification of a behavior and its process is enacted by argumentation, i.e. by providing arguments that explain the social actions.

As far as its origin, ‘legitimation’ refers to conformity to the law or to rules by making something legal or legalized (OED, 2018). In political discourse analysis the term is directly associated with the notion of legitimacy. I. Fairclough and N. Fairclough (2012, p. 112) suggest the following definition which includes a citation from Habermas (1984):

Legitimation is a type of argumentative justification, public justification, in which an action can be justified in terms of reasons and those reasons can themselves be justified as collectively accepted and recognized as ‘worthy of being recognized’.

The word ‘legitimation’ is also used outside the legal and political context and it is synonymous to justification or the ability to be defended with logic (OED, 2018). It is often associated with the speech act of self-defense as the speaker, who seeks legitimation, does it by giving reasons, justification or acceptable motifs for the actions which have been criticized. However, legitimation differs from direct defense or justification in that it does not involve response to a particular accusation or attack. According to Reyes (2011, p. 782) ‘legitimation’ is “the process by which speakers accredit or license a type of social behavior [...] and the act is related to a goal, which seeks our interlocutor’s support or approval”. Chilton (2004, pp. 46-47) refers to legitimation as a strategic function closely related to another strategic function – coercion. Legitimation manufactures legitimacy, i.e. the right to be obeyed, discursively by explicit statements, implicatures or various types of arguments. Thus political decisions may be considered legitimate only if they are made in a process which is in line with the standards of argumentation and reasonableness and „action is justified in terms of values that are themselves capable of public justification” (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012, p. 243). Much of the work of legitimation is textual, though texts vary considerably in how explicit or implicit legitimation is (Fairclough, 2003). Many researchers express the opinion that legitimation and argumentation are related by their nature while the specifics of the acts of legitimation depend on the variables of context (Mackay, 2015; Martin Rojo & van Dijk, 1997; Wodak, 2018).

It is widely accepted that any social order requires legitimation – a widespread acknowledgement of the legitimacy of explanations and justifications for how things are done (Fairclough, 2003, p. 219). Yet, Fairclough and Fairclough (2012, p.109) argue that it is not plausible to equate the notions ‘legitimation’ and ‘justification’ as ‘legitimation’ is a particular type of justification and should be the preferred term in the following context of use:

- Legitimation relates to power, particularly the defensive and justificatory practices that are undertaken in order to protect the legitimacy of the actions or an institution. As van Leeuwen (2007, p. 92) puts it “legitimation is the justification of the practice of institutions”.
- Legitimation is ideological by nature. It constitutes the instrument through which the boundaries of the ideological space are set within which institutions can work with sufficient social approval.
- Legitimation creates publicly shared and justified beliefs, values and norms due to which a suggested course of action is considered legitimate.
- Legitimation is based on reference to law as obeying a law is a reason that can be publicly justified and gives the opportunity for a social consensus.

Also, not every persuasive discourse can be referred to as ‘legitimation’ (van Dijk, 2006, pp. 374-375). Legitimation exists when special conditions or limitations imposed by the context in its social and cognitive aspects are present. These are related to (1) the addresser who must be in a dominant position (member of government or elite in an institutional setting) and the consequences of the communicative act can lead to social inequality if they are only in the interest of the addresser or are at the expense of the addressee; (2) the addressee who might fully or partially lack relevant knowledge or is unable or unwilling to refute the argumentation due to abiding to norms, values and ideologies, strong emotions or his/her social status.

Considering the criteria and the conditions allowing for the act of legitimation, the paper will use the following formulation as a working definition: social and political legitimation can exist when

a powerful group or institution (often the State, the government, the rulers, the elites) seek normative approval for their actions. It does so through strategies that aim to show that such actions are consistent with the moral order, that is, the system of laws, norms, agreements or aims agreed upon by the majority of citizens (Martin Rojo & van Dijk, 1997, p. 528).

Previous research in the field

The analysis of legitimation as a discursive practice and the examination of the use of language for legitimation of policies and actions and legitimization of the personal or group authority is conducted from the standpoints of several theoretical frameworks (Chilton, 2004; Martin Rojo & van Dijk, 1997; Reyes, 2011; van Leeuwen, 2007; van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999; Wodak, 2018). The paper will consider only those frameworks which refer directly to the discussion of authority legitimation.

It must be noted that the process legitimation is carried out in two directions: (1) legitimation of an action and (2) legitimation of the personality and discourse of the person seeking institutional legitimation. The latter is referred to as legitimization (Cap, 2006; Chilton, 2004) or self-legitimation/self-legitimizing discourse (Martin Rojo & van Dijk, 1997). It is associated with the discursive establishment or the verbal realization of the speaker’s authority, his/herrationality and rightfulness to speak or to be listened to. If the seeker of institutional legitimation lacks institutional power and is not considered trustworthy, the legitimacy of his/her discourse will be doubtful and the justification of the action may be refuted. Legitimization/self-legitimation is achieved through the realization and acknowledgement of the addressee’s desires and needs, an emphasis on universal and irrefutable ideological principles, the construction of

an image of charismatic leadership, and self-praise about personal achievements and positive self-presentation (Cap, 2006, pp. 14-28).

The most widely accepted theoretical frameworks for the analysis of the construction of legitimation in discourse and communication belongs to van Leeuwen (2007) and van Leeuwen and Wodak (1999). The classification characterizes legitimation as an answer to two questions: ‘Why should we do this?’ or ‘Why should we do this in this way?’ Four key categories of legitimation are distinguished (Van Leeuwen 2007, p. 92): (1) ‘authorization’, legitimation by reference to the authority of tradition, custom and law, and of persons in whom institutional authority is vested; (2) ‘moral evaluation’, legitimation by reference to discourses of value; (3) ‘rationalization’, legitimation by reference to the goals and uses of institutionalized social action, and to the social knowledge that endow them with cognitive validity; and (4) ‘mythopoesis’, legitimation conveyed through narratives whose outcomes reward legitimate actions and punish non-legitimate actions. These forms of legitimation can occur separately or in combination. They are realized by specific linguistic resources.

In van Leeuwen’s model *authority legitimation* consists of several subcategories (ibid., pp. 94-97):

Personal authority – The legitimate authority is vested in a person because their position in an institution empowers them within the corresponding social practice. They do not need to justify their actions and can use the phrase ‘Because I say so’. In real social practice arguments and reasons are provided because authority is usually vested not in a person but in a social status or a position within an institution. Personal authority legitimation is typically expressed with a verbal process clause, deontic modality and modal phrases such as “it’s time to”.

Expert authority – legitimacy is provided by expertise rather than status. In the age of professionalism, expertise has acquired authority in many areas although there are multitude expert opinions while problems have more than one expert solution. In political discourse the expertise may be stated explicitly, for example by mentioning credentials, if the expert is well known. It is expressed with a verbal or mental process clause with the expert as the subject.

Role model authority – role models can be either members of the group we belong to or celebrities whose behavior is imitated or beliefs are followed. This type of legitimation plays a particularly important role in advertising and lifestyle media. In political discourse it is achieved when theatre or media celebrities endorse presidential candidates.

Impersonal authority – this refers to the impersonal authorities of laws, rules and regulations, policies and guidelines. They can be subjects of verbal process clauses. The indispensable element in such a clause is the presence of the nouns ‘policy’, ‘regulation’, ‘rule’, ‘law’ or their cognate adjectives and adverbs, for

example ‘compulsory’, ‘mandatory’, ‘obligatory’, which appear in impersonal clauses.

The authority of tradition – It is usually assumed that because an action ‘is what we always do or have always done’, it constitutes a strong argument and can go unchallenged. Therefore, tradition does not need to be made explicit or to be justified. This type of authority is invoked through key words like ‘tradition’, ‘practice’, ‘custom’.

The authority of conformity – The implicit message with this type of authority is: “Everybody else is/Most people are doing it, and so should you”. Even contemporary legislators believe that, if most people are doing something, it cannot be wrong, and should be legalized. It is expressed by an explicit comparison and high frequency modality (the majority of ..., many ...).

Another framework that classifies the linguistic, discursive, communicative and interactional characteristics of legitimation is suggested by Martin Rojo and van Dijk (1997). They examine the discursive strategies of self-legitimation by means of which the discourse which conveys the intended representation is legitimated by itself. The framework includes the following strategies:

Discursive management of power and legitimacy – Differences of power and authority between the addresser and the addressee may be increased, balanced or negotiated. This is achieved through (a) the self-presentation of the speaker in the third person singular which has the effect of identification with an institution, thus the person is transformed into a legitimate person; (b) lexical choice; (c) reproducing authoritative sources and discourses, for example medical or legal jargon thus appropriating the social prestige of the professions.

Delegitimation of other sources of discourse – It is achieved when other sources of information and interpreters of the events are disqualified by challenging their authority. Discrediting is accomplished in two ways: (a) through indetermination, i.e. social actors are represented as anonymous individuals or groups; (b) through depersonalization, i.e. vague reference to criticism when other actors are partially suppressed in discourse by mentioning only their critiques without revealing of the sources of the critique. These forms of discursive concealment and exclusion reduce the authority which affects the legitimacy of the opponents. As a consequence, their discourse, their alternative versions of the events are declared biased and false while the self-legitimizing speaker acquires monopoly over the truth.

Moral legitimacy and the rhetoric of objectivity – These are logical consequences of discretization. Unlike the opponent, who misrepresents the events, the self-legitimizing speaker claims that what is presented is not his/her personal opinion and subjective interpretation but the real facts. This constructs his/her moral legitimacy as a credible, reliable and trustworthy speaker. The rhetoric

of objectivity refers to the frequent citation of credible sources, such as experts or authorities, detailed, technical and accurate descriptions of events, the use of numbers which point to truth which cannot be questioned.

Personal commitment – This is a strategy which enhances credibility. Except for the facts and evidence there are other arguments that suggest that the speaker is honest and principled, for instance when the speaker suggests that is personally involved and shares responsibility for the action. This combination of formal responsibility and personal involvement is a move in the overall persuasive strategy of expressing sincerity. This is achieved through the use of personal pronouns in the first person singular.

Manufacturing in-group consensus and solidarity – It is achieved through the polarization of the ‘we’ and ‘they’ groups and the inclusive use of the personal pronouns in the first person plural.

Authorized jargon – Jargon is an instrument of social integration. Therefore, it is used to improve in-group communication and to create social cohesion. Professional jargons, on the other hand, are an instrument of exclusion, preventing contact with those in authority, and of manipulation by concealing or mitigating disagreeable facts.

The discussion of authority legitimation must also consider the overall strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation which is very typical in political discourse. Under the title ‘Ideological square of discursive group polarization’, this framework suggests an examination of the biased account of the facts in favor of the speaker’s own interests, while blaming negative situations and events on the opponents or the Others (van Dijk 2006a, 2006b). The following strategies for legitimation are identified together with their realization in discourse:

- Overall interaction strategies: positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.
- Macro speech act of accusation and defense implying our ‘good’ acts and their ‘bad’ acts.
- Semantic macrostructures: topic selection.
- Local speech acts: statements that prove accusations.
- Local meanings: give many/few details; be general/specific; be vague/precise; be explicit/implicit; etc.
- Lexical choice: select positive words for Us and negative words for Them.
- Local syntax: active vs passive sentences; nominalizations to (de) emphasize Our/Their positive/negative agency, responsibility.

- Rhetorical figures: hyperboles vs euphemisms for positive/negative meanings; metonymies and metaphors emphasizing Our/Their positive/negative properties.
- Expressions: sounds and visuals by emphasizing and ordering (van Dijk, 2006b, p. 373).

Drawing on the literature review it can be concluded that authority legitimization is understood as ethos construction. Speakers can persuade successfully if their speech is based on their own personality or moral traits. According to Aristotle (1986, pp. 46-99) ethos is the principal artistic proof and it can inspire and implant trust in the speaker because we trust honest people generally in everything; and if the issue or its solution is unclear, we trust them unconditionally, without hesitation. This means that when politicians manage to construct trust and admiration of their personality, they increase the credibility of their speech. In our understanding, authority legitimization is much closer, though, to rightness, understood in the sense of one of the validity claims (Habermas, 1984). The claim to rightness is the claim to be normatively right to utter what is being uttered or perform a speech act. This condition establishes a particularity or an aspect of authority that links it to the relative power distribution between the addresser and the addressee. Thus, authority legitimization constructs the positive image of the addresser together with the right to speak, to behave, to make decisions the way he/she does.

One of the linguistic tools used to express this particularity of authority is intertextuality. Intertextuality of a text is the presence within it of elements of other texts and potentially other voices than the author's own. These may be related in various ways, for example dialogued with, assumed, rejected and so on (Fairclough, 2003, p. 218). The relationship between the texts can take many forms like parodies, retelling, summary, irony. The most common and pervasive form of intertextuality is reported speech. Fairclough (1992) distinguishes between *manifest intertextuality* – quotation, citation and paraphrase – and *constitutive intertextuality* – generic features which do not leave an obvious trace from the source. In American presidential discourse Austermühl (2014, pp. 27-39) finds out that the relations and interactions between presidential texts themselves and between presidential texts and other culturally significant texts take place at five levels. The following types of intertextuality are identified which vary in their degree of visibility and intensity:

- *Discursive intertextuality* is characterized by uniform text, sentence, and word lengths, predictable use of active and passive voices, standardized syntactical and pronominal choices.
- *Hypertextuality* is the relationship between texts that is based on shared textual and argumentative patterns.

- *Thematic intertextuality* is the repetition or continuous presence of a set number of topics.
- *Generic intertextuality* functions on the level of the text type or genre, while parallels originate from the belonging to the same groups of texts.
- *Material intertextuality* refers to allusions, both implicit and explicit, to other texts through quotations or paraphrases, references to people and sites of memories. It is the most easily identifiable type of intertextuality.

Given the ceremonial and epideictic aspect of campaign speeches, together with the deliberative one, there is high prevalence of material intertextuality in this type of discourse. There are four main types of allusions (Austermühl, 2014, pp. 221-255):

Quotational allusions – appear with quotation marks, italicization, spacing or the integration of a foreign language element.

Titular allusions – reference to the title of a work, e.g. a book, painting, journal, song or film. In the American context such sacred documents are the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution as well as some semi-sacred documents like John Winthrop’s sermon aboard the *Arabella*, the so-called “American Covenant”, and speeches of American presidents.

Onomastic allusions – name-related references which include references to personal names, names of places (toponyms) and significant historical events and eras. Among the group of persons or moral authorities that are quoted directly or indirectly are the Founding Fathers or Framers. George Washington is a fixture among onomastic allusions. Other national icons alluded to are Lincoln, Kennedy, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Jefferson. References to other political leaders such as Winston Churchill or Martin Luther King Jr. mostly take the form of concrete quotational allusions but can also appear as imitations of the structural, stylistic, or formal nature of previous presidential speeches. Allusions that refer to the collective memory of the American public are the American Revolution, the Civil War, the Great Depression, the two World Wars, the Cold War, and September 11. Textual references to God, the Bible and religious and moral authorities are quite common. Voices of regular, Main Street Americans is a quotational device found in abundance in campaign speeches. It is implemented in quotations from personal letters written by ordinary American citizens to the candidate.

Pseudointertextual allusions – fictitious statements referring to and suggesting the presence of a pre-text that actually does not exist, for example negations, fictitious or rhetorical questions, references to unidentified addressees. The formula “those who say” or “some say” allow the speaker to enter into a rather

one-sided dialogue with invisible opponents which gives the argumentation a quasi-dialogical character.

Research Questions

The study aims to illustrate how speakers highlight the correctness of their own positions and make the audience view their stance as commonsense, valuable and trustworthy. The paper tries to find the answers to two important questions:

- (1) How is authority legitimation achieved via intertextuality?
- (2) Which types of intertextuality are employed in order to justify one's own political stance and to reject opposing points of view?

Methods

The study is conducted within the broad field of Critical Discourse Studies. It is a useful theoretical framework as it focuses on the deconstruction of the hidden relations between the participants in communication. Those relations are usually encoded and embedded into the way language is used and refer to social hierarchy and power, be it only symbolic power. From the perspective of communication, legitimation is one rare instance where the participants simultaneously possess and lack power. On the one hand, the speaker, who as part of the elite has the real power in society, needs the support of the audience to gain or maintain the political power. The audience, on the other hand, has only the symbolic power to accept or to refute the presented arguments if they are worthy enough in terms of societal values.

In order to study this specific situation of the use of language, quantitative and qualitative analyses were carried out, while the instances of intertextuality were manually collected. The study uses primarily qualitative data, paying close attention to linguistic characteristics of intertextuality.

Data Analysis

The data for this study consists of four political speeches delivered during two election campaigns by two about to be American presidents from the Democratic and the Republican Party respectively – Barack Obama and Donald Trump – and their political opponents – John McCain and Hilary Clinton. The corpus consists of 19,567 words. It covers the acceptance speeches of these four candidates, all of whom had not participated in previous election campaigns. Being novice in the contest for the highest elected post within the political structure of the USA, places the speakers at equal footing although they belong to different political parties. There is an expectation that they will employ various rhetorical strategies to legitimize themselves for this new role.

The acceptance speeches of the four political leaders were delivered at the party conventions in 2008 and 2016. These were huge televised events attended in person by thousands of people and followed by many more domestically and internationally. Acceptance speeches are program speeches which present the candidate's political strategy and plans. They are charged with the potential to change the audience's perception of a candidate's personality and influence their preference for the candidates. A televised speech, uploaded on social media such as YouTube may be a powerful channel for politicians to demonstrate their authority and increase their likability, and at the same time discredit their opponents.

Results/Key findings

Justifying one's own political position

The study illustrates how presidential candidates use intertextuality to justify their own position and arguments and uphold the value of their own political stance. This dialogism or polyphonic features of the discourse is achieved through six main sources using the voices of ordinary citizens, family members, authoritative speakers or sources, numbers and research, onomastic allusions of place, historical event, important document, self-reference. By deploying these voices either through direct quotations or indirectly through summaries, narratives or allusions, each candidate highlights not only the correctness of their own political position but mainly the likability and moral value of their personality. Thus, the audience is induced to view their stance as commonsense, valuable and trustworthy.

The voice of citizens

The voice of citizens is represented through the stories that were told or reported to the candidate earlier. Citizens usually have a specific identification, i.e. they are referred to by their names and surnames without honorific titles. The reason for the presence of these narratives within the speech is to show the sources of candidates' motivation and to present him/her as caring for the issues that concern ordinary citizens. These instances of empathy position him/her as a nurturant parent, to use Lakoff's (1996) term, and as a very ordinary person standing for the most powerful position.

- (1) I don't know what kind of lives John McCain thinks that celebrities lead, but this has been mine. These are my heroes. Theirs are the stories that shaped me. And it is on their behalf that I intend to win this election and keep our promise alive as President of the United States. (Obama, 2008)
- (2) After the four days of this convention, you've seen some of the people who have inspired me, people who let me into their lives and became a

part of mine, people like Ryan Moore and Lauren Manning. They told their stories Tuesday night.

I first met Ryan as a 7-year old. He was wearing a full-body brace that must have weighed 40 pounds because I leaned over to lift him up. Children like Ryan kept me going when our plan for universal health care failed and kept me working with leaders of both parties to help create the Children's Health Insurance Program that covers 8 million kids in our country.

Lauren Manning, who stood here with such grace and power, was gravely injured on 9/11. It was the thought of her and Debbie St. John who you saw in the movie and John Dolan and Joe Sweeney and all the victims and survivors that kept me working as hard as I could in the Senate on behalf of 9/11 families and our first responders who got sick from their time at ground zero.

I was thinking of Lauren, Debbie and all the others 10 years later in the White House Situation Room when President Obama made the courageous decision that finally brought Osama bin Laden to justice.

And in this campaign, I've met many more people who motivate me to keep fighting for change. And with your help, I will carry all of your voices and stories with me to the White House. (Clinton, 2016)

- (3) I fight for Americans. I fight for you. I fight for Bill and Sue Nebe from Farmington Hills, Michigan, who lost.....lost their real estate investments in the bad housing market. Bill got a temporary job after he was out of work for seven months. Sue works three jobs to help pay the bills.

I fight for Jake and Toni Wimmer of Franklin County, Pennsylvania. Jake...

Jake works on a loading dock, coaches Little League, and raises money for the mentally and physically disabled. Toni is a schoolteacher, working toward her master's degree. They have two sons. The youngest, Luke, has been diagnosed with autism. Their lives should matter to the people they elect to office. And they matter to me. And they matter to you.

I fight for the family of Matthew Stanley of Wolfeboro, New Hampshire.

Matthew died serving our country in Iraq. I wear his bracelet and think of him every day. I intend to honor their sacrifice by making sure the country their son loved so well and never returned to remains safe from its enemies. (McCain, 2008)

- (4) My heart just swelled when I saw Anastasia Somoza representing millions of young people on this stage. Because we changed our law to make sure she got an education. (Clinton, 2016)

Candidates show compassion not only for ordinary citizens but also for citizens performing their duties and risking their lives.

- (5) A president should respect the men and women who risk their lives to serve our country...including Captain Khan and the sons of Tim Kaine and Mike Pence, both Marines. (Clinton, 2016)
- (6) And thanks -- thanks to the leadership of a brilliant general, David Petraeus, and the brave men and women he has the honor to command... [applause]...that -- that strategy succeeded, and it rescued us from a defeat that would have demoralized our military, risked a wider war, and threatened the security of all Americans. (McCain, 2008)

In some speeches the response to the particular grievances goes beyond the mere expression of compassion. The speech act of blaming unknown personalities for killings creates a negative emotion which is directly related to the justification of a political position and intentions. This frames the candidate as a Strict Father, as defined by Lakoff (1996).

- (7) On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by illegal immigrants Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and my friend Jamiel Shaw. They are just three brave representatives of many thousands who have suffered so gravely. Of all my travels in this country, nothing has affected me more deeply than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to violence spilling across our border, which we can solve. We have to solve it. (Trump, 2016)

The voice of citizens may be generalized with no specific identification except for the city or state they live in or an allusion of it.

- (8) A nation of whiners? Tell that to the proud auto workers at a Michigan plant who, after they found out it was closing, kept showing up every day and working as hard as ever, because they knew there were people who counted on the brakes that they made. Tell that to the military families who shoulder their burdens silently as they watch their loved ones leave for their third or fourth or fifth tour of duty. These are not whiners. They work hard and give back and keep going without complaint. These are the Americans that I know. (Obama, 2008)

In the following excerpt the speaker alludes to the city of New Orleans, devastated by a natural disaster:

- (9) This country is more decent than one where a woman in Ohio, on the brink of retirement, finds herself one illness away from disaster after a lifetime of hard work.

This country is more generous than one where a man in Indiana has to pack up the equipment he's worked on for twenty years and watch it shipped off to China, and then chokes up as he explains how he felt like a failure when he went home to tell his family the news.

We are more compassionate than a government that lets veterans sleep on our streets and families slide into poverty; that sits on its hands while a major **American city drowns** before our eyes. (Obama, 2008)

The same strategy of including voices of citizens without giving their specific identification is used in combination with invoking fear through lexical choice of nouns, verbs and adjectives which denote death.

- (10) America was shocked to its core when our police officers in Dallas were so brutally executed. In the days after Dallas, we have seen continued threats and violence against our law enforcement officials. Law officers have been shot or killed in recent days in Georgia, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas, Michigan and Tennessee.

On Sunday, more police were gunned down in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Three were killed, and three were very very badly injured. [...]

Every action I take, I will ask myself: does this make better for young Americans in Baltimore, in Chicago, in Detroit, in Ferguson who have as much of a right to live out their dreams as any other child America? [...]

Only weeks ago, in Orlando, Florida, 49 wonderful Americans were savagely murdered by an Islamic terrorist. This time, the terrorist targeted LGBTQ community – no good and we're going to stop it. (Trump, 2016)

Voice of family members through narratives

Voices of the candidates' family members are present as narratives in all the speeches. They function as a frame within which the candidate positions himself/herself as a coherent person who has developed in moral terms due to his/her endurance, ambition and personal strength, who is capable of balancing the personal and professional life and is very authentic exposing his/her human nature.

- (11) So let me tell you. The family I'm from, well, no one had their name on big buildings. My family were builders of a different kind, builders in the way most American families are. They used whatever tools they had, whatever God gave them and whatever life in America provided and built better lives and better futures for their kids.

My grandfather worked in the same Scranton lace mill for 50 years.

Because he believed that if he gave everything he had, his children would have a better life than he did. And he was right. My dad, Hugh, made it to college, he played football at Penn State and enlisted in the Navy after Pearl Harbor. When the war was over, he started his own small business printing fabric for draperies. I remember watching him stand for hours over silkscreens. He wanted to give my brothers and me opportunities he never had, and he did.

My mother, Dorothy, was abandoned by her parents as a young girl. She ended up on her own at 14 working as a housemaid. She was saved by the kindness of others. Her first-grade teacher saw she had nothing to eat at lunch, and brought extra food to share the entire year.

The lessons she passed on to me years later stuck with me. No one gets through life alone. We have to look out for each other and lift each other up. And she made sure I learned the words from our Methodist faith: Do all the good you can for all the people you can in all the ways you can as long as ever you can.

So I went to work for the Children's Defense Fund, going door-to-door in New Bedford, Massachusetts on behalf of children with disabilities who were denied the chance to go to school. I remember meeting a young girl in a wheelchair on the small back porch of her house. She told me how badly she wanted to go to school. It just didn't seem possible in those days. And I couldn't stop thinking of my mother and what she'd gone through as a child. (Clinton, 2016)

- (12) In this journey, I'm so lucky to have at my side my wife Melania and my wonderful children, Don, Ivanka, Eric, Tiffany, and Barron: you will always be my greatest source of pride and joy. And by the way, Melania and Ivanka -- did they do a job? My Dad, Fred Trump, was the smartest and hardest working man I ever knew. I wonder sometimes what he'd say if he were here to see this and to see me tonight.

It's because of him that I learned, from my youngest age, to respect the dignity of work and the dignity of working people. He was a guy most comfortable in the company of bricklayers, carpenters, and electricians

and I have a lot of that in me also. I love those people.

Then there's my mother, Mary. She was strong, but also warm and fair-minded. She was a truly great mother. She was also one of the most honest and charitable people I have ever known, and a great judge of character. She could pick 'em out from anywhere.

To my sisters Mary Anne and Elizabeth, my brother Robert and my late brother Fred, I will always give you my love you are most special to me. I have loved my life in business. (Trump, 2016)

- (13) My friends, when I was growing up, my father was often at sea, and the job of raising my brother, sister and me would fall to my mother alone. Roberta McCain gave us her love of life, her deep interest in the world, her strength, and her belief that we're all meant to use our opportunities to make ourselves useful to our country. I wouldn't be here tonight but for the strength of her character. (McCain, 2008)
- (14) My friends, when I was 5 years old, a car pulled up in front of our house. A Navy officer rolled down the window and shouted at my father that the Japanese had bombed Pearl Harbor. I rarely saw my father again for four years. (McCain, 2008)
- (15) Because in the faces of those young veterans who come back from Iraq and Afghanistan, I see my grandfather, who signed up after Pearl Harbor, marched in Patton's Army, and was rewarded by a grateful nation with the chance to go to college on the GI Bill.

In the face of that young student who sleeps just three hours before working the night shift, I think about my mom, who raised my sister and me on her own while she worked and earned her degree; who once turned to food stamps but was still able to send us to the best schools in the country with the help of student loans and scholarships.

When I listen to another worker tell me that his factory has shut down, I remember all those men and women on the South Side of Chicago who I stood by and fought for two decades ago after the local steel plant closed.

And when I hear a woman talk about the difficulties of starting her own business, I think about my grandmother, who worked her way up from the secretarial pool to middle-management, despite years of being passed over for promotions because she was a woman. She's the one who taught me about hard work. She's the one who put off buying a new car or a new dress for herself so that I could have a better life. She

poured everything she had into me. And although she can no longer travel, I know that she's watching tonight, and that tonight is her night as well. (Obama, 2008)

The voice of numbers and research

Another external resource for dialogism is the voice of numbers and research, or the language of objectivity. The notion of numbers and research, or objective professional expertise, refers to something authoritative in a specific field such as academia or science. By quoting this voice, speakers can earn credibility for their political ideology and justify their own position. However, the eight numbers mentioned in excerpt (16) do not create the impression that the speaker needs external, professional authority to extend his own. Rather the speaker tends to reaffirm himself as the exclusive source of credible and truthful information. This effect is achieved by mitigating or hiding the source of the statistics. Also, the selection of particular statistics associated with death and destruction intensifies the negative pathos of the speech by creating fear and disgust. This makes it possible for the speaker to legitimize himself as a hero capable of creating prosperity out of destruction.

- (16) It is finally time for a straightforward assessment of the state of our nation. I will present the facts plainly and honestly. We cannot afford to be so politically correct anymore. [...] We will honor the American people with the truth, and nothing else. These are the facts: [...]

Homicides last year increased by 17 percent in America's fifty largest cities. That's the largest increase in 25 years. In our nation's capital, killings have risen by 50 percent. They are up nearly 60 percent in nearby Baltimore. [...]

The number of police officers killed in the line of duty has risen by almost 50 percent compared to this point last year. Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens. [...]

Excessive regulation is costing our country as much as \$2 trillion a year, and we will end it very very quickly. We are going to lift the restrictions on the production of American energy. This will produce more than \$20 trillion in job creating economic activity over the next four decades. (Trump, 2016)

The authoritative speaker's voice

The heavyweight speaker's voice represents the voice of political leaders or national heroes. These figures from the nation's past and present serve as moral authorities, models of patriotism. The use of this type of intertextuality serves

to position the candidate within a tradition of thought and behavior, to present the current actions as a natural continuation of the past. In the following excerpt the speaker undertakes an interesting form of indirect quotation. She first quotes a song from a very popular Broadway show running just at the time of the campaign and thus creates the context to introduce the real historical figures worth quoting at that occasion. These are the founders of the American nation or the leaders of the American Independence War and authors of the American constitution, Alexander Hamilton being one of them.

- (17) And though we may not live to see the glory, as the song from the musical “Hamilton” goes, let us gladly join the fight, let our legacy be about planting seeds in a garden you never get to see. That’s why we’re here, not just in this hall, but on this earth. The **Founders** showed us that and so have many others since. They were drawn together by love of country and the selfless passion to build something better for all who follow. (Clinton, 2016)

Other moral authorities with whom speakers identify and on whose endorsement they rely are presidents of the country, political leaders and public figures. Therefore, their voices are present in the speech through indirect quotation, i.e. reporting and summarizing their words. The function of this instance of intertextuality is to legitimize the candidate as worth being endorsed due to the support from important public figures she managed to gain.

- (18) We heard the man from Hope, Bill Clinton, and the man of hope, Barack Obama. America is stronger because of President Obama’s leadership. And I’m better because of his friendship. We heard from our terrific vice president, the one and only Joe Biden. He spoke from his big heart about our party’s commitment to working people as only he can do.

And first lady Michelle Obama reminded us that our children are watching. And the president we elect is going to be their president, too. (Clinton, 2016)

- (19) Now, remember what the president said last night: Don’t boo; vote! (Clinton, 2016)

Another instance of intertextuality is the reference to the memorable and endurable ideas of President Kennedy. First, the heavyweight speaker’s voice is introduced through a direct quotation. Then, as the paragraph develops, there is an indirect quotation or rather an allusion to Kennedy’s historic words known from his inaugural address: “And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can do for your country”. In this way, Kennedy inspired and challenged every American to contribute in some way to the public good, to commit themselves to service. Similarly, the speaker

legitimizes himself by applying the same ideas of societal and individual responsibility within a contemporary context.

- (20) And Democrats, we must also admit that fulfilling America's promise will require more than just money. It will require a renewed sense of responsibility from each of us to recover what **John F. Kennedy called our "intellectual and moral strength."** Yes, government must lead on energy independence, but each of us must do our part to make our homes and businesses more efficient. Yes, we must provide more ladders to success for young men who fall into lives of crime and despair. But we must also admit that programs alone can't replace parents; that government can't turn off the television and make a child do her homework; that fathers must take more responsibility for providing the love and guidance their children need. **Individual responsibility and mutual responsibility** – that's the essence of America's promise. (Obama, 2008)

Authoritative speakers can be represented by spiritual leaders and activists such as Martin Luther King Jr. Interestingly, despite the fact that his voice is obvious through a direct and indirect quotation, the name is absent from the text. It is only inferred by references such as "a young preacher from Georgia speaking his dreams". The listener or reader of the speech must rely on their cultural and historical knowledge in order to recognize the source of the intertextuality which is the iconic speech known under the title "I have a Dream" delivered on the steps of Lincoln Memorial in Washington D.C. in front of a numerous gathering and is associated with the civil rights movement of Afro-American citizens in the USA. Being of Afro-American origin himself, the speaker identifies himself with the preacher and his ideas for unity and social equality which should characterize American society today. The speaker goes beyond this instance of intertextuality and continues his speech relying on interdiscursivity, i.e. undertaking a style that resembles one of a preacher instead of a political candidate.

- (21) And it is that promise that forty five years ago today, brought Americans from every corner of this land to stand together on a Mall in Washington, before Lincoln's Memorial, and hear a young preacher from Georgia speak of his dream.

The men and women who gathered there could've heard many things. They could've heard words of anger and discord. They could've been told to succumb to the fear and frustration of so many dreams deferred.

But what the people heard instead – people of every creed and color, from every walk of life – is that in America, our destiny is inextricably linked. That together, our dreams can be one.

“We cannot walk alone,” the preacher cried. “And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back.” (Obama, 2008)

The speakers may quote someone from their own party. In such cases, speakers typically quote a party leader or someone very close to them as in the excerpt, i.e. President Kennedy’s wife. The function of this instance of intertextuality is to stress ideological coherence within the party. It is important for the speaker to bring in the voice of a more authoritative person from their party to show that their political stance lies within a tradition and is supported by someone with more political authority.

- (22) I can’t put it any better than Jackie Kennedy did after the Cuban Missile Crisis. She said that what worried President Kennedy during that very dangerous time was that a war might be started not by big men with self-control and restraint, but by little men, the ones moved by fear and pride.

America’s strength doesn’t come from lashing out. It relies on smarts, judgment, cool resolve and the precise and strategic application of power. And that’s the kind of commander in chief I pledge to be.

And if we’re serious about keeping our country safe, we also can’t afford to have a president who’s in the pocket of the gun lobby. (Clinton, 2016)

Onomastic allusion – name/ place/ historical event/ important document

Onomastic allusion is a form of indirect intertextuality by which in a very elegant, but powerful way a cognitive frame is triggered by the mention of a name, place, historical event or an important document. In the following excerpt the speaker introduces the names of two American presidents supported by the Democratic Party. Thus, the speaker seeks solidarity and endorsement by making the audience recall the record and the success of the mentioned presidents. Franklin D. Roosevelt is considered as one of the nation’s greatest presidents because he managed to fight the worst economic crisis in U.S. history and lead the country during WWII. Kennedy was another widely accepted American leader who served at the height of the Cold War until his assassination. Presidents Lincoln and Reagan are associated with the abolition of slavery after the Civil War and the end of the Cold War, respectively. The ship Mayflower is connected to the early history of the land, especially the first immigration wave from Europe. These facts are not made explicit but can be recollected by those possessing enough historical knowledge. Otherwise the names remain only as symbols of patriotism and responsibility.

- (23) We are the party of **Roosevelt**. We are the party of **Kennedy**. So don't tell me that Democrats won't defend this country. Don't tell me that Democrats won't keep us safe. The Bush-McCain foreign policy has squandered the legacy that generations of Americans -- Democrats and Republicans -- have built, and we are here to restore that legacy. (Obama, 2008)
- (24) We're going to recover the people's trust by standing up again to the values Americans admire. The party of **Lincoln and Reagan** is going to get back to basics.

In this country, we believe everyone has something to contribute and deserves the opportunity to reach their God-given potential, from the boy whose descendants arrived on the **Mayflower** to the Latina daughter of migrant workers. We're all God's children, and we're all Americans (McCain, 2008)

Onomastic allusions refer to the mention of places and historical events as well. In excerpt (24) the toponym Philadelphia unlocks a cognitive frame connected to the early history of the country – it was in the city of Philadelphia that the Declaration of Independence was signed, a document that marked the beginning of the American nation. Although American society today is multicultural, this reference establishes common ground with American citizens even with differing political views, cultural and religious background.

- (25) My friends, we've come to **Philadelphia, the birthplace of our nation**, because what happened in this city 240 years ago still has something to teach us today. We all know the story, but we usually focus on how it turned out and not enough on how close that story came to never being written at all.

When representatives from 13 unruly colonies met just down the road from here, some wanted to stick with the king and some wanted to stick it to the king.

The **Revolution** hung in the balance, and somehow they began listening to each other, compromising, finding common purpose. And by the time they left Philadelphia, they had begun to see themselves as one nation. That's what made it possible to stand up to a king. That took courage, they had courage. Our Founders embraced the enduring truth that we are stronger together. (Clinton, 2016)

The Declaration of Independence and the Scripture are dominant sources of inspiration for patriotism and are often used to invoke a sense of solidarity. Excerpt (26) constitutes an indirect quotation of a very famous line from the historical document while excerpt (27) is a variation of Hebrews chapter 10:

verse 23. The latter is used as a natural move towards the conclusion of the speech in the style of American Jeremiad.

- (26) We're dedicated to the proposition that **all people are created equal and endowed by our creator with inalienable rights**. No country – no country ever had a greater cause than that. And I wouldn't be an American worthy of the name if I didn't honor Senator Obama and his supporters for their achievement. (McCain, 2008)
- (27) Let us keep that promise – that American promise – and in the words of **Scripture** hold firmly, without wavering, to the hope that we confess. (Obama, 2008)

Speakers often show alignment with typical American values or call for national unity. They achieve it by mentioning or quoting important documents like the Constitution or national symbols like the traditional motto of the USA appearing on the Great Seal. The phrase “a more perfect union” belongs to the preamble of the U.S. Constitution and reveals an aspiration at building a balanced and fair society.

- (28) Tonight we've reached a milestone in our nation's march toward **a more perfect union**. The first time that a major party has nominated a woman for president! (Clinton, 2016)
- (29) Now America is once again at a moment of reckoning. Powerful forces are threatening to pull us apart. Bonds of trust and respect are fraying. And just as with our Founders, there are no guarantees. It truly is up to us. We have to decide whether we will all work together so we can all rise together. Our country's motto is E Pluribus Unum, out of many we are one. Will we stay true to that motto? (Clinton, 2016)

Not all allusions have a positive connotation. Some of them include negative evaluation as they refer to places of tragedies, war, and terrorist attacks. The mention of the World Trade Center, the Boston Marathon and Vietnam create an image of destruction and suffering. These can be considered as metonymical expressions, that is, the places where the events happened are used to stand for those events themselves. Thinking of the tragic events associated with these places, the speakers have two objectives: (a) to justify their own position for taking certain action against terrorist organizations; (b) to establish one's own authority as a war hero, veteran, survivor of a war.

- (30) The damage and devastation that can be inflicted by Islamic radicals has been proven over and over – at the **World Trade Center**, at an office party in San Bernardino, at the **Boston Marathon**, and a military recruiting center in Chattanooga, Tennessee. And many, many other locations. (Trump, 2016)

- (31) In **Vietnam**, where I formed the closest friendships of my life, some of those friends never came home with me. (McCain, 2008)
- (32) Long ago, something unusual happened to me that taught me the most valuable lesson of my life. I was blessed by misfortune. I mean that sincerely. I was blessed because I served in the company of heroes and I witnessed a thousand acts of courage, and compassion, and love. On an October morning, in the Gulf of Tonkin, I prepared for my 23rd mission over **North Vietnam**. I hadn't any worry I wouldn't come back safe and sound. I thought I was tougher than anyone. I was pretty independent then, too. I liked to bend a few rules and pick a few fights for the fun of it. (McCain, 2008)

Self-reference

Self-reference is a specific type of intertextuality. Its function is to uphold the positive self-evaluation and credibility of the speaker.

- (33) Recently **I have said** that NATO was obsolete, because it did not properly cover terror, and also, that many of the member countries were not paying their fair share. As usual, the United States has been picking up the cost. Shortly thereafter, it was announced that NATO will be setting up a new program in order to combat terrorism -- a true step in the right direction. (Trump, 2016)

Referring to oneself in the third person singular distances the speaker from the current situation presenting him in a more formal way. This relates to the power relations between the speaker and his audience where the speaker gains authority through the post he aspires to.

- (34) My opponent, on the other hand, wants to put the great miners and steel workers of our country out of work and out of business – **that will never happen with Donald Trump as President**. Our steelworkers and our miners are going back to work again. With these new economic policies, trillions of dollars will start flowing into our country. (Trump, 2016)

Rejecting opposing points of view

The opponents' voice

Attacking or criticizing one's opponent is a common practice in political discourse. Speakers may bring up their opponent's previous utterances and point out their inconsistencies as well as negatively evaluate their political stance. This criticism functions as a platform for presenting one's own arguments as rational, appropriate and moral. The opponent's voice can be heard either through direct

quotation, or much more frequently as indirect reporting paired with negative evaluation. The opponent is usually referred to by name and surname, even only by first name, without the use of honorifics. This discursive strategy contributes to the negative frame within which the opponent is presented and to the speech act of blaming. Here are some examples:

- (35) Now, Donald Trump, Donald Trump says, and this is a quote, “I know more about ISIS than the generals do.” No, Donald, you don’t. He thinks he knows more than our military because he claimed our armed forces are a disaster. (Clinton, 2016)
- (36) Well, we heard Donald Trump’s answer last week at his convention. He wants to divide us from the rest of the world and from each other. He’s betting that the perils of today’s world will blind us to its unlimited promise. He’s taken the Republican Party a long way, from morning in America to midnight in America. He wants us to fear the future and fear each other. (Clinton, 2016)
- (37) Now, you didn’t hear any of this, did you, from Donald Trump at his convention? He spoke for 70-odd minutes—and I do mean odd—and he offered zero solutions. But we already know he doesn’t believe these things. No wonder he doesn’t like talking about his plans. You might have noticed I love talking about mine. (Clinton, 2016)
- (38) My opponent [Hilary Clinton] has called for a radical 550% increase in Syrian -- Think of this. Think of this. This is not believable, but this is what’s happening -- refugees on top of existing massive refugee flows coming into our country under President Obama. She proposes this despite the fact that there’s no way to screen these refugees in order to find out who they are or where they come from.

I only want to admit individuals into our country who will support our values and love our people. Anyone who endorses violence, hatred or oppression is not welcome in our country and never ever will be. (Trump, 2016)

- (39) That is why Hillary Clinton’s message is that things will never change... never ever. My message is that things have to change – and they have to change right now. (Trump, 2016)
- (40) Senator Obama wants our schools to answer to unions and entrenched bureaucrats. I want schools to answer to parents and students. (McCain, 2008)
- (41) Washington’s been talking about our oil addiction for the last thirty years, and John McCain has been there for twenty-six of them. In that time, **he’s said** no to higher fuel-efficiency standards for cars, no to

investments in renewable energy, no to renewable fuels. And today, we import triple the amount of oil as the day that Senator McCain took office. Now is the time to end this addiction, and to understand that drilling is a stop-gap measure, not a long-term solution. Not even close. (Obama, 2008)

- (42) For while Senator McCain was turning his sights to Iraq just days after 9/11, I stood up and opposed this war, knowing that it would distract us from the real threats we face. When John **McCain said** we could just “muddle through” in Afghanistan, I argued for more resources and more troops to finish the fight against the terrorists who actually attacked us on 9/11, and made clear that we must take out Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants if we have them in our sights. John **McCain likes to say** that he’ll follow bin Laden to the Gates of Hell – but he won’t even go to the cave where he lives. [...] John McCain stands alone in his stubborn refusal to end a misguided war. (Obama, 2008)

Excerpt (42) presents an interesting reference to the political opponent, rather an imaginary dialogue with the opponent. Despite the adversarial nature of the election campaign, it is a case in which the opponent is referred to with as much respect and admiration as possible. This is visible from the honorific “Senator” used before the name and the content of the message with which the speaker acknowledges that the rules of the election campaign are rarely based on tolerance and respect. This positions the candidate if not as a combating figure, at least as an honest person.

- (43) And, finally, a word to Senator Obama and his supporters. We’ll go at it -- we’ll go at it over the next two months -- you know that’s the nature of this business -- and there are big differences between us. But you have my respect and **my admiration**. Despite our differences, much more unites us than divides us. We are fellow Americans, and that’s an association that means more to me than any other. (McCain, 2008)

Citizens’ voice

Citizens’ grievances and sufferings, and their unsolved social problems can be used as a reason to blame the political opposition for negligence. These narratives, which are usually told to create negative emotions through the choice of words denoting death, also pave the way for the speaker to present himself as a protector and savior.

- (44) One such border-crosser [illegal immigrant] was released and made his way to Nebraska. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root. She was 21 years-old, and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 Grade Point Average. Number one

in her class. Her killer was then released a second time, and he is now a fugitive from the law.

I've met Sarah's beautiful family. But to this Administration, their amazing daughter was just one more American life that wasn't worth protecting. No more. One more child to sacrifice on the order and on the altar of open borders. (Trump, 2016)

- (45) Every day I wake up determined to deliver for the people I have met all across this nation that have been neglected, ignored, and abandoned.

I have visited the laid-off factory workers, and the communities crushed by our horrible and unfair trade deals. These are the forgotten men and women of our country. And they are forgotten, but they're not going to be forgotten long. People who work hard but no longer have a voice. I am your voice! I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians put their personal agendas before the national good. (Trump, 2016)

The authoritative speaker's voice – national leader/ hero/ important document

In order to refute the arguments of the political opponent, candidates present quotations from other sources such as respectful political leaders, historical figures as a counter argument to the opponent's words. This is noticeable in the examples:

- (46) He [Trump] wants us to fear the future and fear each other. Well, you know, a great **Democratic President Franklin Delano Roosevelt** came up with the perfect rebuke to Trump more than 80 years ago during a much more perilous time: **The only thing we have to fear is fear itself!** (Clinton, 2016)

- (47) Americans don't say "I alone can fix it." We say "we'll fix it together!"

And remember, remember, our Founders fought a Revolution and wrote a Constitution so America would never be a nation where one person had all the power. 240 years later, we still put our faith in each other. (Clinton, 2016)

The arguments of the opposition can be ridiculed by the use of popular wisdom which creates an ironic effect. The metaphoric expression "Pull yourself up by your own bootstraps" is a summary of the wording of the government and is further interpreted by the sarcastic comment "even if you don't have boots". Together with the rhetorical questions "Out of work? No health care? Born into

poverty?” and their answers, this creates an atmosphere of dialogism between the speaker and the opposition.

- (48) For over two decades, he’s subscribed to that old, discredited Republican philosophy – give more and more to those with the most and hope that prosperity trickles down to everyone else. In Washington, **they call this** the Ownership Society, but what it really means is – you’re on your own. Out of work? Tough luck. No health care? The market will fix it. Born into poverty? Pull yourself up by your own bootstraps – even if you don’t have boots. You’re on your own. (Obama, 2008)

Opposition member’s voice

In some cases, speakers find the words of other opposition members worth mentioning because they uphold their political views. In the following excerpts the political adversary is attacked through the direct and indirect quotation. Such an attack is really strong because ideas similar to those of the speaker are expressed by a popular member of the opposition or a high-rank official.

- (49) Her [Hilary’s] bad instincts and her bad judgment – something pointed out by **Bernie Sanders** – are what caused so many of the disasters unfolding today. (Trump, 2016)
- (50) When the **FBI Director** says that the Secretary of State [Hilary Clinton] was “extremely careless” and “negligent,” in handling our classified secrets, I also know that these terms are minor compared to what she actually did. They were just used to save her from facing justice for her terrible, terrible crimes. (Trump, 2016)

Titular allusion

In an attempt to counter the arguments of the political opponent the speaker mentions the title of a book. This is a reaction to the idea that someone can fix the nation’s problems all by himself, alone. The speaker upholds the opposite idea which is developed in the book.

- (51) Twenty years ago I wrote a **book called “It Takes a Village.”** And a lot of people looked at the title and asked, what the heck do you mean by that? This is what I mean. None of us can raise a family, build a business, heal a community or lift a country totally alone. (Clinton, 2016)

Numbers and research

The use of statistical data as evidence for some deeds or misdeeds of the opposition is frequently used as a counter argument. In the following excerpts numbers and examples were sorted out not as a rational argument but rather as a construction of blame directed towards the opposition.

- (52) What about our economy? Again, I will tell you the plain facts that have been edited out of your nightly news and your morning newspaper: Nearly Four in 10 African-American children are living in poverty, while 58% of African American youth are now not employed. 2 million more Latinos are in poverty today than when President Obama took his oath of office less than eight years ago. Another 14 million people have left the workforce entirely. Household incomes are down more than \$4,000 since the year 2000. Our trade deficit in goods -- think of this -- our trade deficit reached nearly \$800 billion last year alone. The budget is no better. (Trump, 2016)
- (53) We measure progress by how many people can find a job that pays the mortgage; whether you can put a little extra money away at the end of each month so you can someday watch your child receive her college diploma. We measure progress in the 23 million new jobs that were created when Bill Clinton was President – when the average American family saw its income go up \$7,500 instead of down \$2,000 like it has under George Bush.

We measure the strength of our economy not by the number of billionaires we have or the profits of the Fortune 500, but by whether someone with a good idea can take a risk and start a new business, or whether the waitress who lives on tips can take a day off to look after a sick kid without losing her job – an economy that honors the dignity of work. (Obama, 2008)

Quasi-reference

Quasi-references are examples of pseudo-intertextuality. However, they do possess certain discursive power as they manage to build arguments and persuade despite the vagueness of the statements presented. “All of the people telling you” may refer to the political opponent, to the leader of the opposition, and ordinary citizens as well. The function of this type of intertextuality is to create a dialogue between the speaker’s position and a position that is unacceptable to him/her and should be refuted.

- (54) Remember: **All of the people telling you** that you can’t have the country you want, are the same people that wouldn’t stand -- I mean, they said Trump doesn’t have a chance of being here tonight. Not a chance! The same people. Oh, we love defeating those people, don’t we? Love it, love it, love it. No longer can we rely on those same people in politics and in the media, who will say anything to keep a rigged system in place. Instead, we must choose to Believe In America. (Trump, 2016)

Conclusion

The analysis above has shown how speakers quote different sources that function dialogically to justify the speaker's own position and suppress alternative points of view. As this study has identified a range of dialogic functions of intertextuality in acceptance speeches, it raises two fundamental questions:

What type of source is more likely to be quoted in acceptance speeches?

Who quotes which source and why?

The limited data set of this study makes it impossible to make generalizations in this regard, but there are certain tendencies in the data which will be worthwhile exploring in future research.

Table 1 shows the relative frequency by paragraph of each source used in these speeches and it reveals that the most common sources are the voices of opponents in the election campaign, the voices of ordinary citizens, and the voices of authoritative speakers or sources. This suggests that intertextuality is most likely to be deployed in order to seek solidarity and elevate one's moral standing, credibility, and thus one's ethos; and to downgrade opposing points of view.

Table 1. *Instances of intertextuality classified by external speakers*

Quoted source	Instances of intertextuality by paragraph
Political opponent	25
Ordinary citizens	14
Authoritative speaker/source	12
Onomastic allusion	9
Numbers and research	5
Family members	5
Opposition member	2
Self-reference	2
Quasi-reference	2
Titular allusion	1
Total	77

Table 2 shows the number of paragraphs with instances of intertextuality classified by speaker, revealing which speakers quote which sources.

Table 2. *Instances of intertextuality by paragraph classified by speaker*

Name	Political opponent	Ordinary citizens	Authoritative speaker/source	Onomastic allusion	Numbers & research
Trump	7	5	3	1	3
Clinton	7	4	6	3	
Obama	6	3	3	2	2
McCain	5	2		3	
Total	25	14	12	9	5

Name	Family members	Opposition member	Self-reference	Quasi-reference	Titular allusion	Total
Trump	1	2	2	2		26
Clinton	1				1	22
Obama	1					17
McCain	2					12
Total	5	2	2	2	1	77

On the basis of these results, a few remarks can be made. First, the most frequent type of intertextuality with the four speakers is citing the political opponent. In fact this type of intertextuality serves as an underlying principle for text organization and construction of arguments in the speeches. Second, reference to the words or reports of the encounters with ordinary citizens is typical for the acceptance speeches, especially those from the second period. These two observations may be explained by the general tendency towards popular speaking and appeal to pathos. Referring to family members is another instance of intertextuality which remains as a typical feature which legitimizes the existential coherence of the speakers. Given the formality of the occasion it can be expected that speakers may identify themselves with the authority of national heroes and important documents. These instances of intertextuality are obvious with only one of the speakers, giving the speech more pathos and less authenticity. Referring to national and cultural symbols may put the speech within the rhetorical presidential tradition but could be a delicate matter as such intertextual links have been used a lot and are well remembered. What strikes one as a novel way to use intertextuality is the reference to numbers and research. These instances show how objective data can be used manipulatively. Both speakers who used this strategy never mentioned the sources or the producers of the statistics and arranged the information to be revealed by intensifying the negative results and mitigating the positive ones. What is more, speakers used, arguably, objectivity and rationality to create a feeling of fear and anxiety, i.e. irrationality. This was achieved by the accumulation of numbers in combination with lexical choice of words from the semantic field of death. Quasi-reference is another example of a manipulative use of intertextuality as it hides the

producer of the text cited or rather constructs artificial dialogism. There are three more instances of intertextuality within the corpus. Those instances are quite interesting because they represent a rhetorical effort at finding various and novel ways to legitimize. The self-reference instances of intertextuality and titular allusion, i.e. the citation of the title of one's own book, are very similar as an effective and cogent strategy to establish the authority of the speaker without the need of overt epistemic modality. Another deployment of intertextuality is the quotation of an opposition member who endorses the same comments made by the speaker. This presents the speaker as wise and credible while the claims of the opponent are downgraded. Such a communicative situation creates discursive polarization between the speaker and his/her opponent and can be explained by van Dijk's "ideological square" (2006b).

Implications

This study has shown that authority legitimation can be achieved through intertextuality along with other linguistic resources. The problem with this means of legitimation is that intertextuality is a text reception phenomenon, it relies strongly on the text receiver's preparedness to interpret texts and cultural frames. On the one hand, the issue of preparedness is easily resolved as this genre of political speeches is mainly directed towards possible voters within the country who are expected to be knowledgeable of recent political events and past historical moments. On the other hand, with regard to the reception of political discourse, the text reading is not at all a private or individual activity but a publicly mediated global event. For instance, all the acceptance speeches from the corpus are available to an international audience through the Internet and the social media. However, if students or users of English desire to approach them as text recipients, their lack of cultural knowledge and preliminary guidance on political and cultural pre-texts might hinder their relevant interpretation of the message. This proves that authority legitimation is an interaction strategy. It is based on shared beliefs and values and is continuously negotiated in communication.

References:

- Aristotle (1986). *Retorika*. Sofia: Science and art.
- Austermühl, F. (2014). *The great American scaffold: Intertextuality and identity in American presidential discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cap, P. (2006). *Legitimization in political discourse. A cross-disciplinary perspective on the modern US war rhetoric*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.

- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London/ New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 3(2), 193–217.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. London: Routledge.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action* (Vol. 1). London: Heinemann.
- Heywood, A. (2007). *Politics* (3rd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives think*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mackay, R. (2015). Multimodal legitimation: Selling Scottish independence. *Discourse & Society*, 26(3), 323–348.
- Martin Rojo, L. & van Dijk, T. A. (1997). “There was a problem and it was solved!”: Legitimizing the expulsion of ‘illegal’ migrants in Spanish parliamentary discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 8(4), 523–566.
- Oxford English Dictionaries*. Available at: <http://en.oxforddictionaries.com>
- Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse & Society*, 22(6), 781–807.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006a). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006b). Politics, ideology, and discourse. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (Vol. 9) (pp. 728-740). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & Communication*, 1(1), 91–112.
- Van Leeuwen, T., and R. Wodak. (1999). Legitimizing immigration control: discourse-historical approach. *Discourse Studies*, 1(1), 83–118.
- Wodak, R. (2018). “Strangers in Europe”. A discourse-historical approach to the legitimation of immigration control 2015/16. In S. Zhao, E. Djonov & A. Björkqvall (Eds.), *Advancing Multimodal and Critical Discourse Studies* (pp. 31-50). London: Routledge.

List of speeches analyzed:

- Clinton, H. (2016). Address accepting the presidential nomination at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In G. Peters & J. T. Woolley (Eds.), *The American Presidency Project*. Retrieved from: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/node/317862>
- McCain, J. (2008). Address accepting the presidential nomination at the Republican National Convention in Saint Paul. In G. Peters & J. T. Woolley (Eds.), *The American Presidency Project*. Retrieved from: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/node/279091>
- Obama, B. (2008). Address accepting the presidential nomination at the Democratic National Convention in Denver: “The American Promise“. In G. Peters & J. T. Woolley (Eds.), *The American Presidency Project*. Retrieved from: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/node/278860>
- Trump, D. (2016). Address accepting the presidential nomination at the Republican National Convention in Cleveland, Ohio. In G. Peters & J. T. Woolley (Eds.), *The American Presidency Project*. Retrieved from: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/node/318521>

THE LIMITS OF TRANSLATING POSTCOLONIAL EXPERIENCE INTO A FOREIGN CULTURE¹

N. Berrin Aksoy²

Abstract: *In this twofold study, I will focus on the exilic/diasporic Nigerian-born black British author Ben Okri as a postcolonial author reflecting the issues of postcolonial literature in his novel *The Famished Road* from a translational point of view. I will first discuss the qualities of the exilic/diasporic experience in postcolonial literature in terms of theme, style and language use; language is the key element in postcolonial literature which reflects the hybridity of cultures and the hybridity of the language used in postcolonial texts, which is closely associated with the translation challenges of a postcolonial text into a culture which is alien to postcolonial experience. My aim in this study firstly will be to discuss whether the novel *The Famished Road* which displays the characteristics of a postcolonial text in terms of style, themes and the hybrid language use avails itself with all its generic qualities in the Turkish translation and creates the same effect and impressions on the Turkish reader in terms of voicing the postcolonial experience as it has on the English reader and, secondly, how the generic qualities are transferred into the language of a culture which does not possess a similar literary or cultural medium.*

Key words: *Postcolonialism, translation challenges, foreign culture, Ben Okri*

Postcolonial turn in literary and translation studies has led the way to the investigation of how the themes of postcolonial experience are expressed, conveyed and recreated in translating postcolonial texts into a foreign language. The purpose of this study is to explore how one of these postcolonial themes, and the trauma it brought about, are represented in a non-European language, Turkish, which belongs to a culture which does not have any colonial or postcolonial experience of the European kind. Turkish readers have met with the postcolonial turn and postcolonial subjects in its literature through translations only quite recently. In this study, I will examine *The Famished Road* by Ben Okri which I translated some years ago, in relation to the issues involved in the translation of a postcolonial novel that engages itself with the themes of exile,

1. This article is a largely revised version of the paper “Ben Okri and the limits of recreating the exilic experience in translation” submitted to Congr s Internacional Literatura i Exili, 23 24 25 d’octubre de 2019, Universtat Rovira i Virgili.

2. Professor, PhD at Atılım University, Department of Translation and Interpretation, Ankara, Turkey, e-mail: berrin.aksoy@atilim.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-5716-1962.

trauma, identity and economic neglect and underdevelopment that are mainly caused by devastations of colonialism. These qualities urge the translator to work on the translation process with a postcolonially-based approach which requires in the translation to highlight elements of language and style that the author of the original text uses to express the postcolonial themes. The novel was translated into Turkish in 2000, and published the same year by İmge Kitabevi, Ankara, Turkey. Hence, there is a time gap which allows me as the translator to assess the translation from a more contemporary perspective.

It may be worthwhile to begin by giving a brief information of Turkish literary polysystem which is the target system in this context. Contextual information of this kind will clarify the role and the images of translations in the Turkish literary polysystem and the conditions that affect the selection of *The Famished Road* for translation and its final reception. Turkish readers were introduced to world literature from Translations in the early years of the Republic which was founded in 1923 when the polysystem initially consisted of court literature models of the Ottoman times and people's oral literature dating back to the same times and even before. With the founding of modern Turkey, translation activities began to be organized by the state to promote affinities with the world literature, mainly with the Western works that contributed to the formation of European Humanism. Inspired by these translated models and together with the employment of our classical Ottoman literary tradition (especially in poetry and in verse form) and Anatolian folk literature modern Turkish literature flourished, which has now in the 21st century, a thriving, rich and varied identity, with a wide reading public composed of a very young population. Considering Turkey's historical past as an empire composed of many nations, Turkish reading public has always maintained a curiosity towards different and foreign cultures. Nevertheless, the situation of the Turkish reader of Ben Okri is rather different from that of his English reader who is familiar with the colonial experience and its manifestations in the book. For the Turkish reader, the translation is above all, very informative about the African culture, and the history of its colonial past, but it does not ignite any familiarity in terms of postcolonial experience and the themes it creates in literature.

Before delving into the issues of the translation analysis for the purpose of studying how the exilic elements in the book are translated, it may be worthwhile to discuss some of the qualities of *The Famished Road* as a postcolonial novel reflecting the exilic experience of its author. The book is culturally grounded in Nigerian myths and motifs as in the case of the narrator Azaro's being an Abiku child, which means a spirit-child in African folklore. The course of action evolves around him and the microcosm of his environment reflected by the author in the myths, beliefs and cultural practices of the African milieu. Okri's employment of myths in order to fictionalise reality of the situation in Nigeria and at the same time universalizing the general condition of the human

self in the post-colonial time in a metaphorical and subtle way along with the hybrid language he chooses to use, situate the book within postcolonial sphere. Abiku, or the spirit child Azaro, may just be a concept in which West-African societies have taken refuge against the environmental problems and dire living conditions such as the raids of mosquitos and the diseases caused by lack of sanitation. However, Okri uses this legendary folktale element of the Abiku child as a metaphor to create an otherworldly and imaginary effect on the reader and an understanding of the African condition. This effect is manifested by the spirit-child Azaro who is in a perpetual exile from the other world and is living the experience of the human condition in a miserable environment. Azaro's experience of this world of Africa, his spiritual disillusionment, sorrow and pain is manifested in a web of criticism. The criticism is about the political and economic conditions in Africa caused by years' long sufferings due to bad management and devastation caused by colonialism. Ben Okri's treatment of the subject matter and the literary devices he employs shed light in a metaphorical way, on the political and economic realities in African nations as well as the lost individual trapped in the mystery of the road of life which has no limits to deplete and devour all the potentials of the African people. All these elements in the novel suggest Ben Okri's preoccupation with his native country and his own situation at the crossroads of Britain and Africa, hence his implicit experience of exile.

The roads seemed to me then to have a cruel and infinite imagination. All the roads multiplied, reproducing themselves, subdividing themselves, like snakes, tall in their mouth, twisting themselves into labyrinths. The road was the worst hallucination of them all, leading towards home and then away from it, without end, with too many signs, and no directions. The road became my torment, my aimless pilgrimage, and I found myself merely walking to discover where all the roads lead to, where they end (Okri, 1993, pp. 114-115)

Elsewhere,

Then, suddenly, with the sun burning itself into evening, with so many people around, everyone active, everything moving, I was overcome with a strange panic. I couldn't see a single familiar face in that jostling universe. And then just as suddenly, in flashess of lightness and dark, I begun to see Mum everywhere. I saw her writhing in the basin of eels. I saw her among the turtles in the plastic buckets. I saw her among the amulets of the sellers of charms. I saw her all over the market, under strange eaves, in the wind that spread woodamoke and rice-chaffs; I felt her everywhere, but I couldn't break the riddle of the market's labyrinths where one path opened into a thousand faces, all of them different, most of them hungry in different ways (Okri, 1993, p. 162).

In the diabolical heat of that afternoon six illegitimate sons of minor warlords, whom I first thought were minotaurs, enacted a battle of ascendancies. They fought near the burnt van. No one came to separate them. They lashed at one another with long sticks, clubs, and whips. They all looked alike. They were the interchangeable faces of violence and politics (Okri, 1993: 192)

These excerpts portray the African situation through Azaro's eyes, back to back with the general feeling of devastation and loss of humans in typical native African metaphors and folktale symbols. Ben Okri's attempt at treating the African situation in connection with the universal situation of mankind in a dream-like "Yoruba folklore" (Obumselu, 2011, p. 3) narrative .

According to Ben Obumselu (2011), Yoruba folklore establishes the main outline of Okri's portrait of Azaro. Obumselu writes the following about how Okri uses literature to voice the postcolonial experience in *The Famished Road*:

But in filling in the details, of the music-filled paradise which is Azaro's spiritual home, of the mazes, labyrinths and lonely crowds which are the backdrop of daily life, of intolerable poverty and misery in city slums, and of disgust and anguish as existential responses to the human condition, Okri consults the folklore of many lands, the tradition of West African political novel, and contemporary world literature (Obumselu, 2011, pp. 2-3).

Adnan Mahmutovic (2010) underlines Azaro's symbolical place as an agent of portraying the postcolonial experience of Africa in general, and of an African in particular, while also portraying the "history of the African territory on the verge of becoming the modern, decolonized nation-state of Nigeria. 'our road was changing. Nothing was what seemed anymore'" (428). Azaro further claims, "I knew we were in the divide between past and future. A new cycle had begun, an old one was being brought to a pitch" (256). "This pitch is the highest point of material and spiritual famine of the colonized people" (Mahmutovic, 2010, pp. 2-3)

With respect to the language used in *The Famished Road*, as in most postcolonial writing, it is manifestly hybrid, meaning that it involves multiple linguistic and cultural systems. The hybridity of the book lies not only in its language that reflects the linguistic and cultural elements of Nigeria, but also in the capacity of Okri of melting a West African postcolonial novel with the existentialist tone of modern European novel, written in the colonizer's language which is English.

Professor Paul Bandia, one of the developers of postcolonial translation as a field of study, explains this idea as following:

In the postcolonial context, when African and European discourses merge, the difference of perception of socio-cultural interactional norms and values and social situations that exists between the traditional African society and its European counterpart makes for a peculiar African discourse-type in European languages. Discoursal indirectness as practised in traditional Africa, is often emulated by Euro-African writers resulting in a peculiar discourse –type. By indirectness we mean the strategy of making a point or statement in a roundabout manner, through circumvention, calculated delays, pausing and so on (Bandia, 2003, pp. 132-133)

According to Bandia, discoursal indirectness shows the oratory skills of the Africans using a language full of symbolism and imagery. Hence, Bandia asserts that African writers often attempt to reproduce these rhetorical skills in their European texts, as seen in *The FR* where the opening passage of the book runs like an ancient traditional African folk story:

In the beginning there was a river. The river became a road and the road branched out to the whole world. And because the road was once a river it was always hungry.

In that land of beginnings spirits mingled with the unborn. We could assume numerous forms. Many of us were birds. We knew no boundaries. There was much feasting, playing and sorrowing. We feasted much because of the beautiful terrors of eternity. We played much because we were free. And we sorrowed much because there were always those amongst us who had just returned from the world of the Living. They had returned inconsolable for all the love they had left behind, all the suffering they hadn't redeemed, all that they hadn't understood, and for all that they had barely begun to learn before they were drawn back to the land of origins. (Okri, 1993, p. 3)

Ben Okri, in an interview he gave to the newspaper *The Guardian*, tells the following about how the native African magical quality of *The Famished Road* is embedded in his narrative style:

The Famished Road is fed by the dreams of literature. I devoured the world, through art, politics, literature, films and music, in order to find the elixir of its tone. Then it became a perpetual story into which flowed the great seas of African dreams, myths and fables of the world, known and unknown. I made up stories in the ancestral mode.....The stories my mother told me were elliptical and strange, and the philosophies of my father steeped in the ancient African world that was older and stranger than the Greek myths... (Okri in *The Guardian.com*)

Evaluating *The Famished Road* from a translational aspect for the purpose of seeing how the exile theme is perpetuated in the translation, lets discuss some ideas put forward by Paul Bandia. According to Bandia, postcolonial translation theory deals with translation between dominant language cultures and minor cultures and minority contexts, including minorities in the former post-colony. Bandia asserts that:

ethno-global minorities result from experiences of migration or displacement whether forced or voluntary. The texts they produce are hybrid, like Homi Bhabba says, polylingual, multilingual, plurivocality even though they are expressed in one and the same language. It means you are expressing the text in English but the English you are expressing it becomes the medium or the matrix of expression infused with the linguistic and aesthetic specificity of African discourse. Hence, the postcolonial text that is being translated is itself a translation with a lot of foreignized elements in the original text (Bandia, 2017: conversation with Yann Le Gall and Moses Marz)

I was commissioned to translate *The Famished Road* from English into Turkish. Initially, I was not aware of all its distinctive qualities as a postcolonial novel in terms of themes and language. The striking thing for me was the lexical and syntactic idiosyncrasy arising from the hybrid nature of the language used by Ben Okri, which is actually the main tenet of his representation of his own exile, and so, the main problems at the beginning appeared to be: First, how to contextualise this hybrid language for the target audience due to the lack of similarity between the Turkish reader's context and that of the source text reader; and between Turkish literary polysystem where exilic literature is still on the periphery and even so with very different connotations; and secondly and of course in connection with the first, how to deal with the Africanness in terms of the cultural and tribal qualities carried over into English. With regard to those translation challenges, extensive research had to be carried out about Ben Okri's peculiar style and the hybrid quality of the language and its cultural manifestations. The translation had to be carried out in such a way that the foreignness in the original text should be preserved and carried over into Turkish in a manner that did not counteract mainstream tendencies in the domestic system in terms of language use and context. Thus, the translation strategy employed in the translation of *The Famished Road* may best be explained by the methods proposed by Susanne Klinger (2018) in her article named *De/Recolonization in Translation*. In general, direct translation method was preferred for instances where I could find literal and semantic equivalences for general expressions, dialogues or descriptions. On the other hand I adopted an exoticizing approach (see Klinger 2018) which is described by Klinger as:

[...] these foreignizing strategies can be either alienating (foreignizing strategies that challenge the domestic canon) or exoticising (foreignizing strategies that comply with domestic stereotypes about the foreign culture). Exoticising strategies... can be either (i) intentional as postcolonial writers might deliberately play with Western stereotypes (see also Carbonell i Cortés, 2002, p.9) or even deliberately comply with these stereotypes to a certain degree in order to get published and read in the West, or (ii) unintentional, an inevitable side-effect of a text that does not want to deny its foreign origins [...] a translated text [...] that is foreignizing in as much as it avoids to “culturally transplant” the text in its entirety [...] will always be exoticizing to some extent as by definition it foregrounds the foreign, constructing the source culture as “other” (ibid., p. 148).

Foreignization strategies have been used in order to comply with domestic stereotypes about Africanness and yet, display these qualities in *The Famished Road* and themes that concern them while at the same time produce a translation which reflects the universal and Western canonical qualities of the original. Hence, for example for the excerpt on page 3 which I have given above and which is the opening and key paragraph of the book, I decided to choose a style which was used in the oral story-telling tradition of ancient Turkish folkstories and tried to stay loyal to the qualities of the paragraph and its ancient non-Western, African oral story narration by drawing similarities with ancient Turkish folkstories. In terms of grammar I used simple past tense in Turkish which stands for an action that takes place in the past, continued for sometime and stopped:

In the beginning there was a river/ başlangıçta bir nehir vardı, nehir yol oldu ve yol da tüm dünyaya dalbudak sardı (Okri, 2000, p.5).

For the expression branched, there is a similar expression of expansion especially used in stories “dalbudak sarmak” which is a metaphor of the branches of a tree.

In the case of the use of an adverb of place at the beginning of the second paragraph in the source text, I could construct the equivalent pattern since it exists in Turkish and is a recurring use in our folk stories.

Elsewhere, the unfinished long sentences divided by commas were also easy to handle since similar structures were used in Turkish, too.

I believe the Africanness as an outlet for the expression of some degree of longing of the native culture and country in the book is conveyed satisfactorily into Turkish. This ancient storytelling mode looks incongruous for the Western narration but smoothly rings the bells in the Turkish reader of its African and magical qualities.

Paraphrasing (Klinger, 2018) is another strategy which keeps the source text's implications and foreignness but at the same time brings the text to the target reader. Especially for some local cultural artefacts such as food, crockery and household goods such as eba, ogogoro , paraphrasing within the sentence was the most suitable method since it did not interrupt the fluency of the narration.

Borrowing was another strategy for some untranslatable objects such as the names of some plants and trees as iroko, obeche and I preferred to borrow them instead of deleting or replacing by some familiar plant names in Turkish. I wanted to attract the geographical distance between English as the medium of the book and the plants in Nigeria that are totally different from the plants in Britain or in Turkey. These two strategies which may be called selective reproduction are an exoticising strategy when these selectively reproduced foreign language words are understandable in their context by the target reader (Klinger, 2018, p.150).

Distancing through literalness or word for word translation (Klinger, 2018, p. 151) is another strategy that serves the recreation of the foreignness of the text to mirror its peculiar hybrid quality. Especially in long descriptions of Azaro's interpretations of his surroundings and the people inhabit it and in metaphorical and imagery loaded expressions reflecting the hybrid quality of a postcolonial text, syntactic and lexical literalness served better. Such as:

On many of those nights, in my childhood hour, Mum told me stories of aquamarine beginnings. Under the white eye of the moon, under the indigo sky, in the golden lights of survival in our little room, I listened to the wisdom of the old songs which Dad rendered in his cracked fighting voice. Mesmerised by the cobalt shadows, the paradoxical ultramarine air, and the silver glances of the dead, I listened to the hard images of joy. I listened also to the songs of work and harvest and the secrets of heroes.

Outside, the wind of recurrence blew gently over the earth. (Okri, 1993, p.183)

Bu gecelerin çoğunda, çocukluğumun saatinde, annem bana mavimsi yeşil başlangıç öyküleri anlatırdı. Ayın beyaz gözü, indigo gökyüzü altında, küçük odamızda var olmanın altın ışıntıları içinde, babamın çatırdayan dövüşken sesiyle söylediği eski şarkıların bilgeliğini dinledim. Kobalt gölgeler, birbirine aykırı ultramavi hava ve ölülerin gümüş bakışlarıyla büyülenmiş olarak sevincin güç imgelerine kulak verirdim. Çalışmanın, hasatın ve yiğitliğin gizemleri üzerine yapılmış ezgileri de dinledim.

Dışarda tekerrür rüzgarı usulca esiyordu yeryüzünün üstüne (Okri, 2000, p. 216)

I translated the above passage grammarwise and syntactically as literally as possible because I felt that it was one of the best expressions of the sense of disconnection from the actual place and a longing for the home as represented in a maze of imagery and metaphors. I believe the translation managed to recreate the meanings in the original.

Ennoblement (Klinger, 2018, p.151) was the next strategy I chose to employ when I felt the need to draw the attention of the reader to a particular foreign issue that stands for the meanings of the source text. For instance for the word 'wisdom' I used a heavier term 'bilge', or for the expression 'the wind of recurrence' I used an archaic word 'tekerrür' to highlight its figurative significance.

Although *The Famished Road* deals with themes of our modern times, its creative portrayal of African folkloric discourse and spiritual and magical Africanness that moves along instances of magical realism and fantasy without losing its touch with political and postcolonial reflections make the translation process a very challenging one. Another important element that poses a challenge is that there is difference between the expectations of the target reading audience and the source audience, or rather the readers who are contextually familiar with postcolonialism and those who are not, that is the target Turkish audience. Target audience is engaged with the translation at all cases, as a novel representing a new and foreign experience in terms of language and themes, whereas for the source reader, the postcolonial experience is shared.

It is hoped that, this paper will shed some light on the strategies employed to deal with the above challenges and may pave the way for further discussions on translating postcolonial novels with all their implications, meanings and artistic qualities to foreign cultures and readers.

References:

- Bandia, P. (2003). Postcolonialism and translation: the dialectic between theory and practice, *Linguistica Antverpiensia, (Special Issue: Translation as Creation: the Postcolonial Influence), II*, 129-142.
- Bandia, P. (2017). Postcolonial translation theory and minor literatures. Professor Paul Bandia in Conversation with the RTG Minor-Cosmopolitanisms. Retrieved from <http://uni-potsdam.de>.
- Klinger, S. (2018). De/Recolonization in translation. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sos. Bil. Ens. Der.* (40), 146-160.
- Mahmutovic, A. (2010). History as the road of existential struggle in Ben Okri's *The famished road* (1993). *JPCS, 1* (3&4), 948-1853. (Electronic). Retrieved from www.jpcs.in

Obumsele, B. (2011). Ben Okri's *The famished road*: a re-evaluation *Tydskr. letterkd*, 8 (1). Pretoria. Retrieved from www.scielo.org.za

Okri, B. (2016). *The Famished Road* was written to give myself reasons to live in. www.theguardian.com/books

Sources:

Okri, B. (1993). *The Famished Road*. Doubleday, New York: Anchor Books.

Okri, B. (2000). *Aç Yol*. (B. Aksoy Trans.). İmge Kitabevi, Ankara. (Original work published 1993)

EXPLORING *SMELL* FROM A COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE IN ENGLISH AND BULGARIAN (A CORPUS STUDY)

Svetlana Nedelcheva¹

Abstract: Perception is universal for human beings but linguists are interested whether it is conceptualized the same way in different languages. The focus of this article is the concept of smell and how it is linguistically coded in English and Bulgarian. Such cross-linguistic meanings have not been systematically investigated when they appear in context. This study is corpus-based to capture, on the one hand, the conceptual organization of smell and, on the other hand, the structure of more abstract concepts. The study applies the cognitive perspective to interpret the conceptual metaphors in the domain of smell. The interplay of senses is used to enhance the “linguistic codability” of perceptions. Smell, which is on the whole understudied, together with touch and taste, offers a wide variety of metaphoric interpretations not only within one language but also across languages. The range of usage that is readily observable in the corpus reveals that this type of data must form the basis for empirically grounded studies of semantics. Moreover, these data suggest that cross-linguistic analogy in polysemous meanings may rely not only on universal cognition, but also on the universal experiences of social interaction.

Key words: smell metaphors, conceptual structure of smell, smell vs. other senses

Introduction

Perception is fundamental to human experience and it provides people with valuable cognitive knowledge which they can express through language. Speakers’ ability to reveal what they see, hear, feel, smell, and taste is one of the most crucial capacities of language. *Sensory Linguistics* is the interdisciplinary field which studies how language relates to the senses. The main idea proposed by sensory analysis is that the use of perceptual metaphors is governed by a cognitively motivated “hierarchy of the senses”, which relies on the fact that some perceptions are easier to encode, while others are “ineffable”. Lexical typologists consider some universal constraints imposed on the organization of perception words across languages, reflecting the psychophysical fact about the ranking of different senses (Evans & Wilkins 2000; Viberg 1983, 2001). Recent studies of other lexical domains, however, give evidence of much more cultural

1. Associate Professor, PhD, Department of English Studies, Shumen University, Bulgaria, e-mail: s.nedelcheva@shu.bg, ORCID: 0000-0003-1614-8758

diversity in the codability of the senses than the universalist approach suggests (Majid & Levinson 2011).

As this article is narrower in scope, we focus on one of the sensory aspects of linguistics – *smell* – and how it is encoded in English and Bulgarian. We use the cognitive approach to analyze the metaphorical uses of both the noun *smell* and the verb *to smell*, and their Bulgarian equivalents *мирис*, *миризма*, *мипууа*, as well as some of their synonyms. Our objective is to demonstrate what characterizes *smell* vocabularies in both languages and to outline what they have in common and how they are different. Even if there is an overlap in using translation equivalents, it is not sure whether the *smell* terms are used and understood in the same way by representatives of both languages. Our analysis is based on data collection of words used in everyday life as well as on sensory lexicons.

Literature review and methodology

The hypothesis that words, grammar, and metaphors in a language lead to our differing perceptions of experiences have long been a topic of discussion for linguists. However, it is problematic to determine the degree of influence language has on the way we think. Other aspects, such as culture, presented by the traditions and habits we grasp from the people around us, also shape the way we communicate, the things we talk about, and in this respect, changes the way we think or even how we remember things. If we refer to the realm of colour, in Bulgarian *sky blue*, *sea blue*, *dark blue* and *Turkish blue* lead speakers to think of these four as different colors but they never *feel blue* as the English do². Some studies say that people do not actually see a color unless there is a word for it.

The traditional five modes of perception: *touch*, *taste*, *smell*, *sight*, and *hearing*, are interrelated and have metaphorical connections. Based on traditional research into synesthetic³ metaphors, scholars in cognitive linguistics (e.g., Kövecses, 2010; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 1999) display a transfer of conceptual metaphors between domains of perception and more abstract domains (see Evans & Wilkins, 2000; Sweetser, 1990). Transfers are systematic and move from the “less

2. It is an interesting fact that the Dani of New Guinea categorize colors as “dark”– which includes blue and green – and “light”– which includes yellow and red. But the speakers of the Dani language can distinguish between yellow and red although they have only one word for them. <https://theconversation.com/the-way-you-see-colour-depends-on-what-language-you-speak-94833>

3. In linguistics, the term synaesthesia refers to a metaphorical transfer from one sensory modality (source) to another (target), namely the perception related to one sense is described by lexical means related to a different sense (e.g., the expression cold colours describes the domain of vision in terms of touch, or temperature) (Strik Lievers, 2015)

differentiated” (*smell, taste*) to the more differentiated senses (*hearing, vision*). Sensory modalities have been ranked also in studies concerning the semantics of single lexemes. Viberg (1983, p. 136) proposes some broad similarities with the hierarchy of sense modalities based on the extension of meaning from one sense modality to another: *sight* > *hearing* > *touch* > *smell/ taste*.

Table 1. *The basic paradigm of the verbs of perception (adapted from Viberg, 1984, p. 125)*

Sense modalities ↓	Activity	Experience	Copulative
Vision	P. <i>looked</i> at the birds.	P. <i>saw</i> the birds.	P. <i>looked</i> happy
Hearing	P. <i>listened</i> to the birds.	P. <i>heard</i> the birds.	P. <i>sounded</i> happy.
Feeling	P. <i>felt</i> the cloth /to see how soft it was/.	P. <i>felt</i> a stone under his foot.	The cloth <i>felt</i> soft.
Taste	P. <i>tasted</i> the food / to see if he could eat it/.	P. <i>tasted</i> garlic in the food.	The food <i>tasted</i> good / bad / of garlic.
Smell	P. <i>smelled</i> the cigar /to see if he could smoke it/.	P. <i>smelled</i> cigars in the room.	P. <i>smelled</i> good / bad / of cigars.

Viberg labels the three “dynamic systems” (see Table 1) – “activity”, “experience” and “copulative”, and uses them to cross-cut the five sense modalities. He defines activities as unbounded processes that are initiated consciously by a human agent, while experiences are defined as involuntary states. In Viberg’s study, activities and experiences are both considered to be “experiencer-based”, i.e. the experiencer is realized as the grammatical subject. Copulative expressions are defined as “source-based” states, with the source realized as the subject. Therefore, Viberg’s classification is a combination of semantic and grammatical criteria. In the present analysis *smell* is considered as a perceptive event which is an activity or experience. Copulatives are not discussed separately but they are interpreted as expressions of perceptive states or achievements in which the experiencer is not overtly expressed.

Studying synaesthesia in language allows defining patterns of association of sensory modalities that are even more revealing if approached from a linguistic or cognitive point of view. Hence, this study is corpus-based, although metaphors are not automatically recognized in context (Stefanowitsch & Gries, 2006). Focusing on *smell* as a specific case of synesthesia, we look at both source and target domain lexical items which belong to the field of perception.

The picture is quite different depending on whether we look at each perception category as the source or target of a metaphor. All categories except *smell* enter into a larger number of metaphorical relationships as the source (Speed et al., 2019, p. 72). *Sight* and *touch* as source categories rank highly, while *hearing*,

noise and especially *smell* rank low. The importance of *sight* and *touch* is in accordance with the Aristotelian hierarchy of senses, in which *sight* is defined as the most highly developed and *touch* as the primary sense (for empirical evidence see Szwedek, 2000). Although the number of instances of the *smell* category is low, it proves a broader metaphorical scope than has been recognized earlier (Ibarretxe-Antunano, 1999). When we consider perception categories as the target of a metaphor, *smell* again ranks low as it is regarded as one of the proximal senses together with *touch* and *taste*. Those representing the distal senses, namely *hearing*, *noise* and *sight*, rank highly (Speed & Majid, 2017).

Based on the assumptions of corpus linguistics and contrastive studies, the proposed method can be presented in three stages: 1) Compiling a list in English and Bulgarian (as exhaustive as possible) of smell-related lexemes, with the help of existing lexical resources, 2) Using the lexemes in the list to collect a corpus, 3) Studying the corpus data from cognitive perspective, in order to extract contexts including metaphorical mappings and comparing them cross-culturally. In this study, the collected data are from English and Bulgarian, but the methodology can be applied in future work to other languages. If some uniformity in the *smell* synaesthetic patterns is found, this could open a fascinating window into human perception and language.

Data analysis

The choice of the concept of *smell* as an object of analysis is due to the fact that *smell* is considered as a quite “ineffable percept and concept” (Kövecses, 2018, p. 4), i.e. it is hard to describe it (at least in relation to some other percepts, like *sight* in the case of *colours*). Levinson and Majid (2014, p. 407) see ineffability as “the degree to which percepts or concepts resist linguistic coding”. Following Levinson and Majid (2014) and Kövecses (2018), in order to “measure” the linguistic codedness of *smell*, (a) we need to describe its linguistic expression in one language (say, in English), (b) then in another language (say, in Bulgarian), and (c) compare their “codedness”. We approach these tasks with the help of the methodology of cognitive semantics, starting with the lexical approach. We check various lexical items related to the perceptual category of *smell*. The best sources for these are all kinds of dictionaries and any collections associated with the concept.

In order to consider the meaning of *smell* both as a noun and as a verb, we use WordNet developed by Princeton University⁴ as a large lexical database of English. The lexical items are organized in sets of cognitive synonyms, called ‘synsets’, each expressing a distinct concept. These synsets are grouped

4. WordNet <https://wordnet.princeton.edu/>

due to conceptual-semantic and lexical relations. Correspondingly, BulNet⁵ is used to study the Bulgarian noun *мирис* ‘smell’ and the Bulgarian verb *мириса* ‘smell’. As a rich lexico-semantic database, BulNet is developed by the Department of Computational Linguistics at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences within the project BalkaNet⁶ – a multilingual semantic network of the Balkan languages, which aims at building synchronized semantic databases for the following Balkan languages – Bulgarian, Greek, Romanian, Serbian, Turkish, and expanding the Czech lexical-semantic network. Each synonymous set – ‘synset’, encodes a relation of equivalence between several units (at least one must be present explicitly in the set), which have a unique lexical meaning, belong to the same part of speech, and express the same meaning.

5. Bulgarian WordNet (BulNet) <https://dcl.bas.bg/bulnet/> contains more than 80,000 synonymous sets divided into nine parts of speech – nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, particles and interjections. The words included in the Bulgarian WordNet are selected according to different criteria. The frequency analysis of the occurrences of the words in large corpora of texts was dominant (not word forms, which would lead to an error in the analysis, but to basic forms), as well as the inclusion of those synonymous sets already appearing in databases in other languages, and synonymous sets corresponding to meanings that occur with high frequency in parallel corpora.

6. BalkaNet <http://www.dblab.upatras.gr/balkanet/> tries to explore the less studied Balkan languages and combine and compare them cross-linguistically. The project aims at developing a multilingual lexical database which contains the individual WordNets for the Balkan languages. “The most ambitious feature of the BalkaNet is its attempt to represent semantic relations between words in each Balkan language and link them together in order to develop an on line multilingual semantic network. The main objective is the development of each’s languages WordNet from available resources covering the general vocabulary of each language. Semantic relations will be classified in the independent WordNets according to a shared ontology. Then, all individual WordNets will be organized into a common database providing linking across them”.

Table 2. *WordNet senses of smell (n)/
BulNet senses of мирис 'smell' (n)*

WordNet: SMELL (noun)	BulNet: МИРИС 'smell' (noun)
S: (n) smell, odor, odour, olfactory sensation, olfactory perception (the sensation that results when olfactory receptors in the nose are stimulated by particular chemicals in gaseous form) "she loved the smell of roses"	bg - n: миризма; мирис; дъх en - any property detected by the olfactory system; olfactory property; smell; aroma; odor; odour; scent
S: (n) olfactory property, smell, aroma, odor, odour, scent (any property detected by the olfactory system)	bg - n: мирис; обонятелно възприятие; миризма en - the sensation that results when olfactory receptors in the nose are stimulated by particular chemicals in gaseous form; smell; odor; odour; olfactory sensation; olfactory perception; "she loved the smell of roses"
S: (n) spirit, tone, feel, feeling, flavor, flavour, look, smell (the general atmosphere of a place or situation and the effect that it has on people) "the feel of the city excited him"; "a clergyman improved the tone of the meeting"; "it had the smell of treason"	bg - n: вонливост; смрадливост; зловонност en - the attribute of having a strong offensive smell; malodorousness; stinkiness; foulness; rankness; fetidness
S: (n) smell, sense of smell, olfaction, olfactory modality (the faculty that enables us to distinguish scents)	bg - n: аромат; благоухание; ухание en - a distinctive odor that is pleasant; aroma; fragrance; perfume; scent
S: (n) smell, smelling (the act of perceiving the odor of something)	bg - n: мирис; дъх; миризма en - an odor left in passing by which a person or animal can be traced; scent

The contrasting arrangement of the senses in English and Bulgarian (see Table 2) is conditioned by the frequency of their occurrences of the large corpora used by WordNet and BulNet. With WordNet the definitions of the noun senses reveal that *smell* in English is conceptualized as a sensation, a property, a faculty, and an act. These are literal senses of the word, and they together build a frame in the sense of Fillmore (1982). The third sense, "general atmosphere", is metaphorical and is not part of this frame. The list of the Bulgarian senses of the analyzed noun all belong to the same frame as they express non-metaphorical senses. The figurative meaning of the Bulgarian noun is not designated on the list but it is semantically related to the last sense, which has as an equivalent the English noun *scent*. The large number of relations included in the Bulgarian WordNet illustrates the linguistic richness at the semantic and word-forming levels – this also implies the possibilities for numerous practical applications of the multilingual database. The Bulgarian Electronic Semantic Database offers

solutions at the semantic level – ability to choose synonyms, ability to refer to the semantic relations of a word in relation to the system of other words in the language (antonyms, hyponyms, derivatives, part-whole relationships, etc.), opportunity to consult the thesaurus and parallel translations.

Table 3. WordNet senses of *smell* (v)/
BulNet senses of *мириша* ‘smell’ (v)

WordNet: SMELL (verb)	BulNet: МИРИША ‘smell’ (verb)
S: (v) smell (inhale the odor of; perceive by the olfactory sense)	bg - v: мириша en - inhale the odor of; perceive by the olfactory sense; smell
S: (v) smell (emit an odor) “The soup smells good”	bg - v: мириша en - emit an odor; smell “The soup smells good”
S: (v) smell (smell bad) “He rarely washes, and he smells”	bg - v: мириша лошо en - smell bad; smell “He rarely washes, and he smells”
S: (v) smack, reek, smell (have an element suggestive (of something)) “his speeches smacked of racism”; “this passage smells of plagiarism”	bg - v: изпълвам с миризма; изпълня с миризма; омирисвам ⁹ ; омириша; вмирисвам; вмириша
S: (v) smell, smell out, sense (become aware of not through the senses but instinctively) “I sense his hostility”; “I smell trouble”; “smell out corruption”	en - cause to smell or be smelly; odo(u)rize; scent

WordNet presents five senses of the verb *smell* (see Table 3) and glosses them as “inhale the odor of”, “emit an odor”, “smell bad”, “have an element suggestive (of something)”, and “become aware of not through the senses but instinctively”. The senses of the equivalent Bulgarian verb enlisted by BulNet are four. The first three glosses suggested by WordNet and BulNet match (see Table 3). These three senses, like the senses of the noun, are also elements of a frame connected to *smell*, as well as the fourth sense of the Bulgarian verb glossed as “cause to smell or be smelly”. Outside the frame but tangent to it remain the last two WordNet senses which are metaphorical.

Considering the definitions in Table 3, we can distinguish two types of construals associated with *smell*: an active and a passive one (Ibarretxe-Antunano, 1999; Kövecses, 2018). Lexically, the two types are based on the verbs *smell* (inhale an odour) and *emit* (smell). The active type involves an agent who is able to perceive a smell and an object that has the property to emit that smell. With the passive model we have an organism with the faculty of smell which is the origin of that smell. In this situation the organism functions rather in the role of patient or experiencer. The *smell* caused involuntarily by the organism occurs to it as an experience.

We regard these two types of the *smell* frame, active and passive, as belonging to one prototype as is usually the case with one category (see, e.g., Rosch, 1978). Kövecses (2018) makes a distinction between passive and active smell and argues that the passive version is more prototypical, while the active one should be viewed as derivative.

Table 4. *The basic paradigm of мирис, миризма, мириша 'smell', following Viberg (1984, p. 125)*

	Activity	Experience	Copulative
(n) <i>мирис</i> , <i>миризма</i> 'smell' (v) <i>мириша</i> 'smell'	(1) <i>Подуши</i> сладкия мирис на победата.	(2) <i>Усети</i> остра миризма	(3) <i>Обувките</i> бяха с <i>мирис</i> на пот и гума.

Table 4 shows that Viberg's (1984) basic paradigm of *smell* correlates to the paradigm of the Bulgarian verb *мириша* and the cognate nouns *мирис*, *миризма*. The Bulgarian corpus presents examples of the three "dynamic systems": the two "experiencer-based" Activity (see Table 4_ Ex. 1) and Experience (see Table 4_ Ex. 2) and the "source-based" Copulative (see Table 4_ Ex. 3).

The corpora show a relationship between *smell* and some other sense modalities like *feel* and *taste*, on the one hand, and *emotion*, on the other (see Section 4). In some metaphors *smell* is conceptualized as the source domain, in others as the target domain.

Smell as a source domain

Based on the previous data and the metaphorical expressions found in the corpus, we can identify the following four different conceptual metaphors:

- 1.SUSPICION IS SMELLING**
- 2.BAD IS SMELLY**
- 3.BECOMING INSTINCTIVELY AWARE OF/GUESSING SOMETHING IS SMELLING SOMETHING**
- 4.THE GENERAL ATMOSPHERE OF SOMETHING IS AN OLFACTORY PERCEPTION**

The first three are conceptual metaphors discussed in extant literature (see, e.g., Ibarretxe-Antunano, 1999; Neagu, 2013; Sweetser, 1990). The last one is introduced by Kövecses (2018) to refer not only to *smell* but also to *sound*, *touch*,

7. According to the Dictionary of Bulgarian Language, the correct spelling is *умириша/умиришвам* <https://rechnik.chitanka.info/w/%D1%83%D0%BC%D0%B8%D1%80%D0%B8%D1%81%D0%B2%D0%B0%D0%BC>, however BulNC contains two examples of *омирисва*.

taste, vision and spiritual perception. He points out that “spiritual perception” is a term coined in analogy to “spiritual vision” (Sweetser, 1990). Although spirituality is not a basic sense perception, it can be treated metaphorically as such, since it matches the model of perception-related metaphors. Conceptualizing abstract notions like the general atmosphere of a situation or event is challenging and we make use of sense perceptions as appropriate vehicles.

The general metaphor EMOTION IS PERCEPTION/ЕМОЦИЯТА Е УСЕЩАНЕ includes all major emotion metaphors, namely EMOTION IS TOUCH/ЕМОЦИЯТА Е ДОКОСВАНЕ, EMOTION IS TASTE/ЕМОЦИЯТА Е ВКУС, EMOTION IS SMELL/ЕМОЦИЯТА Е МИРИС. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) identify the EMOTION IS TOUCH conceptual metaphor as EMOTIONAL EFFECT IS PHYSICAL CONTACT/ЕМОЦИОНАЛНИЯТ ЕФЕКТ Е ФИЗИЧЕСКИ КОНТАКТ and Kövecses (1990) indicates it as EMOTION IS FEELING/ЕМОЦИЯТА Е ЧУВСТВО. This conceptualization can be exemplified by lexical units such as *feeling/ чувство*, e.g.,

COCA corpus	BulNC	Gloss
(4) A terrible feeling <i>hit</i> her.	(5) <i>Жегна</i> я чувството за вина.	‘A feeling of guilt <i>stung</i> her.’

Both *hit* (4) and *sting* (5) express the construal of *feeling* as a kind of physical touch. The lexemes *touch/ докосвам/ докосване* convey the metaphor EMOTION IS TOUCH/ ЕМОЦИЯТА Е ДОКОСВАНЕ.

COCA corpus	BulNC	Gloss
(6) Ms. Prewitt, your article really <i>touched</i> me.	(7) Значи най-накрая успях да <i>докосна</i> сърцето ти.	‘So finally I was able to <i>touch</i> your heart.’

Apart from the *touch* metaphor, in Bulgarian a metonymic relation is also involved as it is specified in (7) that the emotion touches the heart of the recipient⁸, giving rise to the metaphor EMOTION IS TO TOUCH SOMEONE’S HEART based on the definition that the *heart* is “the place within a person where feelings or emotions are considered to come from”⁹.

Unlike the other perceptions, *smell* is not a very common way of conceptualizing emotions although this is what we find in the examples (8-11):

8. A couple of instances were found in the Bulgarian corpus in which the heart is not mentioned but all of them are translation variants of originally English texts, therefore we hypothesize that these examples are a result of negative translation transfer, e.g., Един от тях ме докосна с мръсното си съзнание. ‘One of them touched me with his dirty thoughts.’; Закачката ме докосна по чувствително място. ‘The joke touched me in a sensitive place.’ The English corpus also exhibits a few examples referring to the heart of the recipient, e.g., It will touch your heart as much as it has touched mine, but they are not so frequent as those referring to the recipients themselves.

9. Cambridge dictionary <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/heart>

COCA corpus	BulNC	Gloss
(8) ...a modest <i>smell</i> of success was in the air.	(10) <i>Мирис</i> на страх нямаше, само на възбуда.	'There was no smell of fear, only excitement.'
(9) Does everyone, like me, love the <i>smell</i> of victory in the morning!	(11) ...още можеше да усети характерния <i>мирис</i> на... магия.	'He could still catch the characteristic smell of... magic.'

Showing very low levels of frequency, these examples (8-11) should be considered more as an exception to the rule than as representative instances. The correlation between *smell* and *emotion* can be found in translation equivalents, as in the movie title *Scent of a woman*¹⁰ and its Bulgarian counterpart *Усецане за жена*. The source language employs the conceptual metaphor EMOTION IS SMELL, while the target language applies the conceptual metaphor EMOTION IS TOUCH to express the same meaning. This example provides evidence for the pervasive use of perception metaphors not only in a single language but also cross-linguistically and cross-culturally.

Further, *emotion* is also conceptualized as *taste* in the example *the rancid smell of politics...* Although the word *rancid* apparently modifies *smell*, it actually qualifies an EMOTION 'feeling' (the target domain of *smell* in the example, part of the implicit meaning of the phrase). Since the property of *rancidness* is a characteristic of *taste*, the ensuing conceptual metaphor we can suggest is EMOTION IS TASTE (see 12-15).

COCA corpus	BulNC	Gloss
(12) I can get the bad <i>taste</i> of this loss out of my mouth.	(14) Той спря, усетил горчивия <i>вкус</i> на поражението.	'He stopped, feeling the bitter taste of the defeat.'
(13) A faint <i>taste</i> of his performance style might be had at http...	(15) Имаше <i>вкус</i> на триумф.	'It tasted like triumph.'

Kövecses (2000, 2010) suggests that there is a difference between *taste* and *smell* as sources of conceptual metaphors. He believes that *taste*, especially when modified (*pleasant, bitter, bad*) is wider in scope than *smell*. *Bad* does not only qualify feelings (cf. *that bad feeling of guilt is still there*) but also particular emotions (*there's good anger and bad anger*). A broader metaphor than EMOTION IS TASTE, would be UNPLEASANT IS BITTER/ BAD TASTING and it can apply to unpleasant experiences in general, e.g., *bad luck, bitter shame, лош късмет, горчива загуба, лош спомен*, etc. The literal senses of *bitter* and *bad* are generalized to refer to something largely 'unpleasant' and not limited to *smell* and *taste*.

10. *Scent of a Woman* (1992) is an American drama movie directed by Martin Brest.

Sweetser (1990, p. 37) also acknowledges the use of *bad smell* in English “to indicate bad character or dislikeable mental characteristics”. The COCA corpus exhibits examples of the verb *stink* (18) and the derivative *stinker* (17) to denote unpleasant qualities. The neutral verbs *sniff* (16) and *smell* (19) are collocated with negative adverbs such as *contemptuously* and *fishy*, respectively, to express hateful traits. In particular, *to smell fishy* has developed an idiomatic meaning to refer to situations arousing feelings of doubt or suspicion. Obnoxious features such as contempt, hatred and hostility are correlating with bad smells in Bulgarian as well, as is the case with examples 20-23. The verbs *вони* ‘reek’ and *смърди* ‘stink’ suggest a greater degree of bad smell than *намурихва* ‘smell (lightly)’.

The SUSPICION IS SMELLING metaphor is illustrated in the English idiom *I smell a rat*, used ‘to recognize that something is not as it appears to be or that something dishonest is happening’¹¹. Analogically, the Bulgarian expression *Надушвам нещо гнило* is applied in similar situations of doubt, uncertainty and distrust.

COCA corpus	BulNC	Gloss
(16) “What a burden!” and you <i>sniff</i> at it <i>contemptuously</i> ,” says the LORD Almighty.	(20) Чувствувахте, че хрумването му <i>намурихва</i> на глупост, по-лоша от риска.	‘He sensed that his idea smelled of stupidity worse than the risk’.
(17) Be a thinker not a <i>stinker</i> .	(21) Това <i>намурихва</i> на недоверие, на пълна липса на увереност — да, вони по-лошо дори от мен.	‘It smelled like distrust, a complete lack of confidence — yes, it stank worse than me’.
(18) That idea <i>stinks</i> .	(22) Но въздухът <i>вони</i> на магия.	‘But the air stinks of magic’.
(19) I <i>smell</i> something <i>fishy</i> about this deal.	(23) <i>Смърдеше</i> на отчаяние и безнадеждност, на изгубено бъдеще.	‘It smelled of despair and hopelessness, of a lost future.’

Being a basic sense, *smell* is a productive source domain as humans use it to gather information about reality. The concept of suspicion, mentioned earlier, is conventionally conceived of as *smell*, hence the conceptual metaphor SUSPICION IS SMELLING, e.g., (24) Освен това тук ми *намурихва* на мошенничество! ‘What is more, it *smells* like fraud here!’). More generally, bad qualities and immoral behavior are conceptualized as (bad) smell (e.g., (25) Около Ирулан направо *вони* на тайни намерения ‘Irulan *reeks* of secret decisions’. (26) Той през цялото време *смърди* на страх. ‘He *stinks* of fear all the time.’), from which the metaphor BAD IS SMELLY originates. Apart from *воня* ‘stink, reek’ and *смърдя* ‘stink’ which denote ‘perceiving bad smell’, in Bulgarian the prefix *на-*

11. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/smell-a-rat>

when attached to the verb *мириша* ‘smell’ brings an additional characteristic and modifies the meaning of the verb from being neutral as regards the kind of smell to ‘perceiving bad smell’. What we consider as ‘bad smell’ can refer to either literal meaning, e.g., (28) Малкото, с което разполагаха, вече бе започнало да *намирисва* на застояло ‘The little they had had already started to *smell* stale’ or abstract meaning, e.g., (27) Твоето предложение *намирисва* на лудост! ‘Your proposal *smells* like madness!’¹². The difference between *смърдя*, *воня* ‘stink, reek’ and *мириша*, *намирисвам* ‘smell’ resides in the opposition passive/ active smell.

Table 5. *The active/ passive model of smell and its synonyms*

	Active	Gloss	Passive	Gloss
<i>воня</i> ‘reek’	-	-	(25) Около Ирулан направо <i>вони</i> на тайни намерения	‘Irulan <i>reeks</i> of secret decisions.’
<i>смърдя</i> ‘stink’	-	-	(26) Той през цялото време <i>смърди</i> на страх.	‘He <i>stinks</i> of fear all the time.’
<i>мириша</i> ‘smell’	(29) Трябва да пия и <i>мириша</i> мента!	‘I should drink and <i>smell</i> mint!’	(27) Твоето предложение <i>намирисва</i> на лудост!	‘Your proposal <i>smells</i> like madness!’
<i>намирисвам</i> ‘smell (lightly)’	(30) <i>Намирисвам</i> пушек.	‘I can <i>smell</i> smoke’	(28) Малкото, с което разполагаха, вече бе започнало да <i>намирисва</i> на застояло.	‘The little they had already started to <i>smell</i> stale.’
<i>помирисвам</i> ‘smell, inhale odor’	(31) Сетне взема пакета и го <i>помирисва</i> .	‘Then he picks up the package and <i>smells</i> it’.	-	-
<i>замирисвам</i> ‘start smelling’	(32) И изведнъж <i>замириса</i> боязливо.	‘And he suddenly <i>smelled</i> timidly.’	(33) <i>Замирисва</i> на плесен.	‘It <i>smells</i> like mold.’

12. However, another meaning associated with *намирисвам* ‘smell’ is related to the conceptual domain of INTENSITY (see below) as it refers to “small quantity”. Na- in *намирисвам* adds the nuance of meaning ‘smell slightly/ a little bit’ (Nedelcheva 2019, pp. 565-579) as in Освен това определено бе започнало да *намирисва* на развалено ‘Besides, it had definitely started to smell bad’.

	Active	Gloss	Passive	Gloss
<i>размирисвам се</i> 'begin to spread smell'	-	-	(34) Работата наистина започваше да се <i>размирисва</i> .	'The business was really starting to get rough.'
<i>вмирисвам се</i> 'begin to smell bad'	-	-	(35) Шунката се <i>вмириса</i> .	'The ham smelled bad.'

Almost all of the abovementioned verbs (except *помирисвам* 'smell, inhale odor') conform to the passive model in which the subject is an experiencer, e.g., (25-28), (33-35). The active model applies to *мириша*, *намирисвам* 'smell' and *помирисвам* 'smell, inhale odor', *замириса* 'start smelling' in which the subject is an actor/ instigator who purposefully sniffs at something but also an experiencer who is able to perceive the smell, e.g., (29-32). Each of the prefixed Bulgarian verbs adds a nuance to the meaning of the base form: *намирисвам* 'smell (lightly)', *помирисвам* 'smell, inhale odor', *замирисвам* 'start smelling', *размирисвам се* 'begin to spread smell', *вмирисвам се* 'begin to smell bad'. There is one more verb with a prefix given as an equivalent to 'smell' *омирисвам*, which we consider colloquial as there are only two hits in BuINC, e.g.,

(36) ...захвана да *омирисва* около дънера му и си дигна главата нагоре. 'it started to *sniff* around the log and lifted its head up.'

(37) Не му позволявай друг път да идва и да ми *омирисва* офиса. 'Don't let him come again and make my office *smell* bad.'

Although the examples are only two, they reveal different meanings of the verb. In (36) it can be glossed as 'sniff' and is a synonym of the active frame of *мириша*, *помирисвам*. *Омирисвам* in (37) is a synonym of *вмирисвам* 'begin to smell bad', when it is not used as a reflexive verb. In this case we have a subject who is the source of the smell and makes it spread, so it is interpreted in the active frame.

The more abstract concept of general atmosphere when interpreted in terms of *smell* leads to the conceptual metaphor THE GENERAL ATMOSPHERE IS SMELL, e.g., (38) Случайността *намирисва* на идеализъм и метафизика – лепват ти шест месеца и край. 'Accidents *smell* of idealism and metaphysics – you are sentenced to six months and that's it'. (39) Били сме подведени, а това *намирисва* на измяна. 'We have been misled, and this *smells* of betrayal'. All of the examples employ the sensory domain of *smell* as a source domain of the discussed conceptual metaphors, which is correlated to a more abstract and complex domain.

Other conceptual metaphors related to SUSPICION IS SMELLING are GUESSING IS SMELLING and INVESTIGATION IS SMELLING, as in (40) *Не подушвам крадец!* 'I

smell no thief!’ Speed et al. (2019, p. 78) indicate metaphorical lexis relating to the detection of guessing, suspecting and investigating in English, e.g., knowledge and experience (*smell of*), perception and cognition (*savour, scent*) and enquiry and discovery (*nose, sniff*). Corresponding metaphorical lexis in Bulgarian relates smell to mental detection, e.g., (41-43):

(41) Изведнџ *замириса* на тревога, а Лини – на чисто възмушение.
‘He *smelled of alarm*, suddenly, and Lini of pure indignation.’

(42) Намираше у него всичко, за което беше мечтала – трџпка, романтика, *дџх на приключение*. ‘He was everything she dreamed of – thrill, romance, *a scent of adventure*.’

(43) Въздухџт бе натежал от конска миризма, но той *помириса* още нечие раздражение. ‘Horse-scent was heavy in the air, but he *smelled* someone else who was irritated...’

A large number of more minor metaphors also exploit *smell*, and some of these have not been commonly identified in other works on *smell*. As an illustration, we can observe the connection with moderateness and smallness of quantity (*smack, мипус/ smell, whiff, дџх/ scent*). Large size or large effect corresponds to unpleasant rather than neutral smells, as in sufficiency and abundance (stinkingly), e.g.,

(44) Where did he get the idea that the *stinkingly* wealthy are “job creators”?

(45) But all the fight had gone out of him, leaving him as *stinkingly* droopy as a bartender’s rag.

(46) No one wants to watch gifted, *stinkingly* rich golfers play...

The Bulgarian corpus, however, does not exhibit the ABUNDANCE metaphor, rather *смџрдящ, смрадлив, вонящ, вонлив* ‘stinky’ when collocated with nouns appear in their literal meanings referring to disagreeable smells¹³.

Presenting a sensory domain relevant to bodily experience, we would not expect *smell* to function as a target domain. Kövecses (2018, p. 17) suggests that it can be conceptualized metaphorically as a target because “like any other concept is characterized by a number of conceptual dimensions”.

13. A couple of counter examples were found in the Bulgarian corpus: *Ти ще ми върнеш всяко смрадливо пени, което си чопнал*. ‘You will give me back every *stinky* penny you have grabbed.’ Нали не допускаш, че Бинго ще има безочиеето да се опита отново да ме забџрка в някое *смрадливо* начинание? ‘You don’t think Bingo will have the impudence to try to get me into some stinky endeavor again, do you?’ As these examples are taken from translated texts, the infrequent collocation of *смрадлив* ‘stinky’ with an abstract notion could be interpreted as a result of a negative transfer (the original text has a negative impact on the respective translation).

Smell as a target domain

In the role of *smell* as the target category of a metaphor it is seen to be conceptualized through lexis from the domain of temperature (e.g., *hot, cold, warm*, etc.), strength (e.g., *strong*) and shape (e.g., *acute, pungent*) (Speed et al., 2019, p. 79). Smell is something that has various degrees of intensity and can be sensed physically by a perceiver, or experiencer, who has no control over whether or not s/he perceives it. In other words, three dimensions can be identified for the concept of smell: EXISTENCE, INTENSITY¹⁴, and LACK OF CONTROL (Kövecses, 2018, p. 18). EXISTENCE, INTENSITY, and (LACK OF) CONTROL, the concepts that we apply in this study, are part of the structure of a number of domains, *smell* being one of them. Levinson and Majid (2014) consider such dimensions in relation to various sense modalities (e.g., *vision, hearing, feeling*, etc.). Other dimensions of concepts are discussed by Lakoff (1993) in regard to EVENT STRUCTURE metaphor. The concept of PLEASANTNESS (or positive evaluation) and that of BADNESS, which was discussed above, are dimensional concepts ranging over many domains (e.g., *hearing, feeling, taste*), not just *smell*.

EXISTENCE

The BulNC corpus reveals a number of collocations:

Verb+*мириц* ‘smell, scent’ and *мириц* ‘smell, scent’+verb:

(47) *има, изпълва, пропива, тегне, натезжава* ‘be filled with, have, hang’, e.g., The air was *filled* with the *smells* of cooked food. The cellar *had* a musty *smell*.

има, изпълва, пропива, тегне, натезжава	gloss
a. И катакомбите <i>се изпълниха с мирис</i> на ванилия.	And the catacombs <i>filled with the smell</i> of vanilla.
b. А тук, в тази претоплена стая <i>тегне мирис</i> на пот, на лекарства и на човешка болка...	And here, this warm room <i>smells of</i> sweat, medicine, and human pain...
c. Мисля че <i>трябва да има мирис</i> на кедрово дърво за повече свежест.	I think there <i>must be a smell</i> of cedar wood for more freshness.
d. Въздухът <i>натезжа от барутен мирис</i> .	The air <i>was heavy with</i> a gunpowder <i>smell</i> .
e. Въздухът бе <i>пропит от</i> тежък, сладникав <i>мириц</i> .	The air <i>was soaked with</i> a heavy, sweet <i>smell</i> .
f. Клоните му я скриха от спускащия се мрак, <i>обгърна я мирис</i> на бор и смола.	Its branches hid it from the descending darkness, enveloping it with the smell of pine and pitch.

14. For instance, intensity may be realized as intensity of motion, intensity of pain, intensity of emotion, intensity of light, intensity of exercise, and, of course, intensity of smell. The superordinate concept is intensity.

(48) *издава, идва, лъха, излъчва, носи се, долита* ‘give off, come, emanate, drift, float, waft’, e.g., She *gives off* a smell of rancid cooking oil. I opened the paper, and the *scent* of ginger *wafted out*.

издава, идва, лъха, излъчва, носи се, долита	gloss
a. Подправките <i>издават</i> сладък и остър <i>мирис</i> .	Spices <i>give off</i> a sweet and pungent <i>odor</i> .
b. От него <i>лъхаше</i> <i>мирис</i> на дим.	It <i>smelled</i> of smoke.
c. Подир него <i>се носеше</i> <i>мирис</i> на сяра.	A <i>smell</i> of sulfur <i>floated</i> after him.
d. Вътре <i>долиташе</i> дори лек бриз и опияняващ <i>мирис</i> на цветя.	Even a slight breeze and the intoxicating <i>scent</i> of flowers <i>drifted</i> inside.
e. С нея <i>дойде</i> и непоносимият <i>мирис</i> на плодово масло.	With her <i>came</i> the unbearable <i>smell</i> of fruit oil.
f. От дъбовите мебели <i>се излъчваше</i> <i>мирис</i> на во-ськ.	The <i>smell</i> of wax <i>emanated</i> from the oak furniture.

(49) *усещам, долавям, улавям, надушвам* ‘catch, detect’, e.g., He thought he *detected* the *smell* of sherry.

усещам, долавям, улавям, надушвам	gloss
a. <i>Усетих</i> пот и по-слаб <i>мирис</i> на кръв.	I could <i>smell</i> sweat and a faint <i>scent</i> of blood.
b. Още по-успокоителен беше фактът, че в дъха на непознатия не се <i>долавяше</i> и най-слабият <i>мирис</i> на алкохол.	Even more soothing was the fact that even the faintest <i>odor</i> of alcohol was not <i>detected</i> in the breath of the stranger.
c. По тях още се <i>улавяше</i> неговият <i>мирис</i> .	The <i>smell</i> was still on them.
d. Недалеч оттам видя дим и <i>надуши</i> <i>мирис</i> на печено.	Not far away, he saw smoke and <i>caught the smell</i> of roast.

The examples show how the existence of *smell* is conceptualized. If the verb *пълня, изтълвам* ‘fill’ is used, the smell is viewed as a physical substance in a container. In the case of *имам* ‘have’, the existence of smell corresponds to the possession of an object. In the case of *издавам* ‘give off’, producing smell is the transfer of an object. Finally, *усещам, долавям* ‘catch, detect’ can only be used for denoting the existence of smell.

The examples and their construals of the existence of *smell* reveal the following conceptual metaphors:

filled with: SMELL IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER

have: SMELL IS AN OBJECT OF POSSESSION

give off: SMELL IS AN OBJECT THAT CAN BE TRANSFERRED

The three cases conceptualize the experience of *smell* as the existence of a state. The state is either a substance or an object. EXISTENCE is viewed as a substance being in a container, as possessing an object, and as transferring an object.

INTENSITY

Another characteristic feature of *smell* is its intensity, but it also refers to all senses. As Levinson and Majid (2014, p. 413) suggest: “Intensity is another candidate cross-modal dimension. Lights, sounds, smells, tactile pressures, tastes, pains, emotions can all have low or high intensities.” In the case of *smell*, intensity involves a scale of values from weak to strong. The collocations with *smell* we find in the corpus can be organized in a number of thematic groups:

Adj+*мириц* ‘smell, scent’:

1. *непреодолим* ‘overpowering’, *проникващ* ‘pervasive’, *упоителен*, *натрапчив* ‘pungent’, *опияняващ* ‘intoxicating’, *наситен* ‘rich’, *остър* ‘sharp’, *силен* ‘strong’, e.g., (50) Те изпълваха въздуха с *тегнец*, *тръпчив* *мириц*. ‘They filled the air with a *pervasive, pungent odor*.’

2. *слаб* ‘slight’, *лек* ‘faint’, *смътен*, *неуловим*, *неясен* ‘vague’, *див* ‘wild’, *особен* ‘distinct’, *своеобразен* ‘distinctive’, *определен* ‘particular’, *несравним* ‘unmistakable’, *чуден* ‘funny’, *специфичен* ‘peculiar’, *странен* ‘strange’, *необикновен* ‘unusual’, e.g., (51) Долових *странен* *мириц*, сякаш се беше полял с одеколон. ‘I could smell a *strange smell*, as if he had put on too much perfume.’

3. *познат* ‘familiar’, *устойчив* ‘lingering’, *ароматен* ‘aromatic’, *очарователен* ‘delectable, delicious’, *благоуханен* ‘fragrant’, *свеж* ‘fresh’, *приятен* ‘lovely’, *хубав* ‘nice’, *апетитен* ‘savoury’, *сладникав* ‘sweet’, *прекрасен* ‘wonderful’, e.g., (52) От салфетките лъхал *сладникав*, *сух* *мириц* на памук. ‘A *sweet, dry scent* of cotton came from the napkins.’ (53) Усетих *свежия* *мириц* на стърготини и боя. ‘There was a *fresh smell* of sawdust and paint.’

4. *задушлив* ‘choking’, *топъл* ‘warm’, *противен* ‘appalling’, *отвратителен* ‘awful’, *лош* ‘bad’, *страшен* ‘horrible’, *зловонен* ‘nasty’, *отблъскващ* ‘offensive’, *ужасен* ‘terrible’, *неприятен* ‘unpleasant’, *гаден* ‘vile’, *дразнещ* ‘acrid’, *гнусен* ‘nauseating’, *вонящ* ‘putrid’, *смрадлив* ‘rank’, *гаден* ‘sickly’, e.g., (54) Кабинетът му издаваше *лош*, *прашен* *мириц* на стари книги. ‘His office gave off a *bad, dusty smell* of old books.’

5. *влажен* ‘damp, dank’, *солен* ‘salty’, *гранясал* ‘rancid’, *възкисел* ‘sour’, *застоял* ‘stale’, e.g., (55) Ако се съдеше по *соления* *мириц*, бяха излезли вече в залива. ‘Judging by the *salty smell*, they were already out in the bay.’

6. *животински* ‘animal’, *металически*, *метален* ‘metallic’, *винен* ‘wine’, *мускусен* ‘musky’, *мазен* ‘oily’, *опушен* ‘smoky’, *пикантен* ‘spicy’, e.g., (56) Усещаше *мириса* на реката – *кисел*, *метален* *мириц* на монети, потопени

в амонияк. ‘He could *smell* the river – the *sour, metallic smell* of coins put in ammonia.’

These adjectives predominantly deal with different kinds of smell (*familiar, distinct, funny*), but some of them denote the intensity aspect of smell (*strong, faint, pervasive*). Kövecses (2018, pp. 21-22) organizes the adjectives on the basis of several different conceptual metaphors – in some cases, on etymological grounds:

1. *слаб* ‘slight’, *лек* ‘faint’, *силен* ‘strong’: INTENSITY OF SMELL IS STRENGTH OF EFFECT
2. *остър* ‘sharp’, *напранчив* ‘pungent’: INTENSITY OF SMELL IS SHARPNESS OF AN OBJECT
3. *неясен* ‘vague’: INTENSITY OF SMELL IS DEGREE OF BRIGHTNESS OF LIGHT
4. *проникващ* ‘pervasive’, *опияняващ* ‘intoxicating’: INTENSITY OF SMELL IS QUANTITY OF A SUBSTANCE

These conceptual metaphors that relate to the intensity aspect of *smell* can be transformed into more generic variants:

1. *слаб* ‘slight’, *лек* ‘faint’, *силен* ‘strong’: INTENSITY IS STRENGTH
2. *остър* ‘sharp’, *напранчив* ‘pungent’: INTENSITY IS SHARPNESS
3. *неясен* ‘vague’: INTENSITY IS BRIGHTNESS
4. *проникващ* ‘pervasive’, *опияняващ* ‘intoxicating’: INTENSITY IS QUANTITY

As the examples of metaphors show, other sense modalities can metaphorically convey the intensity of *smell*, for instance INTENSITY OF SMELL IS SHARPNESS OF AN OBJECT OR INTENSITY OF SMELL IS THE DEGREE OF BRIGHTNESS OF LIGHT. These metaphors might be correlated respectively to such cross-modal conceptual metaphors as SMELL IS TOUCH/ FEELING (e.g., (57) Донигър *усети остър мирис*, напомнящ миризмата на етер. ‘Doniger *felt* a pungent *smell* reminding him of ether.’) and SMELL IS VISION (e.g., (58) Посрещна го лек дъх на дамски парфюм. ‘A *vague scent* of female perfume came up to him.’).

LACK OF CONTROL

Perceiving smells comes to animate creatures as natural as breathing and it is hard to control it (unless you deliberately block your nose). This proves the hypothesis that sense perception is passive (Speed et al., 2019, p. 333), in general. Languages also often render this in metaphorical ways – in the case of smell it is by means of the verbs *удрям*, *блъсвам* ‘hit’, e.g., (59-60):

(59) Вътре ни *удару мирис* на дезинфекционни препарати. ‘Inside, the *smell* of disinfectants *hit* us.’

(60) *Блъсна я мирис на брашно, лек и малко задушлив...* ‘A *smell* of flour, light and slightly suffocating, *hit* her...’

Kövecses (2018, pp. 22-23) analyses the metaphorical use of *hit* as follows:

1. SMELL IS A PHYSICAL FORCE
2. INTENSE SMELL IS A STRONG PHYSICAL FORCE
3. SENSING AN INTENSE SMELL IS COMING INTO CONTACT WITH A STRONG PHYSICAL FORCE

The same metaphors apply to the Bulgarian verbs *удрям*, *блъсвам* when collocated with *smell* and what is more, they correspond to the more generic ones:

1. CAUSES ARE FORCES
2. INTENSITY IS STRENGTH
3. SENSING IS CONTACT

The general metaphors apply to all kinds of perception and allow us to conceptualize various kinds of causes, intensity, and sensation. In other words, although smell is a basic experience, it has aspects apt to metaphorical conceptualization.

Conclusion

This corpus-based study shows that similarly to English Bulgarian exhibits two frames in the conceptualization of *smell*: a passive and an active frame. The passive version exhibits greater frequency and represents the conceptual prototype of *smell*. The metaphorical structure of *мирис*, *мириуна* ‘smell, to smell’ is quite complex as they can function both as a source domain and a target domain. Using previous research in English, we found that in Bulgarian there is mapping between *smell* and certain abstract concepts, such as suspicion, badness, and guessing. Additionally, two target concepts are understood through *smell*: general atmosphere (of a state or event) and emotion. *Emotion*, however, is rarely conceptualized by *smell* as the corpus showed. Other sense modalities are more considerably applied to the metaphorical conceptualization of emotions. In particular, the Bulgarian verb *усещам* ‘feel, sense’ is used in common collocations with *touch* and *taste*, as well as *smell*. *Touch* is a basic source domain in conceptualizing emotions and feelings. *Taste* in its turn is more limited, but it is convenient in the construal of negative and positive emotions.

As a basic kind of experience, *smell* is very effective serving as a source domain, but it is surprising from the point of view of the conceptual metaphor theory that it also functions as a target domain in metaphorical conceptualization. It confronts the assumption that basic experiences do not need metaphorical conceptualization to be comprehended. However, some of the characteristics

associated with *smell*, such as existence, intensity, and lack of control are quite abstract to require metaphorical conceptualization. But *smell* is not an exception in the domain of the sense modalities because the related conceptual metaphors, e.g., EXISTENCE IS BEING IN A CONTAINER, INTENSITY IS STRENGTH, CAUSES ARE FORCES refer to the whole conceptual system. Not all metaphors are exhibited cross-culturally, though. In the Bulgarian corpus there are no hits of the ABUNDANCE metaphor, rather *смърдящи, смрадлив, вонящи, вонлив* ‘stinky’ characterize disagreeable smells literally.

The corpus acknowledges metaphors that characterize not only abstract concepts (such as emotions) but also basic perceptions, such as smell. Due to its rich prefixation system, Bulgarian has a lot of equivalents of ‘smell’, which code different nuances of the meaning of the base verb: *намирисвам* ‘smell (lightly)’; *помирисвам* ‘smell, inhale odor’; *замирисвам* ‘start smelling’; *размирисвам се* ‘begin to spread smell’; *вмирисвам се* ‘begin to smell bad’, etc.

Studying *smell* not only as a source but also as a target domain in different languages enriches the conceptual status of smell and how it is coded cross-linguistically. Further research on the conceptualization of *smell* in other languages and on other sense modalities will affirm general tendencies and specific variations in their linguistic codedness. The linguistic evidence involving *smell* illustrates how the conceptual metaphor theory can provide more fine-grained investigation than is possible with intuition-based methods. Regarding *smell*, which is a largely unexplored sense, it allows us to elicit how strong, weak, bad, neutral, and pleasant smells are conceptualized and lexicalized in English and Bulgarian.

References:

- BalkaNet <http://www.dblab.upatras.gr/balkanet/>
 Bulgarian WordNet (BulNet) <https://dcl.bas.bg/bulnet/>
 Cambridge dictionary <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/>
 Casaponsa, A., & Athanasopoulos, P. (2018). The way you see colour depends on what language you speak. <https://theconversation.com/the-way-you-see-colour-depends-on-what-language-you-speak-94833>
 Evans, N., & Wilkins, D. (2000). In the mind’s ear: The semantic extensions of perception verbs in Australian languages. *Language*, 76(3), 546-592.
 Fillmore, Ch. J. (1982). “Frame Semantics” in *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. The Linguistic Society of Korea (ed), Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.
 Ibarretxe-Antunano, I. (1999). Metaphorical mappings in the sense of smell. In R. W. Gibbs & G. J. Steen (Eds.). *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 29-45). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh*. New York: Basic Books.
- Levinson, S., & Majid, A. (2014). Differential ineffability and the senses. *Mind and Language*, 29(4), 407-427.
- Kövecses, Z. (1990.) *Emotion concepts*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion language. Culture and body in human feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002/2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. (2nd ed. 2010). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2018). Perception and metaphor: the case of smell. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323987609_Perception_and_metaphor_the_case_of_smell
- Majid, A., & Levinson, S. C. (2011). The senses in language and culture. *Senses and Society* 6(1), 5-18.
- Neagu, M. (2013). What is universal and what is language-specific in the polysemy of perception verbs? *Revue roumaine de linguistique LVIII* 3, 329-343.
- Nedelcheva, S. (2019). The Prefix Na- in Bulgarian Verbs: a Cognitive Linguistic Approach. *Chuzhdoezikovo obuchenie-Foreign language teaching*, 6, 565-579.
- Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and Categorization* (pp. 27-48). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Speed, L. J., & Majid, A. (2017). Dutch modality exclusivity norms: simulating perceptual modality in space. *Behaviour Research Methods*. <http://doi.org/10.3758/513428-017-0852-3>
- Speed, L. J., Meara, C. O., Roque, L. S., & Majid, A. (eds.). (2019). *Perception metaphors*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stefanowitsch, A., & Gries, S. T. (eds.) (2006). *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Storch, A. (2014). *A Grammar of Luwo: An anthropological approach*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Strik Lievers, F. (2015). Synaesthesia: A corpus-based study of cross-modal directionality. *Functions of language*, 22(1), 69-94. DOI: 10.1075/fol.22.1.04str
- Szwedek, A. (2000). The ontology of metaphors: The sense of touch in language formation. *Scripta Periodica*, 4, 193-199.

- Sweetser, E. (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Viberg, A. (1983). The verbs of perception: A typological study. *Linguistics* 21, 123-162.
- Viberg, A. (1984). The verbs of perception: a typological study. In B. Butterworth, B. Comrie, & Ö. Dahl (Eds.), *Explanations for language universals* (pp. 123-162). Berlin: Mouton.
- Viberg, A. (2001). The verbs of perception. In M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher, & W. Raible (Eds.), *Language typology and language universals. An international handbook* (pp. 1294–1309). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- WordNet <https://wordnet.princeton.edu/>
- Zipf, G. (1929). Relative frequency as a determinant of phonetic change. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 15, 1-95.