



**University of
Zurich** UZH

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2020

**Analogical reasoning with quotations? A spotlight on Russian parliamentary
discourse**

Weiss, Daniel

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.10.008>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-183332>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Weiss, Daniel (2020). Analogical reasoning with quotations? A spotlight on Russian parliamentary discourse.

Journal of Pragmatics, 155:101-110.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.10.008>

Analogical reasoning with quotations? A spotlight on Russian parliamentary discourse

Daniel Weiss, University of Zurich

Abstract

Quotations in political discourse often aim at buttressing the current speaker's argument in an ongoing debate by citing an utterance that states, presupposes or implies an analogous thought. Given the controversial nature of analogical reasoning, this raises a number of questions. First, why does the speaker choose an argumentative strategy that is vulnerable in several respects, being easily refutable by providing counter-analogies, questioning the analogy's relevance, etc.? Second, are the intertextual references meant to enhance the analogy, or do they offer additional pragmatic values that could compensate the "detour" caused by introducing a new voice? Third, does the quoter align or disalign with the quoted analogy? Fourth, typology: do the quotations involved belong to descriptive or normative argumentation, do they refer to real or fictive utterances, are they cited partly or in full, including whole conversations?

The study is based on a sample of quotations from the Russian State Duma. The analogies found allow for the conclusion that the intertextual strategy does not invite a debate on the analogy itself but rather prevents further discussion by focusing the attention on other effects, such as face-threatening acts, entertainment, self-staging or creating a common ground. This holds in particular for fictive references.

Keywords

Analogical reasoning, argument schemes, fictive interaction, political discourse, proverbs, Russian State Duma

1. Introduction

When Russia's president Putin started the truck which first crossed the new-built bridge connecting the Russian mainland with the Crimean Peninsula on 15 May 2018, he simply uttered *Poexali* 'Let's go!'. This seemingly trivial utterance was a quotation the older generation of Russians identified immediately: Putin cited the Soviet astronaut Jurij Gagarin setting out for his first space trip on 12 April 1961. Nothing was more appropriate to boost the historic significance of the event than this quotation. In contrast, Ukraine's president Porošenko hailed the visa-free EU travel deal by quoting the first stanza of a well-known poem by the Russian poet M. Lermontov (1841), which he, who had been brought up in the Soviet Union, remembered impeccably: *Прощай, немытая Россия, Страна рабов, страна господ, И вы, мундиры голубые, И ты, им преданный народ* (Farewell – unwashed, indigent Russia, The land of slaves, the state of lords, And you, its navy-coated marshals, And you, their dedicated herds).¹ When Putin during his gigantic annual TV dialogue called "Direct line" with the Russian nation on 15 June 2017 was asked to comment on this not too flattering goodbye

¹ www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xp6qQ9hCiTI, last time accessed on 22 May 2018.

message by his Ukrainian colleague, he answered by quoting the second stanza of the poem and adding its historical background (Lermontov served as an officer in the Caucasus and was ready to sacrifice his life for his country).² These two episodes may suffice to illustrate two aspects: (i) the enormous importance of quotations in Russian culture and political discourse and (ii) the main reason for this: a thoroughly logocentric educational system that forced whole generations of schoolchildren to learn large amounts of fables, poems etc. by heart.

This study continues a series of papers on parliamentary discourse in today's Russia, among which Weiss 2012 and 2016a were already devoted to the analysis of quotations. The term 'quotation' is interpreted very broadly: it encompasses direct, indirect and mixed citations (free indirect speech was not found so far), full and truncated versions, and even mere mentions of authors, titles or main characters. Direct quotation is not assumed to provide a faithful verbatim reproduction of the original source; for arguments in favor of this approach, see Clark and Gerrig (1990: 795 ff.), but also the criticism by Johnson and Lepore (2011). So far, my understanding of the term is compatible with the one proposed by Bublitz (2015). In contrast, unlike Bublitz (2015: 1), my approach also includes pre-patterned ("canned") examples, such as proverbs, popular sayings, aphorisms, slogans, jokes, memes etc. Moreover, its scope is limited to *xeno-quotations*, i.e. quotations of sources from outside the parliamentary discourse. This was mainly dictated by the comparative objective of a research project that contrasted implicit communicative strategies in Russian, Polish and Czech political discourse:³ this project aimed to capture national particularities based on cultural and political characteristics, whereas intra-parliamentary quotations occur everywhere and do therefore not contribute to the national profile. Note that this does not exclude self-quoting: for instance, S. Lavrov, the Russian minister of Foreign Affairs, frequently quotes his own words in the UN assembly when delivering a speech in the State Duma. Within the aforementioned project, the Russian data yielded about nine times more quotations than their Polish and Czech counterparts.

In a sample of three hundred xeno-quotations analyzed in Weiss (2016a), the typology of sources provided some unexpected results: folklore came in first with 18% proverbs, 3% fairy tales and 1% popular jokes, followed by literary fiction (13%) and literary works adapted in films (1%), next by politicians (12%); the further ranking included TV, press, science, films, slogans, law, animated films, popular songs, the bible, anonymous "voices from the people",

² www.youtube.com/watch?v=YthYfBepPWo, last time accessed on 22.5.2018.

³ Implicit communicative strategies in the political discourse of Russia, Poland and the Czech Republic, 2012-2015. <http://www.research-projects.uzh.ch/p17097.htm>, last time accessed on 22.5.2018.

jokes, animated films, internet sources, radio, encyclopedias, and a work of art. In three cases, the source was not identifiable. Yet, these findings should not be considered fully representative: both the number and the composition of quotations vary considerably depending on the issue discussed and the current speaker (quoter). The debate on the Katyn' massacre (see section 3 below) yielded no less than 145 quotations. On the other hand, in his speech on 23.1.2013 aiming at the abolition of a freshly passed law on the literary curriculum in secondary schools, deputy Mironov used fourteen different quotation-types and seventeen quotation-tokens (including repetitions) which were prevailingly related to fictional literature (total length: 1297 words). Moreover, the speaker also mentioned fourteen sources missing in the program brochure he criticized.

Due to the inclusion of "canned" sources, my understanding of quotes is only partly compatible with the view that "To understand the quote (i.e. the target text), the recipient has to recognize the original context from which the quoted text (i.e. source text) derives its meaning" (Bublitz 2015: 5): what would be the original context of a proverb? Moreover, even Bublitz's formulation allows for a broad range of variation. For instance, if the quoter does not identify their source and quotes too small a portion of text, they may miss the chance to deliver the full blow of their argument against the opponents even if the audience is familiar with the quoted fragment; two such cases are examined in Weiss (2016: 192 f. and 208).

The present study seeks to elucidate the role of arguments from analogy in quotations. It seems to be a sound assumption that this strategy is not likely to trigger full-fledged argumentations: quotations that involve analogical reasoning usually offer a wealth of other aspects that may distract the audience's attention. From the quoter's perspective, they thus provide a comfortable "killer argument" in that they do not invite discussion about the analogy itself. The study is based on a sample of 528 quotations that stem from 47 sessions of the Russian State Duma (the equivalent of the House of Commons in the UK) spanning the period from 4.9.2007 to 16.9.2014. The sessions were selected according to the following criteria: sixteen were at least partly devoted to highly controversial issues (for example the Ukraine conflict) and included two question hours, two preceded presidential elections, six constituted the opening or closing session of a legislative period or a spring or autumn term; the agenda of the remaining ones were dominated by routine matters. As was expected, hotly debated issues engendered more quotations than everyday routine; the same holds for irony, fresh metaphors, and rhetorical questions. The final sample of quotations based on analogy encompasses 60 tokens.

The study is structured as follows: section 2 discusses different argumentative uses of quotations in terms of Strategic Argumentation theory and then homes in on the subtype based

on analogical arguments, section 3 illustrates a particular case, viz. arguing by reference to the source, sections 4 and 5 explore two diametrically opposed types of sources (fictive utterances and proverbs), and section 6 adds the conclusions.

2. *Arguing with quotes*

In Weiss (2016a, 2016b) the argumentative impact of many quotations was examined in detail, though not in terms of argument schemes. The present study is informed by Strategic Argumentation Theory (van Eemeren et al. 2004, 2014), strategic maneuvering being defined as “combining critical reasonableness and artful effectiveness” (van Eemeren et al. 2004: 4). The main three argument schemes are taken from van Eemeren et al. 2004. Their main purpose lies in offering different conditions of acceptability for defending a given standpoint. In all three cases a possible counterargument may attack one or more premises, the conclusion or the inference from premises to conclusion.

The following example illustrates all three argument schemes: the current speaker announces that his fraction (the communists) will not endorse the project to introduce into Russian criminal law the principle of bargaining that characterizes American procedural law. He does so by quoting a famous Russian historian:

(1) То, что нам сегодня предлагают со ссылкой на зарубежный опыт, абсолютно не годится. Я вам могу привести слова известного историка Ключевского, который сказал, *что слепое копирование западного образца и перенесение его на тело России ничего хорошего не вызовет, кроме раковой опухоли*. Вот сегодня мы действительно копируем американский образец.

What they are proposing us now with reference to foreign experience is an absolute failure. I (may) quote to you the words of the well-known historian Ključevskij who said *that blind copying of a Western model on Russia's body can only cause cancer*.

Today we are indeed copying an American model. V. Il'juxin, 15.2.2008

The quote is introduced explicitly by the hedged performative (lit.: “I may quote”) and the mention of the source and rendered in indirect speech. The argumentative structure is transparent: minor premise = ‘this project aims at copying an American legal procedural rule’, major premise = ‘any copying of Western rules will produce disastrous effects in Russia’, conclusion: ‘this bill will have a disastrous effect on Russia’. The minor premise is first merely alluded to (“foreign experience”), then explicitly expressed in the last sentence. The major

premise is based on a metaphorical mapping from bodily disease (cancer) to Russia with “Russia’s body” being a blend (Fauconnier and Turner 2002) of source and target.⁴ Next, a second argument scheme is added: ‘If a law has a negative effect on Russia, it should be rejected’; ‘this law has a negative effect on Russia’; final conclusion: ‘this law must not be passed by the House’. The whole fragment represents the *pragmatic subtype of causal argumentation* “presenting something as a means to a certain end” (van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1992: 97), more precisely its negative variant (avoiding an undesirable consequence). Moreover, it contains an implicit argument from *figurative analogy*: ‘if something causes cancer, it should be avoided’. This subtype of argumentation belongs to the argument scheme that is based on comparison. And finally, quoting Ključevskij also provides an *argument from authority*, which represents a case of symptomatic argumentation. Thus, all three main types (symptomatic, causal, based on comparison) of argumentation distinguished by the “Amsterdam School” complement each other in this example.

The remainder of this paper is devoted to quotations that all belong to the comparative argument scheme: they are based on analogies. Therefore, a few words about analogical reasoning may not be out of place. Many scholars hold the view that analogical argumentation is inherently fallacious (see the comprehensive overview of the literature in Kienpointner 2012), whereas others consider it “not only as an ubiquitous, but also as a rational, albeit weak and often defeasible means of argumentation” (op.cit: 111; see also Walton et al. (2008: 61) and Ribeiro 2014). Many authors limit their discussion to figurative analogies, which link two different domains of reality. In contrast, Walton et al. (2008: 43ff.) include also “same-domain” analogies, a decision I will adhere to. In addition, the conclusions to be drawn from analogies may be divided into descriptive and normative ones.

For reasons of space, I will only sketch out the second scheme presented in Walton (2014 et al.: 28). It runs as follows: “entities a, b, c, all have the attributes P and Q; a, b, c all have the attribute R; therefore d probably has the attribute R.” In my dataset, the analogies usually encompass only two entities a and b, and the properties involved rarely number more than one, an exception being the altered version of a proverb in example 15. However, “quantitative analogies, i.e. analogies whose soundness is a matter of how many properties are shared by both analogs”, are not superior to “qualitative analogies, i.e. analogies whose soundness is a matter of how significant is the comparison between them” (Bermejo 2014: 59). Indeed, specialists of analogical argumentation usually point out that the different properties involved should be

⁴ For a comprehensive analysis of nation-as-body metaphors in political discourse, see Musolff (2016).

weighed by their relevance for the given case. Not a single quotation based on analogy in my sample allows for such an interpretation. This raises serious doubts about the suitability of quotations as full-fledged tools of analogical reasoning. The examples to be analyzed now corroborate these doubts.

(2) Я считаю, что этот закон в принципе принимать нельзя. И вообще я убеждён, что нам стоило бы следовать установлениям родоначальника парламентаризма Солон, который говорил о том, что закон должен быть понятен и землепашцу, и аристократу в одинаковой мере.

I think that this law must not be passed for principal reasons. All in all, I am convinced that we should follow the postulates of Solon, the founder of the parliamentary system, who stated that *a law should be comprehensible both for a peasant and an aristocrat to the same extent.* N. Kolomejcev, 17.4.2009

This is a same-domain normative analogy conveyed by an indirect quotation that highlights only one common feature to be shared by all laws: unrestricted comprehensibility is a necessary condition for their approval. The historical parallel linking the ancient Athenian with the modern Russian society involves one incongruent element: the aristocrats, but the overall sense is maintained ('all groups of free citizens'). The (unexpressed) minor premise says that the bill at hand does not meet this general premise; therefore it should be refuted. The general premise itself seems uncontroversial, all the more so as it is based on an argument from authority; nevertheless, the concept 'comprehensibility' is a hotly debated topic in forensic linguistics. The quoter aligns with the source to discredit the bill under discussion. The quotation is reminiscent of Lenin's famous demand that the communist party program should even enable a cook to lead the country.

When the House discussed a new bill regulating stock exchange transactions, the term "insider", which obviously was not familiar to many deputies (one of them even quoted a note he had taken from a dictionary, which offered several translations), provoked an extended debate with some members proposing to replace it by a Russian term. This view was lively opposed by the minister who had to comment on the new bill:

(3) Вы, наверное, помните, что Хрущёв запретил использование слова "меню" и заменил его "разблюдовкой", потребовал, чтобы во всех ресторанах и столовых лежал лист с названием "разблюдовка". Ну и где эта "разблюдовка" теперь? Кому-то из присутствующих слово "меню" слух режет? Нет. Профессионалам "инсайд" слух тоже не режет.

You surely remember that Xruščev prohibited using the word “menju” and replaced it with “razbljudovka”, demanding *that in all restaurants and cafeterias there lie a sheet called “razbljudovka”*. So where is this “razbljudovka” today? Does the word “menju” offend anybody’s ear in here? No. Neither will the special term “insajd”.

A. Sinenko, 28.1.2009

The different domain-analogy established in the indirect quotation provides the first minor premise of the argument: Xruščev coined a neologism (*bljudo* means ‘dish’) meant to replace the traditional ‘menu’, originally a foreign loanword. The subsequent two rhetorical questions show that this neologism did not survive its author and nobody objects the traditional term nowadays. This still belongs to the minor premise. All this taken together trigger the implicature that artificial neologisms will not succeed in ousting influential international terms; this provides the (unexpressed) major premise. The core of the analogy relates the term ‘insider’ to the term ‘menu’, both being wide-spread international terms. The conclusion must be to accept this term rather than introducing any Russian equivalent into the bill. The minister thus wants to support his argument by disaligning with the source. The case again fits in the second scheme discussed in Walton (2014: 28 ff.). Nevertheless, the analogy is fallacious since unlike *menju*, which at Xruščev’s time was already a firmly established term in Russian, *insajd* was a brand-new loan in 2009, hence the resistance it met seems motivated.

Analogical reasoning involves different verbal strategies since comparisons, metaphors (including some metonymies and blends) and quotations likewise serve this purpose. Each of these strategies may be formally marked or not, each may be based on parallels or counter-parallels (contrasts), and each encompasses conventionalized (or lexicalized) and innovative uses (Weiss 2017, 2018). The criteria [\pm explicit marking] and [\pm conventionalization] do not represent clear-cut dichotomies but are gradable. This leads to an eight-fold typology with partly fuzzy internal borderlines. Often two or even three of these strategies combine within the same fragment.

How can quotations further be characterized against this background? Besides verbal markers such as “I quote” or “Remember X’s words?” (see example 3) etc., they are often introduced by explicit markers of comparisons (“as in the well-known fable”, “this is *similar* to / *reminds* + Q”). They may be pre-fabricated ready-made units or introduce the quotation in an analogical context for the first time. And finally, they may establish analogies that provide counterevidence against a proposed solution or description of the state of affairs; all examples quoted so far illustrate such cases. In all these respects, quotations do not diverge from explicit

comparisons and metaphors based on analogy. In contrast, their argumentative behavior differs sharply from the argumentative use of the two competing strategies. Both comparisons and analogical metaphors lend themselves freely to counterarguments questioning the analogy itself.⁵ This does, however, not hold for quotations. After examining sixty quotations based on analogical reasoning from my State Duma data, my findings are discouraging: these quotations do not invite an in-depth discussion of the analogy at hand by weighing all pro's and con's. The reasons for this are manifold. Sometimes the quotation contains a truism not worth discussing, in other cases the argument from authority may prevent an objection. Quotations from widely known literary works often trigger a pleasant recognition effect (reflected by the audience's back-channel behavior) that does not stimulate further reflections on the analogy intended. Still different is the case of proverbs, whose figurative interpretation is part of the lexicon and therefore highlights always the same property to be shared with the target: for instance, in Russian *Pervyj blin (vyšel) komom* 'the first pancake came as a clot', conventional meaning: "the first result of some process is often a failure", it makes little sense to argue that pancakes have a host of other properties that do not match the given target of the comparison. Most often, however, the quotation seems to distract the attention of the audience from the analogy itself by highlighting such side effects as delegitimization of the opponent, entertaining the audience, creating common ground, and self-staging. This helps explain why follow-ups (Fetzer et al. 2012), if they do occur, always refer to one of these effects. That was the case with Xruščev's neologism mentioned in example (3): the quotation triggered three follow-ups, two of them targeting Xruščev himself and one proposing a Russian equivalent of the term "insider", but the analogy itself, although highly vulnerable, was not questioned.

This said, it seems preferable to focus on particular types of quotations that offer additional choices of arguing by analogy. In section 3, two quotations will be examined that contain a double analogy: an explicit one conveyed by the quote and an implicit one hidden in the reference to the source. Section 5 and 6 contrasts two opposite types: they illustrate the additional benefits of fictive quotations and proverbs.

3. Arguing by reference to the source

The mass executions of 21,000 Polish prisoners committed by the NKVD in spring 1940 in the Katyn' forests and other places initiated a never-ending dispute between the Soviet Union, followed by post-Soviet Russia, and Poland that related not only to government and

⁵ For metaphors, see the controversies about different metaphors related to the future of the EU analyzed in Musolff 2004.

parliamentary interaction, but also to legal and media discourse and comprised national as well as international institutions.⁶ Soviet authorities had always denied their responsibility for this crime until 1990 (this denial came to be known as the ‘Katyn’ lie’), when the Polish president Jaruzelski paid an official visit to the Soviet leader Gorbachev. But the subsequent events did not satisfy the Polish claims at all. In November 2010, the Russian State Duma decided on a gesture of reconciliation towards the Polish people by adopting a resolution that aimed at definitely renouncing the Katyn’ lie and opening a new page in the common history of the two nations. This resolution was approved against the heavy resistance of the communist fraction. It still did not respond to all Polish demands, especially the recognition of the massacre as a genocide, and found little resonance in Poland. The Smolensk plane crash, which had killed 90 high-ranking Polish politicians including president Lech Kaczyński in April 2010, eventually put an end to this reconciliatory episode: the anti-Russian conspiracy theory concocted by Polish right-wing politicians has ever since been empoisoning the mutual relations.

The Katyn’ debate involved a host of historical and legal documents both from World War II and from the recent controversy on Katyn’; hence, it simply abounded in quotations from these sources. Intertextual references and allusions to literary works and films played only a marginal role (5 examples). Most noteworthy is the absence of proverbs, which are so frequent in other Duma debates. All in all, the Katyn’ debate provided no less than 145 quotations within a total length of 11,614 words, which is an unexcelled record among all forty odd Duma debates investigated so far. Some quotations came in bundles of up to five stacked instances.

The following two examples are taken from the initial speech by K. Kosačev, the head of the committee in charge of the text of the resolution.

(4). ...But the Katyn’ lie was still there. As *the holy book of both our Christian nations* says, there is nothing secret that will not become manifest, and it is our duty today to remove this lie from our way. K.I. Kosačev, 26.11.2010

This is a same-domain analogy announced by *kak* ‘as’. The citation adds a new argument to an already established normative thread of argumentation: the Katyn’ lie still constitutes the main obstacle to an improvement of the Polish-Russian relationship and has therefore to be removed. The speaker has already dwelled on the impact of this lie in his speech. Now, the quotation becomes part of the practical reasoning (cf. ‘our duty’): both premises (1. the Katyn’ lie is still there, 2. every secret will become manifest) hold, and the conclusion is explicitly expressed. What seems more intriguing, though, is the circuitous reference to the source: why does the

⁶ For details, see Weiss (forthcoming).

author not directly name the bible? At first glance, this violates the maxim of modality and triggers the implicature that the reference conveys a somewhat more important message. The circumlocution “the holy book of both our Christian nations” does two things: first, it provides an argument from authority, cf. ‘the holy book’, second, it emphasizes the religious and cultural commonality of the two nations, their shared core values. It thus creates a common ground shared by the final addressee, the Polish nation. The whole implicit argument runs as follows: major premise 1. Our two nations have fundamental values in common, 2. minor premise 2: What divides us at the moment is the Katyn’ lie, 3. conclusion: Let us remove this obstacle to restore our common values. As can be seen, this argumentation shares both the minor premise and the explicit conclusion with the direct citation; it simply adds a new argument in favor of the ultimate action, but does so with the reference to the source rather than by means of the quotation itself. On the whole, we are thus dealing with a double analogical support for the ongoing argumentation in which both the citation and its source participate.

The next analogy connects two different domains of reality. The citation works in a similar way as the preceding one but shifts the main weight from the quotation to the reference, which again flouts the modality maxim:

(5) As one of the main characters of *the film by the Russian director Tarkovsky based on the novel by the Polish writer Lem* put it: "Here is probably something that has to do with (a bad) conscience". I think this is really a question of our conscience: after so many years of denials and concealments, we should finally adopt this declaration that would close this page of history and open, as it always happens, a new page of history.

K.I. Kosačev, 26.11.2010

Why not refer to the film directly by its title “Solaris”? Hardly anybody in the audience was not familiar with this highly popular science fiction film. What is highlighted instead is the common cultural achievement of the two nations: a novel by a famous Polish author being adapted by a no less famous Russian film director. On the other hand, the quoted text itself is pretty irrelevant, the only link to the ongoing argumentation being the term “conscience”, and the subsequent string adds nothing new to the moral demand of overcoming the Katyn’ lie. In other words, the main motivation for this whole passage lies in the source and its relevance for both nations: if two individuals jointly succeeded in achieving such a highly esteemed result, why shouldn’t their two nations together also engage in a similar fruitful cooperation? The prerequisite is however to remove their main source of dissent: the Katyn’ lie.

4. Fictive argumentation

Fictive or hypothetical utterances offer the best illustration of the understanding of quotations proposed by Clark and Gerrig (1990): according to these authors, every quotation is a nonserious action marked as such, or else: a demonstration of somebody's verbal or even nonverbal communication. This understanding is also in line with the view that quotes are "constructed dialogue" [...] "because quoters spontaneously construct a replica of what someone else actually said or wrote or, indeed, could have said" (Bublitz 2015: 7-8). If we extend the component "could have said" to "or could say in the future", this covers the whole range of fictive quotations in the sense adopted here.

With fictive utterances, the myth of verbatim reproduction vanishes automatically. If "direct quotation is generally considered to display the lowest degree of subjectivity" (A. Fetzer, this volume), this does not hold for fictive quotations. Instead, they may have depicting, supportive or incidental aspects (Clark and Gerrig 1990). They belong to the wide range of fictive interaction (Pascual 2014, Golato 2012) with its various shapes and manifold functions. Giving voice to animals, things and even abstract entities is an age-old and omnipresent cultural practice, it is available to children, advertisers, brain-damaged patients, etc. – why should politicians not make use of it? When handled skillfully, the fictive strategy contributes to narrative immediacy. This requires direct speech rather than indirect or mixed speech.⁷ Fictive quotations may also become more effective if they are used to build hole chunks of fictive dialogue. On the other hand, their benefit for argumentative purposes seems less clear: they hardly enhance the credibility of the information quoted nor the authority of its source and/or the quoter. Nevertheless, in spontaneous conversation "claim-backing" is a widespread function in hypothetical speech, together with modelling discourse for others and in humorous stories (Golato 2012).

In the State Duma debates, fictive quotations of single utterances or whole conversational exchanges play a significant role. They may anticipate a future utterance or paraphrase a past speech event, they may involve the speaker himself, other well-known personalities or completely unknown people. They are not always explicitly introduced but can function as free-standing direct speech. Moreover, they often support another quotation, for example a proverb. The most prolific author of fictive quotations is the Duma's entertainer and enfant terrible V. Žirinovskij. In one single speech on 7.11.2007, he manages to use this technique three times. First, he anticipates the European reaction to a Russian message intended to impress them:

⁷ For a systematic comparison of fictive and ordinary direct quotation see Pascual (2014: 54-56).

(6a) Or they say: let us send them a message, they will be scared and ratify at once. And again, in Brussels and Washington they will laugh out loud, they will say: *Oh, those Russians, they are so naïve kids.*

As can be seen, the fictive Western echo is used as counterargument against Russian illusions, which are expressed in a (fictive?) quoted proposal. What results is a fictive long-distance pair of stimulus and response in which Russian and Western politicians engage in a pseudo-dialogue. In the next fragment, Žirinovskij adopts the American viewpoint with a similar effect:

(6b) And don't tell us such nonsense that American congressmen consider their electorate's opinion on such agreements. They couldn't care less: *any agreement with Russia, any tanks* – they don't even know where our country lies!

The highlighted sequence fills a phrasal slot (Pascual 2014: 49 ff.) but is not integrated into a clause. The main support for the conclusion “they couldn't care less” lies in the final statement “they don't even know...”. The whole excerpt is highly characteristic of the Speaker's spontaneous and often fragmentary style and also corroborates the view that fictive quotations “often involve theatricality and exaggeration” (Pascual 2014: 54).

The third fragment from this speech does not model future behavior of Russia's antagonists but is oriented towards the past and mainly denounces the ignorance of Soviet leaders. The content of Reagan's fictive utterance is clearly counterfactual or, in terms of Mayes 1990: 336, an “impossible quote”:

(6c) That lousy actor Reagan asked Gorbačev only for one thing in Reykjavik: *remove the Soviet regime – the regime, [I say,] not the whole country nor its economy nor the army, remove only the regime, bring about a desovietization, let there be the State Duma instead of the Supreme Soviet, the President's administration instead of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and that's it!* But what did that lousy guy from Stavropol' do? Together with El'cin he destroyed the whole country, the whole army, the whole economy! The reason lies in the genetic code. For the time being, the professors are there and here are the *Šariks*, we will be let down. The straight-A students are there, here are the flunkeys.

This time, Soviet protagonists react to a fictive American request but overdo it out of sheer stupidity. The illusion of dialogicity is enhanced by the focusing quotation “What did that lousy guy from Stavropol’ (=Gorbačev) do? He destroyed...” ~~used in the~~. Šarik is a character from Bulgakov’s novel *Sobač’je serdce* (The heart of a dog), a former dog turned human but remaining stupid; the name has become deonymized and hence is not capitalized in Russian orthography. The whole episode serves only to buttress the conclusion that Soviet leaders were incompetent and today’s Russian leaders continue to be Šariki, which provides two arguments from analogy. This is coherent with example 6a, in which the speaker had warned against Russian illusions about the US and Europe.

A more exotic variety of fictive argumentation is involved when laws are personified and begin to speak, thus entering in a dialogue with fictive newspaper editors. The whole issue concerns potential slander accusations:

(7a) But the law “On the mass information media” took this particularity in consideration and said: *Yes, gentlemen editors, we will not punish you only if you publish material that has to be obligatorily published according to article 57. But, excuse me, nothing we submit during the electoral campaign and referendums belongs to this heading. That’s why our editor of mass media after scratching his head decided: No, let us better not publish anything whatsoever, God forbid somebody will say afterwards: you offended me here, or this violates, or something else.* S.V. Ivanov, 17.4.2009

This string is not easy to disentangle because it involves three different fictive speakers. The first sentence renders the law’s speech but the second (“but excuse me”) does not continue it: here, the current real speaker is addressing his real audience.⁸ Next, we see the reaction of an editor-in-chief who, scared by the law’s verdict, decides not to publish anything (sc. of what the deputies want him to publish), which he motivates by the quotation of an additional imaginary voice (“somebody”) that could object the published material. By all evidence, this “somebody” is another politician that feels that his rights are infringed, his image might be

⁸ Unfortunately, the session took place long before the electronic archive of the State Duma became publicly accessible; thus, we cannot verify whether the current speaker marks the change back from the fictive to real communication by his delivery (pitch, prosody, etc.). A newly published multimodal analysis of quoting verbatim in English concludes that “the video data drawn from the internet largely lack any non-verbal cues” (Lampert 2018). This is in line with my own findings when comparing a later speech by Žirinovskij with the video record (Weiss 2013, example 23, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tnJ06jBLvuQ>). The analysis of spontaneous Russian conversations given in Bolden 2004 also shows that the change of prosody (or the lack of it) is not a reliable clue to the delimitation of quoted speech.

damaged, etc. Both the speech of the law and the reaction of the editor are marked as past speech events, the current speaker's comment is in the present tense and the hypothetical intervention of the offended politician in the future. It is evident that the practical conclusion to be drawn from this reasoning can only be a rejection of the bill in its present version.

Quotations can be recursive (Clark and Gerrig 1990); as example (7a) shows, this holds also for fictive quotations ("somebody will say"). But are we dealing with an analogy? If so, it is a same-domain analogy. Its purpose seems to be the following. The speaker attempts to predict the consequences (B) of the bill under discussion. To this end, he first rephrases the text (A) of the bill in fictive speech (C) and then adds a possible interpretation by a fictive editor (D). Hence $A : B = C : D$. What makes our example a borderline case is the relation between A and C: as Walton et al. (2014: 34) put it, "this scheme requires that for something to qualify as an argument from analogy it must have one premise asserting that there is a similarity between two cases." In the case at hand, C is even a paraphrase of A. That would probably be an over-extension of the concept of similarity, which anyway is usually defined in terms of different-domain analogies, in particular in the script-based model that is sketched out in Walton (2014). All this calls for a more profound discussion, which is clearly beyond the scope of this paper. The speaker introduced in example (7a) goes on by adding a new quotation from D. Medvedev's (then president) interview:

(7b) By the way, you know, my colleagues, it is quite symbolic that we are discussing this bill literally a couple of days after our president D.A. Medvedev in an interview he gave to, as we believe, our most independent newspaper "Novaja gazeta" said: *"I gave you this interview because you have never licked anything to anybody."*

The argumentative function of this quotation seems to be the following: if a newspaper exhibits an independent stance towards the authorities, this may well pay off, as the head of the state's words confirm, therefore let us as not prevent such a stance but encourage it by our legislation. The analogy thus supports the negative assessment of the bill under discussion.

In the following case, a communist deputy is criticizing both sides for their conflict management in the dispute about the Russian gas deliveries to Ukraine (note that this took place long before the outburst of the military conflict):

(8) Responsible are the Russian and Ukrainian thieves who did not share their profit margins before the new year. The Russians were reluctant to give back so much to the

Ukrainians, the Ukrainians did not want to resign from their own share. As a result, *the scythe hit the rock*. The Russians: “OK, you don’t want to give back more, so we will take your profit margin and you will buy the gas at the global price.” The Ukrainians: “OK, you’ll do that, and we will shut your pipeline lockings.” And they shut them. As a result, the Russian budget and the Russian people suffered enormous losses because of those profiteers. N.F. Rjabov, 21.2.2009

The proverb *коса нашла на камень* ‘the scythe hit the rock’ is based on a figurative analogy and means ‘two intransigent (and equally strong) adversaries met each other’ or, in other words, a case of ‘diamond cut diamond’. In the given context, it triggers the implicature: “neither of the adversaries can win in such a situation”, which provides the generalization⁹ underlying the fictive narration. The subsequent dialogue between the adversaries is rendered with zero quotatives, a typical device in hypothetical discourse (Golato 2102: 30). At first glance, it does not add a new argument but simply rephrases the speaker’s previous description of the state of affairs. Yet, it is not totally redundant because there resonates a lexicalized marker of a ‘tit for tat’ strategy in it: Russian “*Ах, вы так, а мы вам...*” often recurs in children literature and in Soviet political jokes. Thus, it confers a childish and humorous ring to the example at hand. The type of analogy involved here relates to a whole class or genre of texts rather to one single text. The case is comparable to a speech delivered by Žirinovskij on 12.9.2012, a mocking goodbye to deputy G. Gudkov, who had been excluded from the Duma: since it contained several formulae typical of an obituary, the source of the quotation was a whole genre. The next example dates from the current Ukraine conflict and is based on a different-domain analogy. In a TV debate, deputy Žirinovskij criticizes a new bill that assigns a particular status to certain parts of the separatist regions Doneck and Luhansk in eastern Ukrainian territory:

(9) This law is harmful and a provocation. Approximately like this: The doctor says: “*You may wash your elbow and one heel. We do not allow you to wash anything else. You have only the right to some minor parts of your body.*” That’s an idiocy!

V. Žirinovskij, “Vremja pokazet”, Channel 1, 16.9.2014

The comparison is announced by *tak* ‘like this’, followed by a quotative (‘says’). The analogy between body parts and territorial parts serves as the only argument that supports the two

⁹ Linguistically, this proverb describes a single event in the past. Nevertheless, it serves as a generalization much as the majority of proverbs do that are based on a hidden conditional period ‘If p, then q’.

negative evaluations surrounding it. The absurdity is boosted by the fact that it is uttered by a physician, who deserves to be trusted as an authority, and by the bizarre idea that such an elementary process as washing should affect only two minor body parts.

Sometimes we cannot tell for sure whether the quotation is fictive or real. In a sexist FTA against a female fellow deputy examined in Weiss 2013, ex. 23, V. Žirinovskij tries to ridicule her by quoting his conversation with a former friend of his; however, it remains unclear whether a) this dialogue really took place and b) the lady in question really existed.

To sum up, in all examples analyzed in this section the fictive arguments served to motivate a negative evaluation. Two arguments sought to discredit the bill under discussion by anticipating its possible negative consequences (newspaper editor in an electoral campaign) or ridiculing it by an absurd analogy (doctor allowing to wash only certain body parts). The remaining ones were related to past events (Reagan's meeting with Gorbačev, the gas price dispute), whose targets likewise became the object of derision. It goes without saying that fictive communication, be it based on analogy or not, does not increase the "credentializing function" (Bublitz 2015: 12) nor the quoter's authority: for instance, it does not allow to boast about one's profound knowledge of the source. Within rational argumentation, it fulfils at best a supportive function. Not coincidentally, in three examples it accompanied another quotation (a proverb, a popular saying and president Medvedev's comment) that could claim real authority. On the other hand, fictive communication allows engaging partners in a pseudo-dialogue that never took place (recall Žirinovskij's Western – Russian fictive exchanges). Moreover, fictive arguments produce important side effects, such as entertainment and the delegitimization of the enemy. Their place in strategic maneuvering is thus exclusively on the rhetorical side.

5. *Arguing with proverbs*

Proverbs were the most frequent type of source in the sample of 300 quotations analyzed in Weiss 2016a. To argumentation theory they pose a challenge (Goodwin and Wenzel 1979). First, being part of received folk wisdom, they are seldom subject to contestation. Only rarely do social stereotypes rendered by them provoke criticism, as in the following quotation from the debate about the war on Georgia, in which the quoter pleads for a quick attack:

(10) 'We always wait. That stupid Russian proverb: "*The Russian peasant always harnesses the horses slowly, [but then rides quickly].*" As long as we will be harnessing slowly, we will bury people. All should be done quickly, within 24 hours!'

Žirinovskij V.V., 25.8.2008

Truncations of the original proverb such as the one illustrated here ("*Русский мужик медленно запрягает...*") are generally more frequent than full quotations. The proverb provides a negative analogy: the undesirable practical consequence (too many casualties) of the proverbial Russian attitude urges us to act in the opposite way and not hesitate any longer. The quoter alters, however, the character of the original message which merely describes an attitude, whereas he re-interprets it as a norm of behavior. The next quotation does not stem from parliament but from a radio discussion on the Ukraine conflict:

(11) 'That's the wild plain, the wild chaos, the laws of the Tajga, a bear... What did our president say again? "*The bear is the lord of the Tajga*"? That's the direct way to a war of all against all and to decay.' V. Ryžkov, Radio Svoboda, 4.11.2014

The structure of this intertextual reference is more complex than in the preceding case since it represents a two-level quotation.¹⁰ The original version may be traced back to the GULAG folklore: "*Закон – тайга, медведь хозяин*" 'The law is the tajga, the bear is the lord.' It means roughly 'the stronger is always right, there is no sense in talking about justice'. Putin's contextualization identifies the bear metonymically with Russia. The current speaker, himself a Duma deputy, denounces this adaptation as a fatal mistake: again, the proverb serves as a negative analogy. Interestingly enough, he does so without explicitly questioning the analogy ('Russia is not the wilderness of the tajga') but by pointing to the disastrous consequences. As mentioned above, this may be generalized: the meaning of proverbs is known to everybody, therefore they do not invite evaluations of the analogy (Kienpointer 2012) and opponents do not question this analogy.

Things change, however, if the proverb undergoes a creative transformation. In the following case, the main aggressor in our collection of examples will get his at last:

(12) 'They say of many people that their word is a sparrow. Žirinovskij's *word is a crow with a disordered stomach, it circles above this chamber and defecates on the heads of those who are seated (strong noise, roar in the auditory)*, on history, on historical politicians, on the founders of the Russian state, on those living and dead, of course executing somebody's political order.

I. Nikitčuk, KPRF, 4/9/2013 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vAOYXtIrSXs>

¹⁰ Putin often acts as the intermediate link of such stacked quotations. In Weiss 2016a: 209 he appears even in a three-level quote.

In its original version, this proverb is negated: *слово — не воробей*, meaning “A word is not a sparrow that will fly away and you won’t catch it” with the frozen implicature “Therefore mind your words!”. The affirmative version attested here has also become conventionalized; it characterizes people whose words do fly away.¹¹ One finds even the altered version *Слово – воробей, вылетит – поймаешь* ‘A word is a sparrow: when it flies away, you’ll catch it’.¹² The current speaker, a communist deputy who had since long been complaining about Žirinovskij’s constant denigration of the Soviet past, now inserts the individual “possessor” of the word (Žirinovskij), replaces the sparrow with the negatively connotated co-hyponym ‘crow’ and assigns to it a disgusting characteristics that affects the whole audience and provides an additional analogy (diarrhea : logorrhea). The sparrow analogy thus undergoes a substantial transformation: not only does the target display symptoms of pathological logorrhea, but his verbal mud (metonymically attributed to the word) offends the whole House. The allusion to a foreign (whose?) order in the subsequent text seems to suggest that the stomach disorder is controllable. The accused launched a furious rejoinder of ten minutes length but did not comment on the analogy itself.¹³

6. Concluding remarks

The overview of problems presented in this study allows for the conclusion that quotations are a much less suitable stimulus for analogical reasoning than explicit comparisons. In the case of “fresh” quotations, this is explainable by the additional cognitive effort required for the decoding of the message. The identification of the source, the reconstruction of possibly missing strings of text and of the whole background of the quoted original, the recognition of the analogy intended, let alone additional implicit analogies that are hidden in the reference to the source (section 3), leave little space for questioning the analogy itself. The authority of the source may be an additional obstacle. Thus, neither the relevance of the highlighted shared properties nor the validity of the original message are discussed. An alternative challenge would be a counter-quote; such a repartee requires however an exceptionally erudite mind and is not attested in my data.

¹¹ This version featured for instance as the heading of a post that informed about the possibility of deleting a message already sent on Whatsapp:

https://m.pikabu.ru/story/slovo__vorobey_5497970, accessed on 23.5.2018.

¹² This was targeted at the new government of Armenia, whose unexperienced ministers spend whole days on apologizing for their absurd public statements:

<http://shame.am/ru/news/view/66099.html>, accessed on 23.5.2018.

¹³ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ln8mfExJ9js>, accessed on accessed on 23.5.2018.

In the case of “canned” quotations (proverbs, aphorisms, slogans, etc.), the cognitive “detour” cannot be the reason for the missing echo. Most of the examples in this category are stereotyped vehicles of received folk wisdom that do not provoke any dissent: as stereotypes in general, they simply serve as comfortable cognitive short-cuts that facilitate decision-making but may also create undesirable attitudinal biases. This spell can be broken by counter-proverbs or by a creative transformation of the original as shown in example 14, where the quoter himself exploited this strategy.

If argumentation from analogy is not the essence of the quotations examined in this study, what other purposes do they serve? As has been pointed out above, they offer a range of side effects that prove more rewarding than the argumentative purpose. Polemical goals, be this the delegitimization of an opponent or the discreditation of a bill, are the principal *raison d'être* of the analogical quotations analyzed here. In many contexts, they combine with humoristic or other entertaining effects. Fictive quotations provide a particularly suitable technique to achieve this by enabling the speaker to create imaginary dialogic scenarios and rearrange whole political constellations. Self-staging thus becomes another driving force of humorous and fictive quotations. As shown in section 3, in more consensus-oriented contexts the analogies used may also create common ground as a prerequisite for reconciliation. As for the quoter's self-positioning between source and target of the analogy, all four possible combinations were found: \pm alignment with the source and \pm support for the target.

References

- Bolden, Galina. 2004. The quote and beyond: defining boundaries of reported speech in conversational Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 1071-1118.
- Bredel, Elke, Jörg Meibauer and Markus Steinbach. 2011. Exploring the Meaning of Quotation. In Elke Bredel, Jörg Meibauer and Markus Steinbach (eds.). *Understanding Quotation*, (eds.), 1-33. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bublitz, Wolfram. 2015. Introducing Quoting as a Ubiquitous Meta-communicative Act. In Jenny Arendholz, Wolfram Bublitz and Monika Kirner (eds.). *The Pragmatics of Quoting Now and Then*, 1-26. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Bermejo-Luque, Lilian. 2014. The Uses of Analogies. In Ribeiro, Henrique J. (ed.). *Systematic Approaches to Argument by Analogy*. Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 57-71.
- Clark, Herbert H., & Richard J. Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as demonstrations. *Language*, 66 (4), 764-805.
- van Eemeren, Frans and Grootendorst, Rob. 1992. *Argumentation, communication and fallacies. A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- van Eemeren, Frans, and Houtlosser, Peter. 2004. *A systematic theory of argumentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Eemeren, Frans, and Garssen, Bart. 2014. Argumentation by Analogy in Stereotypical Argumentative Pattern. In: Ribeiro, H. (ed.). *Systematic Approaches to Argument by Analogy*. 41-56. Springer International Publishing Switzerland

- Fauconnier, Gilles, and Turner, Mark. 2002. *The Way We Think. Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fetzer, Anita, Weizman, Elda and Reber, Elisabeth (eds.). 2012. *Follow-ups across Discourse Domains: A Cross-cultural Exploration of their Form and Function*. Proceedings of the EFC strategic workshop, Würzburg, 31 May–2 June 2012, Universität Würzburg: OPUS. <http://opus.bibliothek.uni-wuerzburg.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/6116>.
- Golato, Andrea. 2012. Impersonal quotation and hypothetical discourse. In Buchstaller, Isabelle and Van Alphen, Ingrid (eds.) *Quotatives. Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, 3-36.
- Goodwin, Paul D., and Joseph W. Wenzel (1979). Proverbs and practical reasoning. A Study in Socio-Logic. *The Quarterly journal of speech*, 65, 289-302.
- Johnson, Michael and Lepore, Ernie. 2012. Misrepresenting Misrepresentation. In Elke Bredel, Jörg Meibauer and Markus Steinbach (eds.). *Understanding Quotation*, (eds.), 231-248. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kienpointner, Manfred. 2012. When Figurative Analogies Fail: Fallacious Uses of Arguments from Analogy. In Frans van Eemeren and Bart Garssen (eds.), *Topical Themes in Argumentation Theory: Twenty Exploratory Studies*, 111-125. Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- Lampert, Martina. 2018. 'Speaking' Quotation marks. Towards a Multimodal Analysis of Quoting Verbatim in English. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Mayes, Patricia. 1990. Quotation in Spoken English. *Studies in Language* 14(2): 325-363.
- Musolff, Andreas. 2004. *Metaphor and political discourse: analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, Andreas. 2016. Metaphor Scenario Analysis as Part of Cultural Linguistics. *Tekst i diskurs* 9, 2016, 47-69.
- Pascual, Esther. *Fictive interaction. The conversational frame in thought, language, and discourse*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ribeiro, Henrique J. (ed.). 2014. *Systematic Approaches to Argument by Analogy*. Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Walton, Douglas N., Reed, C., and Macagno, F. 2008. *Argumentation schemes*. Cambridge: Cambridge: University Press.
- Walton, Douglas N. 2014. Argumentation Schemes for Argument from Analogy. In Ribeiro, Henrique J. (ed.). 2014. *Systematic Approaches to Argument by Analogy*. 23-40. Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- Weiss, Daniel. 2012. "Deputaty ljubjat citaty: ssylki na ksenoteksty v Gosdume [Deputies love quotations: references to xenotexts in the State Duma]." In *Russkij jazyk segodnja: Problemy rečevogo obščeniija* [The Russian language today: issues of speech communication], ed. by Nina Rozanova, 64–75. Moskva, Flinta/Nauka.
- Weiss, Daniel. 2016a. Quotations in the Russian State Duma: types and functions. In: D. Weiss (guest editor), *Contemporary Eastern European political discourse, ZfSl 1/2016, Special issue*, 2016, 184-214.
- Weiss, Daniel. 2016b. The New Russian Legislation on Blasphemy and Swearing: the Parliamentary Debates. in: Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie Special Issue: The Culture and Politics of Verbal Prohibition in Putin's Russia Guest Editors: Michael S. Gorham and Daniel Weiss, 2017, 287–319.

Weiss, Daniel. 2017. Implizite Argumentation im politischen Diskurs: Metaphern, Vergleiche, intertextuelle Verweise. In: A. Mayer, L. Reinkowski (Hrsg.), *Im Rhythmus der Linguistik*. Festschrift für S. Kempgen, 465-483. Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press, 2017.