

Daniel Weiss\*

# Types and functions of intertextual references in the Russian State Duma

DOI 10.1515/slav-2016-0010

**Summary:** The paper aims at a first typological and functional characterisation of xeno-quotations (intertextual references to external sources) in Russian parliamentary discourse based on 300 examples used by deputies of the State Duma. After a preliminary discussion of the Gricean-based background and its applicability to various contextual embeddings of quotations, the second section is devoted to methodological problems posed by the identification of the source and the delimitation of different types of sources. Next, a quantitative overview of the different types of sources attested in the sample is presented and illustrated by particularly intricate data; special attention is paid to salient preferences that seem to be most typical of Russian political discourse, such as proverbs, classical literature or animation films. The last two sections discuss the frequency of quotations per deputies, parties and “hot topics” and outline a wide range of open questions for future research.

**Keywords:** Implicatures, Implicit communication, Intertextuality, Parliamentary debates, Russian parliament, Sources of quotations, Xeno-quotations

## Introduction

Quotations in political discourse have recently been explored in several studies whose precise objects and methodological approaches vary considerably: two of them analyse quotations as follow-ups in British interviews and speeches (Fetzer 2012) and in Austrian parliamentary debates after the inaugural speech of the newly elected president (Gruber 2012), others focus on the main functions of quotations, such as the support of one’s own arguments, the undermining of the adversary’s position in the Rumanian parliament from 1866 to 1938 (Constantinescu 2010) or the evaluation of the adversary’s skills and credibility in a Czech talk-show (Čmejrková & Hoffmannová 2012). The present volume unites three other studies on intertextuality which are devoted to confrontational strategies in

---

\*Corresponding author: Prof. em. Dr. Daniel Weiss, University of Zurich, Slavic Department, Plattenstrasse 43, CH-8032 Zürich, E-Mail: daw@slav.uzh.ch

Rumanian political discourse (C. Ilie), to intertextual references in British, German and Russian interviews and blogs (M. Sivenkova) and to quotations in the presidential debate of the Czech parliament in 2008 (M. Berrocal).

The present paper shares its focus on contemporary Eastern Europe with the three last-mentioned papers; its particular object (parliamentary debates) coincides with M. Berrocal's contribution. It continues a previous study (Weiss 2012) on quotations in the Russian State Duma (the lower house of the Federal Assembly). Unlike all above-mentioned analyses of intertextuality in parliamentary discourse (Constantinescu 2010; Gruber 2012; Berrocal 2014), it takes into account only so-called *xeno-texts* (Weiss 2012), i.e. citations from sources *outside the parliament*; thus, quotes from other deputies or government representatives who delivered a statement in the Duma are excluded. This restriction is dictated by a research project on implicit communicative strategies which both articles are affiliated with and which aims at a systematic comparison of three genres of political discourse (parliamentary debates, TV talk shows, print and TV interviews) in contemporary Russia, Poland and Czechia.<sup>1</sup> Given this *comparative orientation*, intra-parliamentary quotations do not present much interest since they occur everywhere. Instead, the project attempts to capture the national particularities of political discourse in the above-mentioned countries, be they due to different cultural traditions or divergent political systems, to mention but the contrast between the Russian-styled "directed democracy" and the Polish and Czech parliamentary models.

As for its theoretical background, this paper owes most to previous work on parliamentary discourse, notably Burkhardt (2003), Chilton (2004), Bayley (2004), and Ilie (2010). Some general aspects of Russian parliamentary discourse have been elucidated in Weiss (2012, 2013, 2015). Moreover, three papers by Sivenkova (2009, 2012, 2013) are devoted to a comparative analysis of question hours in the Russian, British and (2013) German parliament. The methodology of our research project differs from that of most above-mentioned authors in that it is centered on a neo-Gricean approach (see Section 1) and supplemented by impoliteness theory (Bousfield 2008; Culpeper 2011). Argumentation theory does not belong to its essential tools.

The paper is structured as follows: section 1 discusses the theoretical prerequisites. Section 2 constitutes the most comprehensive part; it comprizes a preliminary typology of the sources encountered (2.1) and a quantitative overview accompanied by illustrations of the main types (2.2). Section 3 presents informa-

---

<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed description of this project and the list of publications related to it, see <http://www.research-projects.uzh.ch/p17097.htm>.

tion on the frequency of quotes by individual deputies and parties represented in the Duma. The last section (4) enumerates open questions that wait for further research.

## 1 Why Grice?

In view of the ever-growing influence of Relevance Theory, which is intended to replace the whole apparatus of Gricean maxims, the decision on a neo-Gricean framework in this study calls for an explanation. Since a systematic evaluation of these two theories lies beyond the scope of the present paper, the reader may be referred to the criticism of Sperber and Wilson (1995) formulated in Levinson (2000: 55–59). The decisive argument against Sperber and Wilson in the context of this study is provided by the latter author's statement that "the factor of cognitive effort, an essential ingredient in the proportional measurement of Relevance, is not empirically measurable" (Levinson 2000: 57). As will be shown in the remainder of this paper, this cognitive effort is the crucial variable when interpreting quotations in political discourse. All other arguments against Relevance Theory are of minor importance in our context, although they do apply to specific situations; this holds in particular for the distinction of generalised and particularised implicatures. On the other hand, some elements of Relevance Theory may well merit to be preserved, e.g. its account of the ironical use of utterances or of explicatures (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 182).

To illustrate the application of the Gricean approach for the analysis of quotes in parliament, let us analyse a first, not very sophisticated example:

- (1) Уважаемые коллеги, кто-то скажет: «Ну что придираетесь, *первый блин комом*, всё это исправят...»  
 [Dear colleagues, somebody may say: "why do you object, the first pancake [always comes as] a blob, they will correct all this"]  
 (Mironov S.M., SR,<sup>2</sup> 23.1.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

By mentioning 'the first *blin*', the speaker clearly flouts the maxim of relevance, since there has been no mention of pancakes before. These words are, however, easily recognisable as a well-known Russian proverb. Its adaptation to the present context by means of the conversational implicature "the first draft of the bill

---

**2** The political parties represented in the State Duma are denoted by the following abbreviations: ER = *Edinaja Rossija* 'A United Russia' [the ruling party], KPRF = *Kommunističeskaja Partija Rossijskoj Federacii* 'Communist Party', LDPR *Liberal'no-demokratičeskaja Partija Rossii* 'Liberal-democratic Party of Russia', SR = *Spravedlivaja Rossija* 'a Just Russia'.

is not wholly satisfactory, but can still be improved” is supported by the subsequent context (“they will correct all this”), but would work even without this additional element. Thus, the quotation simply enhances the ongoing argumentation. To put it differently: implicatures are *reinforcable* in that “it is often possible to add explicitly what is anyway implicated with less sense of redundancy than would be the case if one repeated the coded context” (Levinson 2000: 15).

In the next example we do not find any contextual support:

- (2) напомню вам, господа коммунисты, что вы отказались поддержать закон о повышении экспортных налогов на нефть и позволили “ЮКОСу” и другим компаниям заработать миллиарды, ограбив наш народ, — здесь, в этом зале, вы лоббировали интересы “ЮКОСа”, получив от них, видимо, подарок хороший, поэтому, прежде чем в чужом глазу искать соринку, в своём глазу с бревном разбейтесь!

[*may I remind you, communists, that you rejected support for the bill on raised export taxes on oil and allowed Yukos and other companies to earn billions by robbing our nation – here, in this room, you were lobbying for the interests of Yukos, obviously after obtaining a nice little present from them, [so] before searching for a speck of dust in the other’s eye, just come to grips with the plank in your own eye!*] (Žirinovskij V.V., LDPR, 19.6.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

This reference to the words of Christ does not require any specification, although it is slightly altered, the original version being “Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother’s eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye?” [Matthew 7:3]. The implicature triggered by this may be rendered as ‘mind your own flaws before getting upset by others’ behaviour’. In this example, argumentation combines with polemics.

In the case of *flouting* the non-observance of a conversation maxim is overt: it must be noticed by the hearer in order to trigger a conversational implicature. But a Grician approach should also take into account the remaining types of non-observance of the maxims. *Violating* a maxim means the deliberate and unostentatious non-observance of maxim; the speaker “[...] will be liable to mislead” (Grice 1975:49), “usually for some self-serving purpose”. *Infringing* a maxim denotes the unmotivated or unintentional non-observance of a maxim, generated through a speaker’s imperfect or impaired linguistic performance due to incomplete competence, excitement, drunkenness, etc. *Opting out* of a maxim indicates clearly that the interactant is unwilling to co-operate in the way the maxim (s) require (Grice 1975: 49). The “example of opting out occurs frequently in public life, when the speaker cannot, perhaps for legal or ethical reasons, reply in the way normally expected. The speaker usually wishes to avoid generating a false implicature or appearing uncooperative” (Thomas 1995: 74). Such behaviour is typical of a government’s official speaker, but rather not for a parliamentary

deputy. And finally, *suspending* [of] a maxim is characteristic of a whole range of genres including obituaries or marriage advertisements (Quality), e-mails and SMS (Quantity), poetry (Manner) or jokes (all four maxims).

As for quotations, it may be recalled that the non-observation of Relevance is decisive for their functioning. It would be hard to find instances of violation or suspension of the Relevance Maxim, nor would a speaker opt out of it by using a quote. Infringing is more tricky in that it involves insufficient command of the code, which may lead to false rendering and/or interpretation of a given quote. But it also presupposes that the speaker has no intention of generating an implicature (nor an intention of deceiving, as in the case of violation). Consequently, a simply erroneous quote, such as the following use of a proverb, would not fall under this category:

- (3) Грузия – это ягоды, а теперь о цветочках. В ближайшие два месяца Израиль нанесёт самый страшный удар по Ирану в целях предотвращения создания им ядерного оружия...  
 [Georgia is berries, but now about flowers. In the next two months Israel will deliver a most terrible blow on Iran to prevent their creation of nuclear weapons...] (Žirinovskij V. V., LDPR, 25.8.2008, Emphasis mine D.W.)

This is a partial quote, the full proverb being *это еще цветочки, а ягоды впереди* ‘these are only the flowers, the berries are still before us’ which is to be interpreted as *это только начало, а потом еще не то будет* ‘this is only the beginning, later something worse will happen’. By referring to the conflict with Georgia in summer 2008 as ‘berries’ and Israel’s alleged preventive attack against Iran as ‘flowers’, the speaker inverts the sequence of events and their evaluation in terms of ‘bad – worse’. Thus, he does not infringe the Relevance Maxim since he indeed wants to generate an implicature, but (by all evidence unintentionally) triggers a misleading one. To the best of my knowledge, this case is not covered by Grice’s account.

That the same speaker is aware of the correct meaning of said proverb is shown five years later by the following use:

- (4) Беспилотники появились — это так, цветочки, а ягоды — это секретная программа “Призма”: вот я сейчас говорю, а они в Вашингтоне уже читают моё выступление...  
 [Drones have appeared – these are just the flowers, but the secret programm “Prisma” is the berries: I am speaking right now, and in Washington they are already reading my speech...] (Žirinovskij V.V., LDPR, 19.6.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

In both examples, the speaker provides support for the intended interpretation by equating the two contrasting elements of the source (flowers vs. berries) with

two current political events, one of which has already occurred (war with Georgia, drones). The other one (the berries) is anticipated for the immediate future (Israel's attack against Iran) or already ongoing ("Prisma"). What results in both cases is a *comparison*. The lack of an overt comparative marker, such as 'like', 'reminds', 'remember', 'similar', 'analogous' or 'parallel', is reminiscent of the emergence of new metaphors, cf. "Sally is an iceberg", the only difference being that here the predicative terms 'berries' and 'flowers' are not semantically derived from their literal meaning, but already from the figurative meaning encoded in the proverb. Be this as it may, the question arises whether we are still dealing with Gricean implicatures if such explicit interpretative cues are given. The Relevance Maxim is indeed flouted, but the only intellectual challenge now consists in reconstructing the missing parts of the proverb, which leads to the intended reading "The worst is still ahead of us". A thorough discussion of the nature of such implicit messages would have to consider the classical properties of conversational implicatures, i.e. their cancellability, non-detachability and calculability. Due to reasons of space, this is beyond the scope of the present paper.

Note that in examples 1 and 2, the essence of the 'quotative' strategy was quite the same: both served a comparative purpose by equating the first pancake with the present first draft of a bill and the biblical blindness for one's own mistakes with the behaviour of the communist deputies. What varies, though, is the nature of the implicit message and the extent of contextual (subsequent or preceding) support needed for their decoding.

On the whole, the insertion of quotations in a political speech is mainly based on flouting the Relevance Maxim. Besides this, a quotation may of course be built on an additional non-observance of another maxim, e.g. Quality (ironical use), as in the following example:

- (5) "Самый справедливый суд в мире". Ну, насчёт самого справедливого суда в мире тут, конечно... гм, это да! [...] но суд у нас самый гуманный. Вот смертная казнь у нас не применяется судом, да? Но сотрудники полиции её сами приводят в исполнение: в Казани — бутылкой из-под шампанского, в Томске — шваброй, а в Курске вам вообще могут череп вашего супруга выдать как вещественное доказательство. В общем, смертная казнь не применяется, суд её не назначает. [*"The fairest justice system in the world". Well, as for the fairest court in the world, there, of course...well, yes! [...] but our courts are the most humane. For instance, the death sentence is not spoken by the court in our country, is it? But police officers carry it out themselves: in Kazan' by means of a Champagne bottle, in Tomsk with a mop, and in Kursk they may even deliver the skull of your husband as a piece of material evidence. In general, the death sentence is not spoken, the court does not impose it.*] (Ivanov S.V., LDPR, 20.2.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

The quote in the beginning is taken from a still very popular Soviet film comedy from the sixties (*Kavkazskaja plennica* ‘Kidnapping, Caucasian style’). It serves as an ironic introduction to a whole series of extra-judicial executions that bluntly run counter its meaning. The argument runs as follows: ‘the ban on death penalty becomes pretty senseless under such circumstances, so what kind of justice are we talking about?’ The same quote is later used in the same speech (see Example 23 below), but that time it serves to ironise a court’s own verdict.<sup>3</sup> The ironic effect is achieved by flouting the Quality Maxim.<sup>4</sup>

Again, the mental operation underlying this passage is a comparison. This time, however, it reveals a contradiction of the ideal (the quote) and the reality. This mechanism is comparable to what in humour theory (Raskin 1986; Attardo 1994) is called incongruity of two scripts. Closer to irony theory, it may as well serve to illustrate the influential, though not universally applicable “echo theory” (Sperber and Wilson 1995): the current speaker quotes the other’s voice and then expresses his critical stance towards it.

The following example first identifies the type of source (a *simile*), which is then elaborated at full length:

- (6) Так вот, притча такая. Пошли волки на охоту, поймали зайца и говорят: “Мы тебя съедем”. Заяц просит: “Не ешьте, я вас наведу на отару овец”. — “Хорошо, давай наведи”. Навёл он их на отару овец, волки давай её крушить, а заодно съели и зайца, который под горячую руку попался. Сидят сытые, довольные: “Давай похороним зайца”. Похоронили зайца и решили написать на могиле, кто здесь похоронен: “Давай напишем, что здесь похоронен наш друг заяц”. — “Ну не был он нам другом, не будем так писать”. — “Давай напишем, что враг”. — “И врагом вроде не был — навёл нас на этих овец”. И они единодушно постановили написать: “Здесь похоронен наш партнёр заяц”. Вот примерно в таком состоянии сегодня Россия находится, когда твердит о своём безусловном партнёрстве с Америкой, с Западом.

[Okay, a simile. The wolves went hunting, caught a hare and said: “We will eat you up.” The hare begs: “Don’t eat me, I will lead you to a flock of sheep.” — “OK, go lead us.” The hare led them to a flock of sheep, the wolves ripped them apart, and while they were at it, ate up the hare as well. They are sitting there full and happy: “Let’s bury the hare.” They buried the hare and decided to write on the grave who was lying here: “Let’s write that buried here lies our friend, the hare.” — “Well, he was not our friend, we won’t write this.” — “So let’s write that he was our enemy.” — “But he was not an enemy either: after all, he led us to the sheep.” And they unanimously decided to write: “Buried here lies our partner,

<sup>3</sup> The quote *Sovetskij sud samyj spravedlivyj v mire* has gained so much popularity that it sometimes is cited automatically, without any evident contextual import. Such was the case with president Putin’s comment on the outcome of the first *Xodorkovskij* trial, where he used the same words.

<sup>4</sup> An Internet search shows that this quote is most often used ironically.

*the hare.” This is pretty much the situation in which Russia finds itself today, when it claims its unconditional partnership with America, the West.] (Kalašnikov, L.I., KPRF, 11.9.2013)*

The initial indication of the genre explicitly announces a comparison. The target of the latter is presented after the narrative: Russia’s relationship with the West can neither be described as friendship nor hostility (note the date of this quote, though!).<sup>5</sup> This explicative frame – announcement of a simile in the beginning plus reference to the present political situation at the end – excludes a Gricean interpretation. At the same time, the example shows that only parts of the narrative are really explicitly encompassed by the comparison: if the wolves are equated with the West and the hare with Russia, who would be the sheep?

The quotation of a *joke* in political discourse (Thielemann 2010) may in addition to the flouting of the Relevance Maxim have one or more built-in suspensions of any Maxim due to the genre itself. The following example again identifies the genre at the beginning. The subsequent narrative already contains a hidden reference to the present political issue, cf. the keyword ‘capital’ in parentheses. The full resolution of the hidden sense is then presented at the end of the excerpt:

- (7) И я новогодний анекдот расскажу всё-таки, кончается у нас неделя, связанная с трудом. Мальчик – как раз материнский капитал – спрашивает у папы: “Папа, что такое *восхищение* и *кризис*?” – “Ну, *восхищение* – это шампанское, мерседес и красивые женщины”. – “А *кризис*?” – “А *кризис* – это ситро, метро и твоя мама”. Вот ситуация-то: наша политика переходит в анекдоты. Поэтому правильный закон: ипотечный капитал, больше времени на жильё давать. [And I’ll tell you a new year’s joke, [since] a week full of hard work lies behind us. A boy – just his mother’s capital – asks his father: “Dad, what’s this, abundance and crisis?” – Well, abundance means champagne, a Mercedes and beautiful women.” – “So what about crisis?” – “A crisis means lemonade, subway and your Mum.” So this is [exactly] our situation: our politics is becoming a joke. Hence the (only) correct bill: to provide mortgage capital and more time to create housing space.] (Žirinovskij V.V., LDPR, 19.12.2008, Emphasis mine D.W.)

The structure of this passage is thus reminiscent of the simile in Example 6, but it contains a threefold comparison: the joke itself is built on the contrast of two situations (abundance vs. crisis), to which the speaker first adds a global comparison (Russian politics vs. joke) and then (not very convincingly) relates the joke to

<sup>5</sup> Another deputy of the Communist fraction coined the formula *zakljatyj drug* ‘sworn friend’ based on the blending of two idioms: *zakljatyj vrag* ‘sworn enemy’ and *zakadyčnyj drug* ‘a close friend’.

the bill under discussion (abundance  $\leftrightarrow$  mortgage capital). The joke itself is based on the suspension of the Quality Maxim or else: the assumption of bona fide communication (Raskin 1985). Moreover, its insertion initially flouts the Relevance Maxim. The speaker attempts to make the relevance to the context at hand explicit at the end, marking it as a conclusion (“hence”), but the exact link remains unclear. The same holds for the comparison ‘son  $\leftrightarrow$  capital’ in the parenthesis.

To sum up, a treatment of quotations in Gricean terms may be helpful in three respects: it allows to determine (i) the type of non-observance of the given maxim(s), (ii) the status of the implicit message in question, that is to say whether it is a conversational implicature or not, and (iii) the circumstances in which the intended interpretation requires contextual support. The first point is of minor importance, given the general dominance of flouting. The second point heavily depends on the contextual embedding of the quote and is therefore related to the third point, which opens a whole continuum ranging from most implicit to most explicit contextual cues. As was already argued in Weiss (2012), the majority of all quotations in parliamentary discourse may well turn out not to lend themselves to a Gricean analysis.

## 2 (Xeno-)Quotations in parliamentary discourse

Let us now turn to a more thorough scrutiny of the functioning of quotations in Parliament. As a first approximation, one may state that for a quotation to function effectively, two steps are to be achieved: first, the quote as such has to be recognised, second, the original source should be properly identified. It seems, however, that these two steps are not of equal importance. The identification of a quotation as such triggers a process that should allow for the reconstruction of the missing link with the current argumentation, polemics, etc. This can in principle be achieved without the exact identification of the source. The latter adds, however, a surplus of information by evoking the historical or literary context, the individual author behind the quote, his/her political, philosophical or other affiliations, etc. The cognitive effort posited by Relevance Theory is thus subject to manifold variation.

The following excerpt illustrates a situation where the speaker himself does not seem to be aware of the exact source. It is taken from the oppositional deputy G. Gudkov’s defence speech before his unprecedented exclusion from the Duma:

- (8) а все вот эти вот крючки, все эти формальные попытки поймать — это “*жалкий лепет оправдания*” (есть у нас такая фраза в литературе — “*жалкий лепет оправ-*

данья”), это фиговый листок, которым вы пытаетесь прикрыть срамное место, извините!

[and all these tricks, all these formal attempts to catch [me], are only the “miserable justifying stuttering” (we have such a sentence in our literature), it’s a fig leaf with which you are trying to cover your genitals, pardon me!] (G.Gudkov, SR, 14.9.2012, Emphasis mine D.W.)

As can be seen, the quote serves his main, metaphorical purpose even without the identification of its original source: it simply anticipates the following idiom “fig leaf”. The source – a poem by Michail Jur’evič Lermontov (1837), entitled *Smert’ poëta* ‘Death of the poet’, referring to Puškin’s death in a duel and full of pathos and passion – describes an event of crucial significance in the history of Russian literature and culture. It begins with the words: “The Poet’s dead! – a slave to honor – He fell, by rumor slandered...”, and before the end it cumulates in these verses: “You, greedy hordes around the throne, Killers of Freedom, Genius and Glory! You hide beneath the canopy of law Fall silent – truth and justice before you... But justice also comes from God, corruption’s friends! The judge most terrible awaits you: He’s hardened to the clink of gold,...”.<sup>6</sup> Even if the exact wording of this poem may have escaped the majority of the audience, its contents were probably well known to them from their school days.<sup>7</sup> No need to add that all this fits perfectly into the overall picture drawn by the speaker, who several times emphasises the historical moment marked by the ongoing debate. A more precise identification of the source would not only boost the *argumentum per analogiam*, but also add an *argumentum ad auctoritatem*.

As for the gap between different background knowledge due to different levels of education among the audience, it should be borne in mind that during a live TV broadcasted debate as in the case at hand (the overhearing TV audience is directly addressed by Gudkov in the very beginning of his speech) this gap is even more pronounced. Thus, the multi-addressed and multi-layered character of political discourse inevitably makes itself felt in the interpretation of intertextual references. The identification of the source may be facilitated by making it explicit in some way or other, but it can also be hampered by omitting such information and/or fragmentising or transforming the quote itself. The latter procedure may again engender an additional affect: the more remote the ultimate version from the original, the more intellectual satisfaction is caused by the reconstruction.

<sup>6</sup> See [http://max.mmlc.northwestern.edu/~mdenner/Demo/texts/death\\_poet.html](http://max.mmlc.northwestern.edu/~mdenner/Demo/texts/death_poet.html), accessed 6.4.2014.

<sup>7</sup> The poem figures on the list of mandatory works to be known to Russian high-school graduates from 1995.

## 2.1 A preliminary typology of sources

The present paper is based on a broad interpretation of the term “quotation” embracing the following types: full vs. truncated citation, paraphrase, mention of the title, of the genre involved and/or the author, or reference to the main character.<sup>8</sup> To illustrate some of these types by examples from literary fiction: references such as *dama s sobačkoj* ‘The Lady with the Dog’, *kak v izvestnoj skazke* ‘as in the well known fairy tale’, *kak ta unteroficerskaja vdova* ‘as that widow of a sergeant’, *geroi v Besax* ‘the characters in the Demons’ or even *kogo-nibud’ iz klassikov, naprimer Majakovskogo* ‘one of the classics, e.g. Majakovskij’ all count as quotes. Such a liberal approach may, however, prove cumbersome when it comes to identify the exact source. Will existing dictionaries like Elistratov (1999) for cinematographic quotes, Dušenko (1997) for quotes of all kinds from the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Gusejnov (2003) for citations from political sources, Knjazev (2010) for so-called “winged words” (see below), or Dal’s well know ‘Collection of Russian proverbs’ do the job? Several arguments incline us to reject such a solution. To begin with, the typical audience of a deputy’s speech does not have such dictionaries at hand, nor would they have the time to look up the quotes online during the debate. Moreover, said dictionaries do not cover recent material, and even the search for a historic quote often yields no result. Therefore, it seems preferable to rely on the potential average hearer’s knowledge. But then, how could we capture this type of competence? Not all hearers, be they members of parliament or not, do recognise a given quote as such, nor will they all trace it back to the same origin. For instance, when a deputy characterises the Russian system of election fraud as a real *sprut* ‘octopus’, he simply uses a conventional metaphor which in Soviet propaganda from the twenties up to Xruščev served as a frequent derogatory marker and cannot count as a quote. A more recent association, however, evokes the Italian Mafia film *La Piovra*, which was literally translated as *Sprut*.<sup>9</sup> This would have to be treated as a quote reactivating an old metaphor.

In general, one should seek to establish filters in order to prevent an inundation of weakly justified quotations. For instance, if deputies use expressions such as “Pandora’s box”, “Augean stables”, “Gordian knot” or “to nurture a snake in one’s bosom”, one may argue that they are connected with a mythological preceding text. The latter is, however, presumably not fully accessible to most speakers. In this respect, the present study adopts a minimalist approach. Consequently, such cases are treated as conventional metaphors with a mythological

<sup>8</sup> See <http://inosmi.ru/untitled/20020509/143717.html#ixzz2vbII1SS5>, Last access 6.4.2014.

<sup>9</sup> This association was suggested by my student assistant Galina Brunner.

background, but excluded from the list in Section 2.2. In a similar way, the above-mentioned octopus example was left out.

Even in the remaining cases, the identification of the source is often non-trivial, as may be shown by the following example:

- (9) Когда министр, как говорится, “ля-ля-ля” и “тра-ля-ля” – много вопросов.  
[When the minister, as one says, does “la-la-la” and “tra-la-la”, this raises many questions.] (Kolomejcev N.V., KPRF, 26.12.2008)

Although the marker *kak govoritsja* ‘as one says’ already points to a figurative reading and the interjections have been put in quotation marks by the editor of the transcript, hearers are still at a loss when trying to retrieve the desired interpretation: they will probably think of an uninspired refrain of a song or just incomprehensible babbling. In both cases we would already have to posit a quotation of another discourse (pop music or baby talk). If the hearers have, however, spent their youth in Russia, they might as well associate these words with the animated film *Alisa v Zazerkal’e* (‘Through the Looking-Glass’) with the two brothers *Traljala* ‘Tweedledum’ and *Truljalja* ‘Tweedledee’; moreover, their names serve as a refrain accompanying Alice’s dance with the brothers. Would such a decipherment alter the ultimate interpretation of the deputy’s utterance? Certainly not on the denotational level, since in both ways the minister’s words are characterised as nonsensical, but the absurd connotations associated with the quote and their ridiculous effect add a whole new dimension. This example illustrates the researcher’s dilemma: hearers may according to their cultural background, their imagination etc. associate divergent origins with one and the same wording, and more than that, they may even admit two or more competing interpretations. Only extensive empirical surveys could determine which of these prevails in the given case.

The fact that animated childrens’ films are indeed used as a source of mocking quotations is shown by the next example, which refers to election fraud:

- (10) Помните старый советский мультфильм “38 попугаев”, там один персонаж говорил, что в попугаях он длиннее? Да, в мандатах ваш результат “длиннее”, чем по уровню поддержки избирателей, но в чём секрет всех этих “излишних” мандатов?  
[Remember the old Soviet animated film “38 parrots”? Where one character says that he is longer in terms of parrots? Well, in terms of votes your result is “longer” than your support from the electorate would suggest, but what is the secret of all these “superfluous” votes?] (Obuxov S.P., KPRF, 13.9.2013)

In general, the importance of animated films (mostly of Soviet origin) in Russian culture can hardly be overstated; some of them, e.g. *Prostokvašino* or *Nu pogodi!* 'Just You Wait!' provided a multitude of winged words (for the definition of this term see below). Since many of them are based on literary works, one could consider establishing a separate category 'animated film or literature' which would comprise not only *Alice in Wonderland*, but also the popular novel *Dvenadcat' stul'ev* 'Twelve chairs' and its no less popular film adaptations.

From these observations one may conclude that the overview of sources to be presented below is not always airtight in that certain assignments to one or the other origin may be controversial. Moreover, certain categories have fuzzy boundaries. This holds in particular for 'winged words' (*krlyatyje slova* in Russian, *Geflügelte Worte* in German), a category which according to The Great Soviet Encyclopedia (1979) may be defined as "widely used apt words, figurative expressions, sayings of historical figures, short quotations, and names of mythological or literary figures that have become part of common usage".<sup>10</sup> This definition should be narrowed down by excluding mere proper names; moreover, the term "figurative expressions" needs a specification since it also encompasses metaphors, metonymies and the like. On the other hand, it should be added that users may be only vaguely aware of a quotation (which separates this category from proverbs and popular sayings) without being able to identify the original author. This holds e.g. for the example *sovershenstvu net predela* 'there is no limit to perfection', which is attested in my sample and may be, according to some authors, traced back to Socrates, whereas others attribute it to Cicero or even Nietzsche. In a similar vein, speakers do no longer feel the link between the set phrase *My universitetov ne končali* 'We have not finished any universities', and Vas'kin's film *Sledstvie vedut znatoki*, which provides the original source; they often erroneously attribute the wording to Mixail Bulgakov's *Sobač'e serdce* ('A dog's heart'), where it does not occur.

The joking idiom *Gitler kaput* 'Hitler is kaput (beaten-up)' meaning roughly 'it's all lost' is attributed to various sources ranging from the famous Soviet broadcast presenter Levitan and the German general Paulus to anonymous German or even Italian soldiers who surrendered to the victorious Soviet Army; the real author will probably never be known.<sup>11</sup> Even the authorship of much more recent quotes may escape the audience. For instance, this holds true for the formula *žuliki i vory* 'swindlers and thieves', now a universally known denotation

<sup>10</sup> <http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Winged+Words>. The term is firmly established in Russian and German scientific tradition, but less so in English where it seems to be closer to its Greek (Homeric) origin and thus limited to classical philology, Last access: 8.2. 2016.

<sup>11</sup> See <http://inosmi.ru/untitled/20020509/143717.html#ixzz2vbII1SS5>. Last access 8.4.2014.

of the ruling party ER. It was also used by deputy Ponomarëv on July 13, 2012 when addressing the State Duma by *Uvažаемые жулики и воры!* ‘Dear swindlers and thieves!’. The formula was coined by the country’s leading oppositional blogger Aleksej Naval’nyj, and although this link is most likely no longer felt by many speakers, the Duma deputies are most certainly aware of it.

All this boils down to the statement that winged words constitute a kind of cemetery for various kinds of former individually attributable quotes which have become stock expressions. In the classification to be presented below they are located between literary, film, political and scientific quotes and proverbs but should not overlap with any of these categories. Pragmatically, they function in the same way as proverbs and popular sayings by triggering contextually appropriate implicatures. It would, however, not be advisable to merge winged words and proverbs since they differ semantically in more than one respect (reference to a single event vs. implicit conditional structure, individual experience vs. folk wisdom, etc.). Moreover, winged words may consist of one single word form: the neologism *Pexting* ‘Pekhting’, phonetically reminiscent of *petting* and coined by A. Naval’nyj to ridicule the head of the Ethic committee of the Duma Aleksej Pextin, whom he accused of owning two undeclared real estate properties in Florida worth 2.5 million USD,<sup>12</sup> has long since become an Internet-meme and is nowadays considered a winged expression.<sup>13</sup>

Another term that needs specification is *allusion*. Unlike the English term, which may indirectly refer either to a verbal object or an entire situation, the Russian counterpart *alljuzija* is always bound to intertextuality, while the term denoting indirect reference to a situation existing in the external world (and hence not falling under our understanding of quotations) is *namëk*.<sup>14</sup> The difference may be illustrated by the following excerpt:

- (11) У нас всего пять солдат на один километр государственной границы, а в Минобороны ещё долго будут вспоминать, как кошмарный сон, “дам с собачками” от Сердюкова!

[We have only five soldiers per kilometer of the national frontier. And people at the Ministry of Defence will remember Serdjukov’s “ladies with lapdogs” for a long time, like a nightmare!]

(Kolomijcev N.V., KPRF, 21.06.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

<sup>12</sup> Naval’nyj’s revelation of these illegal possessions eventually forced Pextin to resign from his post in the Duma on 20.2.2013.

<sup>13</sup> “выражение крылатое запустили (Васильев имел в виду интернет-мем «пектинг»)”. See [http://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2013/04/26\\_a\\_5281313.shtml](http://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2013/04/26_a_5281313.shtml). Last access 8.4.2014.

<sup>14</sup> For a definition of this term see Baranov 2007: 215–218.

The mention of the former defence minister Serdjukov, who was dismissed by Putin because he had transformed the ministry into a kind of personal harem, functions as a *naměk*.<sup>15</sup> Could the description of the inhabitants of this harem as *damy s sobačkami* count as an allusion? Most authors agree that an allusion serves as a covert or indirect reference, which is not the case with Čexov's well-known short story. A reliable candidate for such an indirect reference would be a distorted or dismembered version of an existing quote, title, character etc. The following example meets this condition:

- (12) Это трусливая последняя цивилизация, загнивающая, умирающая. Они потому в стаю, в кучу и собрались – Евросоюз. Вы что, думаете, они от радости вместе? Просто *умирать веселее вместе*, по отдельности им грустно, вот они и собрались вместе в свой новый, так сказать, колхоз политический европейский.  
 [This is a cowardly last civilisation, rotten and dying. Therefore they gathered in a flock, the European Union. Do you really think they are together for fun? It simply is more pleasant to die together, as individuals they grieve, therefore they united in that new European political Kolkhoz.] (Žirinovskij, 25.8.2008, Emphasis mine D.W.)

This speaker probably alludes to the popular film adaption of the (considerably less known) novel *Gorjačij sneg* 'Hot snow' by Jurij Bondarev, where we find the following utterance:

- (13) Лошадей твоих побили — пойдешь ко мне в расчет. *Рядом умирать будем*. — Уханов усмехнулся. — *Веселее...* А может, еще и попляшем!  
 [Your horses were killed, so come to me for the settlement of accounts. We will die together. — Uханov smiled. — It's more cheerful... May be, we will even dance.] (<http://glfr.ru/klassiki-i-sovremenniki/jurij-bondarev/gorjachij-sneg-glavi-1120.html>; Last access: 8.2. 2016 Emphasis mine D.W.)

This association is all the more plausible as the plot of Bondarev's novel describes an episode during the battle of Stalingrad, whereas deputy Žirinovskij refers to Russia's war with Georgia. The ironical note of his allusion is reinforced by the fresh metaphor "new political collective farm" denoting the European Union. The allusion may as well immediately follow the original wording: this happens in the example where a communist deputy attacks Žirinovskij by quoting first the proverb *slovo – vorobej* 'A word is a sparrow' and then characterising Žirinovskij's speech as *vorona s rasstroennym želudkom* 'a crow with a disordered stomach'

---

15 Another *naměk* is triggered by the phrasing *glotatel' galstukov* 'swallower of ties' used by a deputy on 22.8.2008. This alluded to Georgia's former premier Saakašvili, who during a TV interview out of nervousness began to chew on his tie.

(see Anderson, this volume). In general, it seems to be a sound assumption that allusions tend to serve a parodistic purpose, as in the following example.

- (14) Закон написан по известному принципу: чему учить, мне всё равно, но вот ЕГЭ сдавать обязан.  
[The bill is written according to the well-known principle: I don't care what they're supposed to learn, but you/they are obliged to take the Unified State Exam.] (Smolin O. N. KPRF, 14.11.2007, Emphasis mine D.W.)

The Russian wording mimics a quote stemming from the poet Nikolaj Alekseevič Nekrasov: *poëtom možeš' ty ne byt', no graždaninom byt' objazan* 'You need not be a poet, but you are obliged to be a (good) citizen'. Note that while Smolin's wording does not show many correspondences with the original, its lyrical structure (number of syllables) coincides exactly with Nekrasov's verse. Since the formal transformations of quotations will be the object of a separate study, allusions were not included in the table below as a distinct category.

Finally, our sample contains not only authentic, but also fictitious quotations, ascribed for example to the enemy (the press, the US etc.), but also the own electorate. On the time axis, such quotes may thus refer to past or else anticipate future speech events.

2.2 Different types of sources: an overview

After all these terminological caveats the overview of the different sources may now be presented. It is based on a total of 298 quotations (tokens) stemming from 35 sessions of the State Duma in the period from 4.9.2007 to 20.9.2013 (currently [October 2015], the sample comprizes more than 500 quotations).<sup>16</sup> The composition of this sample is shown in table 1.

Table 1: types of sources

politicians	35
scientists	20
dictionaries, encyclopedias	2

<sup>16</sup> The sessions were selected according to the following criteria: seven were partly devoted to extremely controversial issues 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 was dominated by routine matters.

law	6
fairy tales + similes	8
proverbs	41
winged words	16
fictional literature	38
film or literature	3
film	15
Press	25
TV	26
radio	3
animated film	3
songs	9
Works of art	1
Internet: blogs, social media	5
slogans	12
jokes	4
biblisms	8
antiquity	7
unknown source	3
“the voice of the people“	8
total	298

These results are remarkable in several respects. To begin with, folklore prevails over literature: proverbs (14%), fairy tales (3%) and popular jokes (1%) together sum up to 18% of the whole bulk, whereas literary fiction yields 13%, to which may be added the hybrid category ‘literature and/or film’ (1%) and part of the winged words (5%; but recall that this category also contains sayings coined by politicians and scientists). Most of the proverbs represent traditional folk wisdom, whereas modern sayings as *Dva jurista – tri mnenija* ‘two lawyers, three opinions’ belong to the exceptions. For similes see Example 6.

As for the composition of the literary quotes, the overwhelming majority (30 out of 36 examples) involve Russian sources, mainly the classics of the 19th century such as Gogol’ (4 references, among which three to the ‘Dead Souls’), Lermontov, Puškin, Dostoevskij and others. The following paraphrase of a sentence from Solženicyn’s novel *Odin den’ v žizni Ivana Denisoviča* ‘One day in the life of Ivan Denisovič’ serves to characterise the narrow limits of budget policy:

- (15) мы настолько зарегламентировали бюджетополучателей, что, условно говоря, шаг вправо, шаг влево – это уже расстрел.  
 [we have regulated the budget receivers so much, that one step to the right, one to the left, so to speak, already means the execution.] (Storgin S. I., KPRF, 13.3.2012<sup>17</sup>)

Foreign sources include Voltaire, Rousseau and Conan Doyle. The frequent citation of Krylov's fables (6 examples) is obviously due to the strong position of this author in the traditional school curriculum. The following quote denounces the prosecution's unlucky attempt to convict the oppositional deputy Gudkov, who eventually was excluded from the Duma because of alleged illegal business affairs:

- (16) Знаете, получается аргументация такая: “Ты виноват уж тем, что хочется мне кушать”, — помните, у Крылова в басенке?  
 [You know, the argument runs as follows: “You are guilty by the mere fact that I am hungry”, you remember [this] from Krylov's fable?] (Drapeko E.G., SR, 14.9.2012)

Later during this session, this fragment was quoted by the accused himself. The frequency of quotes from fables is perfectly in line with the preference for fairy tales, animated films and reference to such works of children's literature as Čukovskij's *Doktor Ajbolit*. All this evokes childish imagery which may well constitute a quirk of Russian parliamentary discourse.

Literary fiction is outnumbered by mass media (18%), with equal shares for the press (9%) and TV (9%), whereas Radio broadcasting provides only for 1%. This huge portion illustrates the often-evoked symbiosis of parliament (or politics in general) and modern mass media. A closer look at the composition of the different groups reveals an even more intimate relationship: more than half of all references to TV broadcasts and one third of the replies to press commentaries focus on the unequal coverage of the presidential electoral campaign and the insufficient coverage of parliamentary debates. Not surprisingly, such comments tend to conglomerate in corresponding sessions: for instance, six comments were found in two sessions immediately preceding the presidential elections (2/15/08, 3/13/12). They illustrate one of the permanent topics of oppositional speeches, namely electoral fraud, which is a main source of frustration (Weiss 2013: 215 f., 2015: 166–172). The following global assessment puts the problem in a nutshell:

---

17 The original version has *Шаг вправо, шаг влево – считается побег, конвой открывает огонь без предупреждения!* ‘One step to the right, one to the left, and the convoy will fire without warning’.

- (17) Федеральные телеканалы, контролируемые государством или друзьями Путина по кооперативу “Озеро”, весь предвыборный период пели осанну одному кандидату. Путину было отдано с начала кампании 70 процентов телеэфира — шестьдесят шесть часов, а у Зюганова за два месяца — ровно в десять раз меньше. [...] Мы увидели и, что ещё хуже, оплатили из своих карманов, наверное, самое масштабное и самое безвкусное в истории реалити-шоу “Кого сегодня ещё спас Путин”. Только в путинской России стали возможны сфальсифицированные митинги в защиту сфальсифицированных выборов.  
*[The federal TV channels, which are controlled by the government and Putin’s buddies from the company “Ozero”, sang Hosanna only for one candidate during the whole preelection period. Initially, 70 percent of broadcasting time was devoted to Putin: 66 hours, whereas Zjuganov received exactly ten times less during those two months. [...] We watched and, what is even worse, payed from our own pockets, for the most oversized and tasteless reality show in all of history entitled “Whom did Putin rescue today”. Only in Putin’s Russia have made-up demonstrations in favour of made-up elections become possible.]* (Raškin V. F., KPRF, 13.3.2012)

A different but related source for “frustrative” speech acts is the TV coverage of Duma sessions, often judged insufficient by deputies (Weiss 2013: 230–233). In other words: the favourite topics picked up in the deputies’ speeches are self-referential in a broader sense, they concern mediated parliamentary and governmental activities.

The category “political quotes” (12%) encompasses both Russian and non-Russian authors, the ratio between the former and the latter being approximately 2:1. Contemporary references (notably to Putin) prevail over historical ones. According to the party affiliation of the speaker, such quotes may either mark approval or disapproval of the primary author’s words. The latter stance is evident in a deputy’s comment on the unexpected restitution of direct elections of governors and mayors:

- (18) Я сразу же вспомнил цитату Дмитрия Анатольевича Медведева, год назад он сказал (цитирую точно): “Губернаторские выборы не будут возвращены ни сейчас, ни через сто лет.”  
*[I immediately remembered a quote by D.A.Medvedev, a year ago he said (I am citing exactly): “the governors’ elections will not be reestablished – not now, not in a hundred years.”]* (Beljakov, A.V., SR, 28.2.2012)

The underlying comparison simply contrasts Medvedev’s prediction with today’s reality. Historical pre-revolutionary and non-Russian sources tend to be evaluated positively. One sentence coined by the former prime-minister Černomyrdin has gained such popularity that it now functions as a winged word whose exact source may no longer be known to many users: *My xoteli kak lučše, no polučilos’*

*kak vseгда* ‘We wanted to do it as best as we could, but it turned out as always’. In my collection it is cited no less than three times.

The neighbouring category “slogans” (4%) consists of heterogeneous material. It embraces prerevolutionary, Soviet and current (oppositional) quotes, one slogan from the Syrian war (*Alavitov – na kladbišče, xristian – v Bejrut* ‘Alevites to the cemetery, Christians to Beirut’) and one from an advertisement (*Malyj biznes – opora Rossii* ‘Small businesses are Russia’s backbone’). In the next example, an inscription from a Nazi concentration camp depicts the possible future of Russia:

- (19) А потом мы с вами увидим небо в клеточку и надпись на воротах лагеря “Каждому своё” на непонятном языке. Ничего не напоминает?  
 [And afterwards we will look at the sky from behind a grid and see an inscription on the gate of the prison camp saying “To each what he deserves” in an uncomprehensible language. Doesn’t this remind you of anything?]  
 (Ivanov S. V., LDPR, 20.2.2013)

See also the Soviet slogan in Example 29 below. The group of quotes by scientists constitutes 7% of the total and shows a striking preference for the Russian Academy of Sciences: eight quotes are centered around this institution. This is partly due to the government’s recent reform project which seeks to deprive the Academy of its property in real estate; this bill triggered a whole wave of solidarity addresses both from Russia and abroad, some of which are quoted by deputies during the sessions on 3.7.2013 and 11.9.2013. Among the citations one even finds a satirical poem written by the member of the Academy A. Gorodnickij (11.9.2013). Due to the controversial issue, we find not only praise for the Academy, but also extremely critical and even offending voices, as in the Examples 20 and 24 below. During another debate, a deputy establishes a link between this institution’s protest letter from some members of the Academy against the intrusion of Orthodox religious doctrine into the state sphere and the open letter from some intellectuals who ten years before had encouraged President El’cin to break the Duma’s resistance by force:

- (20) Письмо десяти академиков напоминает знаменитое обращение деятелей культуры в октябре 93-го года, призывавшее Ельцина к расправе над своими согражданами. Тогда Ельцин расстрелял парламент.  
 [The letter from ten members of the academy is reminiscent of the famous address of cultural activists who in October 1993 appealed to El’cin to take revenge on his fellow citizens. Back then El’cin shot the parliament.]  
 (Krutov A. N., SR – Rodina, 4.9.2007)

The remaining quotes belong to such diverse authors, as Frédérique Joliot-Curie and Dmitrij Mendeleev, the historian Ključevskij, the philologist Lixačev, the economist Livšic, and Karl Marx.

Cinematographic citations (5%) stem almost exclusively from Russian (Soviet and post-Soviet) sources, the only exception being “Slumdog Millionaire”, which is interpreted ideologically as a critique of India’s backwardness from Hollywood’s perspective. Example 5 already illustrated the ironical use of a quote from the Soviet film comedy *Kavkazskaja plennica* ‘Kidnapping, Caucasian Style’.

Quotations from songs (3%) are almost evenly divided in hits from pop-music (five examples) and from the military and patriotic domain (four examples). The latter are triggered by military topics, whereas the former occur in manifold non-specific contexts, as in the following:

- (21) Получается, как в знаменитой песне Аллы Пугачёвой: папа, купивший автомобиль и севший за руль, даже велосипед обогнать не может. Почему? Да потому что нет воли правительства! Фракция «СПРАВЕДЛИВАЯ РОССИЯ», конечно же, поддержит эту здравую идею, но на душе остаётся какой-то печальный осадок. Коллеги, давайте хоть велосипеды-то обгонять, образно говоря!  
*[It’s like in the famous song by Alla Pugačeva: a father who has bought a car and sits behind the steering wheel doesn’t even manage to overtake a bike. Why? Well, because the government is not willing! The fraction “A just Russia” will of course support this sound idea, but deep in their heart a bit of sadness remains. Dear colleagues, let’s at least overtake the bikes, metaphorically speaking!]* (Nilov O.A., SR, 3.7.2013)

This paraphrase of Pugačeva’s hit *Papa kupil avtomobil* ‘Father bought a car’ is meant to incite the House to exploit the tools available (the car = bill in question) properly to achieve at least a modest goal. In a different tune, the next speaker draws from the criminal folklore of the twenties by quoting a fragment from *Rostov-papa! Odessa-mama šlet privet* ‘Daddy Rostov! Odessa Mama sends her greetings’:

- (22) Я в детстве слышал дурацкую фразу: “Одесса-мама, Ростов-nana”. ... Вот прошло шестьдесят лет — теперь я понимаю, что это такое: это самый преступный, самый грязный, самый криминальный город в Российской Федерации! И «ЕДИНОЙ РОССИИ» не стыдно говорить, что они там победили! Вы победили в криминальном городе — значит, вы с этим криминалом, с этими бандитами!  
*[In my childhood I heard that silly sentence: “Mama Odessa, daddy Rostov”. ... Fifty years have passed, now I understand what this means: that’s the most criminal, the most dirty town in the Russian Federation! And ER is not ashamed to say that they won there! You won in a criminal town – this means that you are in cahoots with those bandits!]* (Žirinovskij, LDPR, 20.9.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

By pointing out Rostov’s role as the leading criminal center of Russia, the speaker seeks to discredit the ruling party’s fabulous election results in that city.

Legal sources (2%) range from the Russian Constitution to the following formulation, which by its absurdity discredits its authors, a local Muscovite tribunal (the speaker is the same as in Example 5 above):

- (23) А вот когда говорят, что на территории, которая находится напротив Музея изобразительных искусств имени Пушкина, работают автомойка, шиномонтаж, магазин без кассовых чеков и так далее, то есть с нарушением всех правил торговли, Хамовнический суд принимает решение, которое вообще стало перлом (это новое определение торговли), — что это вообще не торговля и не оказание услуг, а знаете, что это? Зачитываю дословно: “Взаимное безвозмездное одаривание” (оживление в зале), понятно? Вот такой у нас самый справедливый суд в мире!

*[And when they say that on the area in front of the Pushkin Museum there is a car wash, a tyre fitting service, a shop without proof of payments and all that, which means they work against all rules of trade, the Xamovniki court takes a decision that has become a pearl (it's a new definition of trade), – that this is not a trade at all and not a service, but you know what? I am quoting verbatim: “a mutual gratuitous donation” (audience gets animated), you see? That's how it is, our fairest justice system in the world!]*

(Ivanov S.V., LDPR, 20.2.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

As can be seen by the transcribers' remark “animation”, this quotation is indeed judged as outrageous by the audience. Note the ironical introductory qualifications “new definition of trade” and “pearl”. This ironical note is boosted by the final exclamation, which resumes the quote from the Soviet film comedy known already from Example 5.

Quotations from Internet sources are not numerous in my sample (less than 2%), but due to the uncensored character of the new social media, we find the most revealing examples here. The following stems from facebook and is related to the discussion about the future fate of the Academy of Sciences and its buildings:

- (24a) С ними и Кох. Напомню, что это соратник Чубайса, бывший вице-премьер, занимавшийся приватизацией, который написал в “Фейсбуке”, что в академии надо “всё сжечь напалмом, там все трупы, давно пора разогнать эту шарашкину контору старых маразматиков”. Сейчас он пишет Ливанову: “Будут обвинять в покушении на святыни. Господи, как достали эти козлы!”

*[Kox is also with them. I recall that he was a brother-in-arms of Čubajs, the former vice-president in charge of the privatisation, who wrote on Facebook, that “in the Academy one should burn everything with napalm, there are only cadavres there, it's about high time to expulse the whole camp of decrepit old men.” Now he writes to Livanov: “They will accuse us of an assault on [their] sanctuaries. God, are those assholes driving me mad!”]*

(Kašin B.S., KPRF, 2.7.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

This quotation serves uniquely to discredit its source, a declared enemy of the Academy's possessions. If we add a subsequent fragment of this post which the deputy probably considered too indecent to be quoted, the aggressive note becomes even more obvious:

- (24b) За что не возьмешься – так сразу святыня. Заебали, язычники!  
 [Whatever you want to criticise, it's always a sacred space. They are fucking annoying, those gossipmongers.]  
 (www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story\_fbi  
 d=614048075295588&id=100000712037223, Last access: 23.3.2014, Emphasis mine D.W.)

As for style, Mr Kox would surely not win an award: *dostali* and *kozly* are marked vulgarisms, and *zaebali* belongs to *Mat*, a highly stigmatised and socially sanctioned variety of swearwords. The use of the latter expression could according to Russian Administrative Law already earn him a fine for swearing on public ground (KoAP RF, stat'ja 20.1)<sup>18</sup>, whereas *kozël* [litt. 'he-goat'] probably figures on all lists of indecent expressions used by Russian courts and thus meets the requirements mentioned by the Penal Code for an "offence" (UK RF, stat'ja 130)<sup>19</sup>. Note that the author himself is not a member of the State Duma and therefore not protected by parliamentary immunity.

The category "voice of the people" (3% of the total) is very heterogeneous. On one hand, it comprises complaints from the electorate addressing individual deputies that could occur in any other parliament. On the other hand, we also find quotations that again discredit their author, for instance their insufficient command of the Russian language. The most famous example was provided by a young girl named Sveta from the provincial town Ivanovo, who among the achievements of the ruling party ER mentioned that 'the population started dressing *more better*'. Due to the grammatical mistake (double marking of the comparative), this quote has gained nationwide popularity: the clip (see youtube.com/watch?v=24XB0Wkmpw) has already reached more than 4 million views. Deputy Ivanov, known already from Examples 5 and 22, did not fail to pick up this quote in another ironical statement:

<sup>18</sup> KoAP = *Kodeks RF ob administrativnykh pravonarushenijach* [Code of administrative trespasses of the Russian Federation] <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/901807667>. Last access: 8.4.2014.

<sup>19</sup> UK = *Ugolovnyj kodeks Rossijskoj Federacii* [Criminal code of the Russian Federation]. Moskva: IKC "Akademkniga", 2003.

- (25) И всё это не замедлило сказаться на благосостоянии нашего населения: как сказала Света из Иванова, “население стало более лучше одеваться” — все помните, да? Замечательно!  
*[And all this did not fail to have an immediate impact on the prosperity of our society: as Sveta from Ivanovo put it, “the population started dressing more better” – you all remember that, do you? Remarkable!]*  
 (S.V.Ivanov, LDPR, 20.2.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

Since the surrounding context of this speech abounds in ironical assessments of the existing political situation in the country and the government’s economic failures, this quotation is double-targeted: it not only denounces the incompetence of its individual author, but discredits the entire party whose adherent Sveta is. One is tempted to call this an *argumentum ex negativa auctoritate*. The fact that this young woman now runs her own TV show is sarcastically paralleled with the presumptive destiny of a woman who denigrated the oppositional activist Udalcov in the next fragment:

- (26) А куда вы дели эту провокаторшу из Ульяновска, которая Удальцова оговорила, лжесвидетельствуя на процессе? Она тоже придёт на какой-нибудь телеканал и будет вести программу, как вот эта Света из Иванова, ...  
*[And where did you put that provocatrix from Ul’janovsk that denounced Udalcov by giving false testimony during the trial? Will she also be hired by a TV channel and work as a presenter like that Sveta from Ivanovo?]*  
 (G.Gudkov, SR, 14.9.2012)

Another voice from the people is rendered by the court’s enfant terrible Žirinovskij, who possibly quotes a dialogue with a former girlfriend:

- (27) Выходит депутат Николаева и так это походя как бы делает в сторону нашей фракции замечание: “И ваших избирателей это касается”. Скрытый смысл какой? Ей хочется, чтобы всё внимание было на неё — она же, кроме того что депутат, ещё и женщина. Но насильно мил не будешь, вы понимаете? (Оживление, шум в зале.) Когда вы ждёте, просите... Мне в жизни пришлось столкнуться с этим: “Чего ты мне ничего не даришь?”. — да не хочу я тебе дарить ничего, не хочу! (Оживление в зале.) “Подари цветы, подари что-то!”. — что это за вымогательство?! Неужели кому-то приятно, когда дарят, потому что сам попросил?  
*[Deputy Nikolaeva takes the floor and on the way to the tribune makes a remark in the direction of our fraction: “This concerns your electorate, too.” What is the hidden sense (of this remark)? She wants our whole attention on her – she is not only a deputy, but also a woman. But you can’t be nice when they force you, you know? (audience gets animated, noise). [...]. In my life I’ve come across similar situations: “Why don’t you give me any presents?” – “But I don’t want to give you anything, no I don’t!” (audience gets animated) – “Give me flowers, give me something!”- What sort of blackmail is this? [...].]*

(Žirinovskij V. V., LDPR, (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tnJ06jBLvuQ>), 15.2.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

The speaker's sexist interpretation of an utterance made by his fellow deputy Nikolaeva is seemingly paralleled by the (authentic or fictitious) utterance of a woman from his own entourage: both are said to suffer from a lack of attention. The quotation serves to corroborate his point (you cannot gain somebody's attention through coercion) and to additionally ridicule deputy Nikolaeva's behaviour.

The category "works of art" is represented by one single quotation of the title of a painting by the socialist realist painter Pavel Rešetnikov:

- (28) Или господин министр понимает, что, если он придёт сюда, у него опять будет очередная двойка, *как на известной нашей картине?*  
[Or does the minister understand that, if he shows up here, he will get another "F", as in the well known painting?] (Cernyšëv A. G., LDPR, 4.9.2007, Emphasis mine D.W.)

The picture shows an unsuccessful schoolboy who returns home defeated and is welcomed only by the dog, while his mother and sister look disappointed. What is relevant here is only the title *Opjat' dvojka* 'Again an F', which is metaphorically related to the minister's presumed failure had he appeared before the House. The example illustrates a point made in the beginning of Section 2: the metaphor itself conveys the main message (bad mark = the minister's failure), but the identification of the exact source adds satirical power since the target is belittled by the comparison to a schoolboy who has flunked his exam.

There remain two special types that deserve an illustration. Some quotes allow for a *double assignment* of the quotation. This happens in the following racist context:

- (29) Мы прощаем долги многим странам: Африке прощаем, Кубе прощаем, многим другим государствам мира прощаем, себе — опять в последнюю очередь, как в советское время: *всё для братьев!* Обезьяны с пальмы слезли, сказали, что будут строить режим, так сказать, коммунистический, ...  
[We exempt many countries from their debts: Africa, Cuba, many other countries of the world, [but] ourselves we exempt again last, as in Soviet times: all for our brothers! The monkeys climbed down from their palmtree and said they would build a communist regime, ...]  
(Ovsjannikov V. A., LDPR, 22.2.2013, Emphasis mine D.W.)

The formula "All for our brothers" indeed evokes a Soviet slogan, but since the subsequent utterance refers to monkeys, it is also reminiscent of the popular designation of animals as "our smaller brothers" (*naši men'sie brat'ja*).

Sometimes, we are dealing with a *double-layered* source, cf.

- (30) Подтверждает это и ответ Владимира Владимировича Путина на вопрос о том, какие журавли полетели, а какие нет, — он ответил так: “Действи тельно, не все журавли полетели сразу, но не полетели только слабые журавли”, — подчеркнув этим, что якобы здравомыслящая часть народа с ним.  
 [This is confirmed by V.V. Putin’s answer to the question which cranes flew south and which didn’t. He answered: “Indeed, not all cranes flew at once, but only the weakest ones did not fly”, thus pointing out that the allegedly reasonable part of the population supports him.]  
 (N. F. Rjabov, KPRF, 14.9.2012, Emphasis mine D.W.)

This quotation has an unusually complex biography. The speaker is repeating Putin’s answer given to a TV presenter who had asked him to comment on a quote from Ksenija Sobčak’s tweet. The latter, an “it-girl” and oppositional TV star, had characterised the outcome of the presidential election with the following metaphor: “Not all cranes flew with him”, thus alluding to Putin’s famous endeavour to show a flock of cranes the way south by plane. The whole communicative chain encompasses four speech events: K. Sobčak – TV presenter – Putin – Deputy Rjabov; the latter interprets Putin’s words by deciphering the metaphor and assigning a negative truth value to this assertion through the adverb *jakoby*, ‘allegedly’.

Summarising this section, our overview has revealed an astonishingly broad range of different types of sources. The specific traits of the Russian case will become more salient when sufficient data from other parliaments (notably the Polish *Sejm* and the Czech *Sněmovná*) will be available.<sup>20</sup> But even now one can point out several preferences that may turn out to be Russian “quirks”: the strong position of folk wisdom and the high prestige of nineteenth and twentieth century literature belong to them as well as the popularity of Soviet film comedies<sup>21</sup> and, last but not least, the impact of children’s imagery (animated films, literature). On the other hand, it seems noteworthy that Soviet slogans, songs and other elements of the official Soviet discourse play an insignificant role, even among members of the KPRF. As in the case of Krylov’s fables and many other literary sources, the traditional Russian educational system with its strong bias for verbal culture makes itself felt.

<sup>20</sup> For a comparative analysis of Russian, German and English data from political interviews and blogs, see also Sivenkova (this volume).

<sup>21</sup> This preference is contrasted with the German bias for action movies in Krylova 2012, see <http://www.portalus.ru>, accessed 6.4.2014.

### 3 Frequency of quotes by individual deputies and parties

The frequency of xeno-quotations per session varies significantly. 20 or even more quotations during one session are not uncommon. Individual speakers sometimes deliver speeches containing up to five different quotations, as is the case with the communist O.N. Smolin on 20.6.2012 (cf. Weiss 2012: 66 f.) or with another communist, I.I. Nikitčuk, whose speech is analysed by R. Anderson (this volume). Quotations may be repeated either during the same turn and by the same speaker (cf. Examples 5 and 23), or by a subsequent speaker (cf. Example 16). The quote may remain unchanged as in the latter example, or else undergo a slight alteration as in the former case.

The duration of the speech is another parameter that influences the frequency: speakers that take the floor at the beginning of a daily session are offered extended speech time, which, when belonging to the opposition, they employ with relish to deliver an overall critique of existing shortcomings etc. This often leads to a higher rate of citations. Thus, deputy Ivanov, who is the author of Examples 5, 19, 23 and 25, speaks about ten minutes, which allows him to deliver six quotes. At the same, his speech contains no less than 42 ironic formulations. This corroborates the impression that implicit techniques, be they Gricean-based or not, often tend to cluster.

Another issue that deserves a closer look concerns the impact of controversial topics. On the basis of the sample at hand, one might risk the hypothesis that the frequency of quotations (as well as of other implicit strategies) increases with “hot topics”. For instance, the debate on the unprecedented and anti-constitutional exclusion of deputy Gudkov yields 28 quotations,<sup>22</sup> nine of which are used by the accused; the debate on Russia’s abstention during the debate of the International Security council on the Libya resolution (23.3.2011) triggered 32 quotations. The whole issue calls for a detailed quantitative analysis, which lies beyond the scope of this paper.

A brief look at the distribution of quotations among political fractions reveals a striking disproportion: whereas the numbers of quotes provided by the three oppositional parties reflect their relative strength in terms of seats in the State Duma, the ruling party ER is seriously underrepresented, as can be seen in the Table below:

---

**22** This figure does not include 10 legal documents referred to by the representatives of the public prosecution department.

Table 2: numbers of quotes by political fractions

party	quotations	seats
KPRF	32%	21%
SR	29%	14%
LDPR	24%	12%
ER	15%	53%

Of course, these figures are only of limited validity since the number of quotations should also be correlated with the respective frequency of speeches delivered by the members of all four parties, which, however, cannot be calculated here. It may be added that according to my observations, members of the ER are also far less prone to employ other implicit strategies, notably irony.

As for the correlation between types of sources and party membership, the LDPR shows a marked preference for proverbs (50% of all examples in this category), but never refers to scientists, whereas the SR slightly exceeds the KPRF in literary quotes and offers the most scientific sources. The communists take the lead in quotes from politicians, the press and television.

## 4 Open questions for further research

The sample under scrutiny invites a host of additional analyses that will be carried out in a separate study. The relevant criteria were already outlined in Weiss (2012). On a formal level, the different extent of the reproduction and the different ways of identifying the source distinguished in Section 1.2 should be accounted for: (i) is the quotation cited in full, partly or in paraphrased shape, or are we merely dealing with an allusion? (ii) Is the source identified by mention of the title, of the genre involved, the author, or the main character? These criteria are mainly indicative of the speaker’s assessment of the intellectual background of the audience.

The second group of criteria relates to the contextual embedding: (iii) is the genre announced, as was the case with the simile and the joke in Examples 6 and 7, respectively? (iv) Is the quote introduced by metatextual performative verbs such as ‘I quote’ or ‘I recall’, or by imperatives like ‘remember’? Here, we even find cases of the traditional *praeteritio* in rhetorics, namely ‘not to mention + quote’ (Weiss 2012: 770 f.). (v) Are there markers of comparison, e.g. ‘as in...’, ‘is reminiscent’ and the like? In making the intended comparison explicit, such clues are crucial for argumentative purposes. For the same reason, they do not lend themselves to a Gricean analysis.

The third group points to an evaluation of the source by the current speaker (vi). The latter may mark his or her attitude by an affirmative or negative (including ironical) characterisation preceding or following the quote itself (cf. “remarkable” in Example 25; “pearl” in 23; “silly” in 22 or “blackmail” in 27). In other cases, the disapproval is expressed by a subsequent rhetorical question (Weiss 2012: 70) or by lexically encoded evaluations in the surrounding context (cf. the appeal to El’cin to take revenge [*rasprava*] on his fellow citizens in 20). An interesting example is provided in (23) since the second quote “the fairest justice system in the world” ironically comments on the first, i.e. the Xamovniki court’s new definition of trade. In other contexts, no explicit marker is needed since the source discredits itself (cf. Medvedev’s futile prediction in 18 or Kox’s vulgar attacks against the Academy of Sciences in 24). On the other hand, we also find a multitude of uncontested authoritative sources such as Peter the Great, Chancellor Bismarck, the writer Karamzin etc., whose political statements serve as *argumentum ex auctoritate* (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 2008: 413–416; for quotations in political discourse, see also Constantinescu 2012: 265). As for those currently in power, notably president Putin, they constitute an authority for many deputies (not only from the ruling party!), whereas for others they provide a negative standard of comparison. The latter holds also for the former presidents Gorbačev and El’cin. And finally, due to Russian cultural context, a completely different authority is represented by folk wisdom, hence the abundance of proverbs, fairy tales and the like in our collection.

As may be seen from this little overview, what is often at stake in such evaluations is pragmatics, more precisely: (vii) the speaker’s self-positioning in the current political debate. Thus, by praising or criticising his source (the object of comparison), he takes a positive or negative stance towards other politicians, parties, the economic or social situation in the country, etc., in other words: the comparatum. It seems to be a fair assumption that disapproval will prevail over approval in the final statistics. The source may be coreferential with the adversary (Medvedev) or be his/her adherent (Sveta from Ivanovo). However, in many cases it simply exhibits behaviour to be paralleled with the present adversary, to mention but Žirinovskij’s “former girlfriend”.

Among the remaining pragmatic criteria, the sequential position (viii) of the present turn should be examined: is the given example part of an initial or reactive turn in a sense still to be defined? In the latter case, is it a counter or an expression of support, and how great is the distance from the initial turn? Does it function as a follow-up in the sense defined by Fetzer (2012)? And finally, does the utterance in question trigger a response? If so, does the latter refer to the source itself (e.g. by correcting its wording) or to its argumentative embedding, its polemical intention, etc.? Does it simply repeat the quote or evaluate it, present a counterargument?

All these criteria taken together will hopefully allow for a better functional assessment of quotations by reconstructing their argumentative input and describing their political (supportive or polemical) effects and ludic components.

## References

- Attardo, Salvatore. 1994. *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baranov, Anatolij Nikolaevič. 2007. *Lingvističeskaja ekspertiza teksta*. Moskva: Flinta.
- Bayley, Paul (ed.). 2004. *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bousfield, Derek. 2008. *Impoliteness in interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Burkhardt, Armin. 2003. *Das Parlament und seine Sprache: Studien zu Theorie und Geschichte parlamentarischer Kommunikation*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Chilton, Paul. 2004. *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Čmejrková, Světlá, and Jana Hoffmannová. 2012. Intertextuality as a means of positioning in a talk-show. In Lorda C.U., and Zabalbeascoa P. (eds.), *Spaces of polyphony*, 161–172. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Constantinescu, Mihaela. 2012. The Use of Quotations in the Romanian Parliamentary Discourse. In L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, M. Roibu, and M. V. Constantinescu (eds.), *Parliamentary Discourses across Cultures: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, 263–282. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Dušenko, Konstantin Vasil'evič. 1997. *Slovar' sovremennyx citat. 4300 xodjačix citat XX veka, ix istočniki, avtory, datirovka*. Moskva: Agraf.
- Ilie, Cornelia (ed.). 2010. *European parliaments under scrutiny*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Elistratov, Vladimir Stanislavovič. 1999. *Slovar' krylatyx slov (russkij kinematograf)*. Moskva. Russkie slovari.
- Fetzer, Anita. 2012. Quotations in monologic and dialogic political discourse. In Anita Fetzer, Elda Weizman & Elisabeth Reber (eds.), *Follow-ups across Discourse Domains: A Cross-cultural Exploration of their Form and Function*. Proceedings of the EFC strategic workshop, Würzburg (Germany), 31 May–2 June 2012, 72–86. Universität Würzburg: OPUS. <http://opus.bibliothek.uni-wuerzburg.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/6116> (accessed 6.4.2014).
- Grice, Herbert Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech arts*, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.
- Gruber, Helmut. 2012. Establishing intertextual references in Austrian parliamentary debates. A pilot study. In Anita Fetzer, Elda Weizman & Elisabeth Reber (eds.), *Follow-ups across Discourse Domains: A Cross-cultural Exploration of their Form and Function*. Proceedings of the EFC strategic workshop, Würzburg (Germany), 31 May–2 June 2012, 86–107. Universität Würzburg: OPUS. <http://opus.bibliothek.uni-wuerzburg.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/6116> (accessed 6.4.2014).
- Gusejnov. Gasan. 2003. *D.S.P. Materialy k russkomu slovarju obščestvenno-političeskogo jazyka XX veka*. Moskva: Tri kvadrata.

- Knjazev, Jurij Pavlovič. 2010. *Slovar' živyx krylatyx vyražnij russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Astrel'.
- Kotthoff, Helga. 2002. Irony, quotation, and other forms of staged intertextuality. Double or contrastive perspectivation in conversation. In Graumann, Karl Friedrich, and Werner Kallmeyer (eds.), *Perspective and Perspectivation in Discourse*, 201–229. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Krylova, Marija Nikolaeva. 2012. *Kino kak istočnik intertekstual'nosti. (Na materiale sravnitel'nyx konstrukcij)*. [http://www.portalus.ru/modules/linguistics/rus\\_readme.Php](http://www.portalus.ru/modules/linguistics/rus_readme.Php) (accessed 6.4.2014)
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2000. *Presumptive meanings: The Theory of Generalised Conversational Implicature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press Hay 2001.
- Perelman, Chaim and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. 2010.[1969] *The New Rhetoric. A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Raskin, Victor. 1986. *Semantics Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht/Boston: D. Reidel.
- Sivenkova, Marija. 2009. Otvety na voprosy v britanskich i rossijskich parlamentskich debatach. *Političeskaja lingvistika* 1(27). 124–131.
- Sivenkova, Maria. 2012. Metacommunication and intertextuality in British and Russian parliamentary answers. In Lorda Clara-Ubalдина, Zabalbeascoa Patrick (eds.), *Spaces of polyphony*, 129–160. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sivenkova, Maria. 2013. On the metapragmatics of British, German and Russian political questions and answers. In Anita Fetzer (ed.), *The Pragmatics of Political Discourse: Explorations across cultures*, 21–46. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson. 1995. *Relevance. Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Swales, John Malcolm. 1990. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in interaction*. London and New York: Longman.
- Thielemann, Nadine. 2010. Arguing by *anekdot* – jocular accounts in Russian media interaction. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 67. 185–215.
- Weiss, Daniel. 2012. Deputaty ljubjat citaty: ssylki na ksenoteksty v Gosdume. In Nina Rozanova (ed.), *Russkij jazyk segodnja: Problemy rečevogo obščeniya*, 64–75. Moskva: Flinta/Nauka.
- Weiss, Daniel. 2013. The Structure of Parliamentary Debates: the Case of the Russian Gosduma. In Nadine Thielemann & Petr Kosta (eds.), *Approaches to Slavic Interaction*, 215–237. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Weiss, Daniel. 2015. Xula v Gosdume. In: Ljudmila Fedorovna (ed.), *Xvala i xula v jazyke i komunikacii*. Sbornik statej, 163–186. Moskva: Izdatel'skij centr Rossijskogo gosudarstvennogo humanitarnogo universiteta.