

---

© Natalia N. BELOZEROVA

*naticbel@gmail.com*

UDC 802.0-73

### **POWER DISCOURSE AND THE CATEGORY OF LOCUS**

*SUMMARY.* This article is written to contribute to the topic «Power Discourse» (*Discours d'Autorité et de l'Autorité*) with the use of ecolinguistics research approaches. The author examines the semiolinguistic links between Power Discourse and the category of locus. To prove the hypothesis the author analyzes several texts from Shakespearean tragedies, from the trilogy of Alexey K. Tolstoy, as well as several lexemes from the Lord's Prayer in six language versions. The author scrutinizes semantic, etymological, metaphorical and traductological aspects of this semantic fusion. Methods of definition, etymological, seme, corpus, and conceptual as well as semiotic analyses are used to demonstrate the variants of the semantic fusion of power discourse and the category of locus. As a result the author proves that this semantic fusion can be regarded as a conceptual "UNIVERSAL". All the deviations in rendering this universal into different languages are caused by semantic insufficiency or semantic redundancy.

*KEY WORDS.* Power discourse, category of locus, seme, etymology, semiotic analysis, metaphor of up and down, the universal, semantic insufficiency, semantic redundancy

The link between power discourse and the category of locus is evident when we examine the semantic components of certain artifacts, the etymology of the lexemes that shape the semantic field of political discourse, metaphorical and metonymical expressions as well as several real and fictional events from a semiotic perspective. This link reveals itself in such nominations as "the political map of the world", in such metonymical expressions as "*The Kremlin*" denoting the Government of Russian Federation, "*The White House*" denoting the government of the USA [1], as well as in such metaphorical expressions as "*bulldogs under the rug*" ("*under-the rug — battle*"), denoting a concealed political scuffle. It is obvious that these examples expose the fusion of the two semes: that of political discourse and that of the locus (place) where this discourse develops. The examples of real and fictional events where such fusion is present can be traced, for instance, in works by William Shakespeare and in History (for instance, in the modern history of Russia). In this regard two cases are worthy of consideration.

Reading the opening scene of the tragedy "King Lear" we learn that Lear places himself in the centre of his realm and divides his realm into three, thus destroying the political centre, in fact, destroying his authority as a king or himself as a political man.

To consider an example from modern history revealing how the destruction of a political centre causes the loss of political power, we may cite “The Belovezhskiy Treaty” of the 8<sup>th</sup> December of 1991 which declared the establishment of the Union of Independent States (UIS) [2]. This treaty stated that “*The USSR as a subject of international law and a geopolitical reality ceases its existence*”. [3] As a consequence the authority of president Mikhail Gorbachev came to an end.

It is evident that in both cases a *political* locus (centre) is meant, i.e. the fusion of the two semes: that of political discourse and that of the locus (place) where this discourse develops.

An erroneous locus can destroy a political man (as well as a physical one). For instance, Polonius from the “Tragedy of Prince Hamlet” is killed when he hides behind the arras in the bedroom of the queen, in a place utterly unsuitable for a prime minister. Shouting “A rat?”, Hamlet with his rapier pierces both the arras and Polonius, sending the latter to the supper, where “he is eaten”. Modern Russian opposition leaders consciously or subconsciously choose for their actions streets and squares nearby the centers of political authority. As soon as any of these leaders in the heat of the protest mounts an unsuitable construction (locus), a fountain, for instance, his image of a power-seeker becomes ridiculous.

It seems that this semantic fusion is too apparent to trace and research any linguistic lacunas. Nevertheless, semantic, etymological, metaphorical and traductological aspects of this fusion cause a number of linguistic enigmas.

A first one is connected with the translation of the English word *kingdom* into other languages. We shall consider the two episodes from Shakespearean plays: (1) the opening scene from “The tragedy of King Lear”, mentioned above, and (2) the final scene of “The tragedy of Richard III”.

## Text 1

Original text	Translation into Russian	Translation into French	Translation into German
<p><i>LEAR.</i> Give me the map there. Know that we have divided In three our <b>kingdom</b>; and 'tis our fast intent To shake all <b>cares</b> and business from our age, [4]</p>	<p><i>Лир:</i> Подайте карту мне. Узнайте все: Мы разделили <b>край</b> наш на три части. Ярмо <b>забот</b> мы с наших дряхлых плеч [5] Подайте карту. Знайте: разделили Мы <b>королевство</b> на трое, решив С преклонных наших лет сложить заботы [6]</p>	<p><i>LEAR.</i> — <i>Qu'on place la carte sous mes yeux. Sachez que nous avons divisé notre <b>royaume</b> en trois parts, étant fermement résolu de soulager notre vieillesse de tout <b>souci</b> et affaire pour en charger de plus jeunes forces</i> [7]</p>	<p><i>Lear.</i> Gebet mir diese Land-Carte-<b>Wisset</b>, wir haben unser <b>Königreich</b> in drey Theile getheilt, und es ist unsre erste Absicht, unser Alter aller <b>Regierungs-Sorgen</b></p> <p>Übersetzt von Christoph Martin Wieland [8]</p>

The translations reveal that the lexemes *королевство* (tr. by M.A. Kuzmin), “royaume”, “Königreich” render to the full extent the seme of political locus. In contrast, Boris Pasternak, being a reader-centered translator, suggests a geographical space, free of political authority: *край наш* (which roughly corresponds to **our area/edge**). Even the possessive pronoun *наш* (**our**) does not turn this geographical space into a political one. Moreover, the word “край” renders the geographical realia of the vast Russian territory rather than a realia of England, an insular state.

Still more enigmatic seem the translations of the final words of King Richard III.

Text 2

The original text	Translation into Russian	Translation into French	Translation into German
K. RICH. A horse, a horse! my kingdom for a horse! [9]	Коня, коня! Венец мой за коня! (Перевод А.Д. Радловой)  Коня! Коня! Полцарства за коня! (translator: Yakov G. Bryansky Брянского (1790-1853) [10]	Un cheval! un cheval! mon royaume pour mon cheval! (translator: François Pierre Guillaume Guizot, 1787-1874) [11]	Ein Pferd! ein Pferd! mein Königreich für 'n Pferd! (Übersetzung, Schlegel) [12]

It is not completely clear what meaning of the collocation *my kingdom* is present in the original text, even if we take into account that Shakespeare often used simultaneously all the meanings of a given word for the sake of pun. The comparison reveals that in the French and German versions the collocations *mon royaume*, *mein Königreich* have a meaning similar to the translations of the phrase “our kingdom” from “The tragedy of King Lear”. It is obvious that the territory of political authority is meant. Ya. G. Bryansky in his version that has become a “winged phrase” in Russian culture cuts this territory into two, thus making Richard promise half of the kingdom for a horse. Literary critics explain such shortening by the demands of the rhythm and by the tradition of Russian fairytales where the tsar promises half of his realm to a bridegroom of his daughter as a dowry [13]. In the metonymic version suggested by Anna D. Radlova (*венец мой за коня!* = *my crown for a horse*) the major seme is that of authority. Hence several questions arise: What does King Richard offer for a horse? Territory or power? Or both? What semantic elements does the English word *kingdom* conceal?

Before looking up this word in explanatory and etymological dictionaries, it is worth analyzing texts which include the lexemes under consideration, and which are common in Christian culture. Thus, we intend to examine “The Lord’s Prayer” to extract semantic similarities and deviations of the same text in different languages. We shall scrutinize several lexemes in the opening verses of the prayer in Russian, English, French, German and Latin versions as well as in the Greek original. [14]

variant	The text of the Lord's Prayer (opening verses)
Greek ΠΑΤΕΡ ΗΜΩΝ	ΠΑΤΕΡ ΗΜΩΝ Ο ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΙΣ/ ΑΓΙΑΣΘΗΤΩ ΤΟ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΣΟΥ / ΕΛΘΕΤΩ Η ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΣΟΥ/ΓΕΝΗΘΗΤΩ ΤΟ ΘΕΛΗΜΑ ΣΟΥ/ ΩΣ ΕΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ..... Μφ.6:9-13
Latin Pater Noster	Pater noster, qui es in caelis/ sanctificetur nomen tuum/ adveniat <b>regnum</b> tuum/ fiat <b>voluntas</b> tuascicut in caelo et in terra.....
Russian “Отче наш”	Отче наш, Иже еси на небесех!//Да святится имя Твое,/ да придет Царствие Твое,/да будет воля Твоя,/ яко на небеси и на земли... Церковнославянский текст: Отче нашъ иже еси на небесѣхъ,/ да свѣтитса имя Твоѣ,/ да прійдетъ царствіе Твоѣ:/ да будетъ воля Твоа, яко на небеси и на земли
English Lord's Prayer (1611)	Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy Name/ Thy <b>Kingdom</b> come./ Thy <b>will</b> be done in earth, As it is in heaven.....
French Notre Père	Notre Père qui es aux cieux /que ton nom soit sanctifié/que ton <b>règne</b> vienne,/que ta <b>volonté</b> soit faite/ sur la terre comme au ciel....
German Unser Vater Luther (1545)	Unser Vater in dem Himmel! / Dein Name werde geheiliget. Dein <b>Reich</b> komme. / Dein <b>Wille</b> geschehe auf Erden wie im Himmel....

In this context all the variants of nomination **ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΣΟΥ**, **regnum tuum**, **Царствие Твое**, **Thy Kingdom**, **ton règne**, **Dein Reich** denote The KINGDOM OF GOD, i.e. the Lord's Authority (Power) on earth (as it is in heaven) [15]. Yet in other contexts the highlighted lexemes, in addition to the same “Authority”, bring to surface the same “subservient” space (realm) [16]. The inner form of these lexemes, that is, according to A. Potebnya, the nearest etymological meaning, in addition to the universal meaning of a semantic fusion “AUTHORITY (POWER) + SUBSERVIENT SPACE”, attaches to it the deviating shades of meaning, for instance, of the meaning “Empire” in the lexemes **ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ** (Βασιλεία Ρωμαίων — Roman Empire (27 B.C. — 68 AD [17]), **regnum**, **Reich**. The analysis of dictionary definitions reveals that in the lexemes **regnum**, **règne**, **Reich**, the seme of AUTHORITY is dominant, while in the lexemes **ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ**, **Царствие** and **Kingdom** the semes of AUTHORITY and POLITICAL SPACE are equipollent. This allows us to explain why the lexemes *royaume* and *Königreich* are used to render the seme of a SUBSERVIENT (POLITICAL) SPACE in the French and German translation versions of Shakespearean

texts. It is obvious that the space component of meaning in the lexeme **règne** is insufficient to render the idea of a SUBSERVIENT (POLITICAL) SPACE, and redundant in the lexeme **Reich**. This explains the substitution of the lexeme **règne** in the French version by the word *royaume* [18] and semantic rectification or constriction in the German version. The Medieval England presented in Shakespearean tragedies was not an empire, so could not be designated by the word **Reich**. To constrict the meaning the translator used a compound noun *Königreich*, joining a component *König* in the meaning of a king to the word **Reich**.

To continue the semantic analysis of the Lord's Prayer, we should point to one more phenomenon, characteristic of Biblical Style. Every translated version of the prayer, as well as the original, exposes a stylistic feature that Bergen and Cornelia Evans, the researchers of Biblical English [19], call "semantic doubling". This semantic phenomenon can be observed in the fourth and fifth verses of the prayer (*ΓΕΝΗΘΗΤΩ ΤΟ ΘΕΛΗΜΑ ΣΟΥ, ΩΣ ΕΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ*; *fiat voluntas tuascicut in caelo et in terra*; *да будет воля Твоя, яко на небеси и на земли*; *Thy will be done in earth, / As it is in heaven*; *que ta volonté soit faite/sur la terre comme au ciel*; *Dein Wille geschehe auf Erden wie im Himmel*). Obviously, the lexemes **ΘΕΛΗΜΑ**, **voluntas**, **воля**, **volonté**, **Wille** notwithstanding their semantic and cultural similarities and deviations, double up the seme "POWER (Authority)" of the lexemes **ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ**, **regnum**, **Царствие**, **Kingdom**, **règne**, **Reich**, while the fifth verse doubles up the seme of "SUBSERVIENT SPACE" of the words *heaven* and *earth*. Anyway, it is possible to observe in the text of the prayer the semantic "fusion" and "doubling" of the semes "POWER (authority)" and "SUBSERVIENT SPACE". Yet, one property of the Lord's Prayer makes it possible to confirm that in its contexts the seme "Power" is supreme. This property rests upon the verbs of movement in the subjunctive mood: *ΕΛΘΕΤΩ*, *adveniat*, *да нпуудем*, *come*, *vienne*, *komme*. Of course, these verbs grammatically render the category of temporality, yet in a text, this category is often inseparable from the category of locus, shaping together a textual deixis. Hence, it is possible to admit that physical space (heaven and earth in this case) is unable to move if only a natural disaster or a Deity makes it move. In contrast, political space can grow wider or narrower; it can even disappear with the destruction of its centre (see above). Hence the Lord's Prayer suggests the idea of the advent of POWER over space.

Having defined the semantic value of the English word "kingdom" and its equivalents in five languages, we can return to the question of what King Richard offered for a horse, his power or his territory. Another question was connected with the possibility of the variant "*Венец мой за коня= my crown for a horse*", which Anna Radlova has suggested in her translation of the tragedy. In the English language there is an equivalent to the Russian word *венец*. This is the word "crown", which apart from its direct meaning of the attribute of royal power can be used both metonymically and metaphorically to denote Royal Power itself. To demonstrate the peculiarities of its indirect usage we shall examine two episodes from the deposition scene of "The Tragedy of King Richard II" by Shakespeare.

Текст оригинал	Перевод А.И. Курошевой
<p>K. RICH. Give me the <b>crown</b>. Here, cousin, seize the <b>crown</b>; Here, cousin, On this side my hand, [and] on that side thine. <i>Now is this golden crown like a deep well That owes two buckets, filling one another, The emptier ever dancing in the air, The other down, unseen, and full of water: That bucket down and full of tears am I, Drinking my griefs, whilst you mount up on high.</i> [20]</p>	<p>Король Ричард Подайте мне <b>корону</b>. — Вот, кузен, Возьмите: В моей руке край этот, в вашей — тот.  <i>Сейчас <b>корона</b> эта — как колодец, Где полнятся по очереди ведра: Вверх устремляется ведро пустое, А полное водой — незримо, вниз. Ведро, слезами полное, — я сам; Пью скорбь я; вы ж летите к небесам.</i> [21]</p>

*The proposition of this scene is the following: [22]: The king who ruled over England from the age of 10 and who often abused his power is deposed by Henry Bolingbroke his adversary, who is popular not only among the aristocracy but also among the common people. King Richard portrayed by Shakespeare is an extravagant politician not hostile to poetic self-exposition, a person capable of doubting, a king in whose personality a man of nature and a man of politics are rolled into one [23]. What is more, here Shakespeare, as in his later tragedies, places the man of nature above the man of politics. (“... I am greater than a king;/For when I was a king my flatterers/Were then but subjects;/being now a subject,/I have a king here to my flatterer./Being so great, I have no need to beg [24]. [25]*

In terms of proposition theory this is an episode of three “actants (actors)”: King Richard who is being deposed, Henry *Bolingbroke*, a usurper, and a crown, first as an artifact that symbolizes Power, then metonymically as Power itself. In fact, King Richard is in the state of a disjunction process with his power (crown). The crown, which symbolizes royal POWER, is presented here as a valuable desired object. This process can be formalized by the formulae of the Paris School of Semiotics as follows [26]:

$$F(S1) \rightarrow [(S1 \cup O1) \rightarrow (S1 \cap O1)],$$

where  $S1 = \textit{Bolingbroke}$

$O1 = \text{the crown.}$

$$F(S2) \rightarrow [(S2 \cap O1) \rightarrow (S2 \cup O1)],$$

where  $S2 = \textit{Bolingbroke.}$

As soon as both adversaries enter into their relations of conjunction with the crown, i.e. seize the crown on both sides, it stops to be a mere artifact, symbolizing royal power, and becomes POWER itself, that by the will of Shakespeare (in the monologue of King Richard) acquires the spatial parameters of “up” and “down”.

Power is compared with a well with two buckets, and the adversaries themselves are compared with these buckets, either with an empty one, dancing in the air (*Bolingbroke*), or with a heavy one, going down, full of tears (*King Richard*). It is possible to observe the blend of several conceptual spheres in this spatial metaphor: the spatial archetype of “up/down”, and conceptual spheres of *POWER*, symbol of Power, man of nature, man of politics, abyss, (well), heaven (air), as well as the process of falling down and Rising up. Such fusion of conceptual spheres as this extended metaphorical expression exposes is known as “conceptual blending” [27].

In the episode that follows, the crown (*POWER*) acquires the properties of a category, while the political space (*locus*) becomes “anthropogenic”.

Text 5

Текст-оригинал	Перевод А.И. Курошевой
<p><i>BULL.</i> <i>Are you contented to resign the crown?</i></p> <p><i>K. RICH.</i> <i>Ay, no, no ay; for I must nothing be;</i> <i>Therefore no no, for I resign to thee.</i> <i>Now mark me how I will undo myself:</i> <i>I give this heavy weight from off my head,</i> <i>And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand,</i> <i><u>The pride of kingly sway from out my heart:</u></i> <i>With mine own tears I wash away my balm,</i> <i>With mine own hands I give away my crown,</i> <i><u>With mine own tongue deny my sacred state,</u></i> <i>With mine own breath release all duteous oaths;</i> <i>All pomp and majesty I do forswear;</i> <i>My manors, rents, revenues I forgo;</i> <i>My acts, decrees, and statutes I deny;</i> <i>God pardon all oaths that are broke to me!</i> <i>God keep all vows unbroke are made to thee!</i> <i>Make me, that nothing have, with nothing griev'd,</i> <i>And thou with all pleas'd, that hast all achiev'd!</i> <i>Long mayst thou live in Richard's seat to sit,</i> <i>And soon lie Richard in an earthy pit!</i> <i>God save King Henry, unking'd Richard says,</i> <i>And send him many years of sunshine days!</i> <i>What more remains?</i></p>	<p><i>Боллингброк</i> <i>Согласны ль вы отречься от короны?</i></p> <p><i>Король Ричард</i> <i>Да... нет... нет... да. Я должен стать ничем;</i> <i>Не надо «нет»: я поступаюсь всем.</i> <i>Итак, смотри, как я себя свергаю:</i> <i>Сняв бремя с головы своей, его</i> <i>Я отдаю со скипетром тяжельм,</i> <i><u>Из сердца гордость сам я вырываю,</u></i> <i>Слезами сам смываю свой елей,</i> <i>Своей рукой я отдаю корону,</i> <i><u>Священный сан с себя слагаю сам;</u></i> <i>Я отвергаю знаки почитанья,</i> <i>От блеска отрекаюсь и величья,</i> <i>От всех моих доходов и земель,</i> <i>От всех моих указов отступаюсь;</i> <i>Тех бог простит, кто не сдержал присягу!</i> <i>Бог да хранит ее тебе ко благу!</i> <i>Всего лишен, пусть я лишусь и зол;</i> <i>Ты ж наслаждайся всем, что приобрел.</i> <i>Живи и троном Ричарда владей,</i> <i>А Ричарда пусть смерть возьмет скорей!</i> <i>«Король наш Гарри, бог тебя храни</i> <i>На многие безоблачные дни!» —</i> <i>Развенчанный так Ричард возглашает.</i> <i>Еще что сделать?</i></p>

The translator renders into Russian *Bolingbroke's* question “*Are you contented to resign the crown?*”, preserving the nomination of the artifact, though for the Russian language in this context the variant “отречься от престола = to resign the throne” would be more suitable. The latter, however, would not allow the preservation of the semantic category of the word **crown** in its metonymic sense of POWER. To use the comparison of the category with a container suggested by George Lakoff [28], we should note that the notion “CROWN” as a “category container” stores what Shakespearean kings call CARES (*this heavy weight=cares*) [29]. Then it stores attributes of Royal Power, that belong both to the sphere of objects and to the sphere of discourse. It is possible to attribute to the sphere of objects *unwieldy sceptre, balm, manors, rents, revenues, seat to*, as well as the crown itself. In turn, the discursive sphere of the monologue incorporates such markers as *The pride of kingly sway, sacred state, all duteous oaths; All pomp and majesty, acts, decrees, and statutes*, as well as common *oaths* and *vows*. The process of acquiring the status of a category for the notion CROWN as a metonymic presentation of POWER coincides in this monologue by King Richard with the process of his disjunction with the attributes of Royal power and simultaneously with the process of turning the man of politics into the man of nature. The pun in the opening line of the monologue, which the translators of the tragedy have failed to render into other languages, (*Ay, no, no ay* [30]; *for I must nothing be — Да... нет... нет... да. Я должен стать ничем;*) signals the launch of this disjunction as well as of the gradual destruction of the *anthropogenic political space* embodied by King Richard. In the text the annihilation function is performed by the verbs: *resign, undo, give off, give from, give away, wash off, deny, release, forswear, forgo, break*. Each of these verbs belongs to the semantic field of POWER. Furthermore, all of them share the integral seme of SPATIAL movement (passage), either of object removal or of subject removal, which is another evidence in favour of the conceptual syncretism of the semes POWER and SPACE (LOCUS). The morphological structure un + Noun + -ed (*unking'd*), characteristic of Shakespeare's writing, is rendered into Russian as “развенчанный” in the sense of “decrowned”. This variant of translation, in turn, is evidence in favour of Anna Radlova's choice “Венец мой за коня” for “My kingdom for a horse” in the final scene of “Richard III”.

To complete our analysis of the interrelation of Power Discourse and the category of locus, we turn to the monologue of Boris Godunov from the second part of Alexey K. Tolstoy's trilogy “The Death of Ivan the Terrible” (1866), “Tsar Fyodor Ioanovitch” (1868) and “Tsar Boris” (1870). This monologue is remarkable not only for the comparison of the two political leaders (of tsar Ivan and Tsar Fyodor) with the spatial objects that form an archetypal vertical, but also for the presence of multicomponential “point of view”.

In this monologue dominates the point of view of Boris Godunov. In Russian culture his image and merits as a political man are distorted to a great extent by his presentation in fiction and opera. In the popular perception he embodies the stereotype



of a power-seeker “whose eyes reflect the image of bleeding boys”<sup>\*</sup>. Such perception owes to the works of A.S. Pushkin and M. Musorgsky as well to the prejudged writings of the first analysts of Boris Godunov’s rule [32]. In any case, in this monologue several points of view coincide: the point of view of the author (A.K. Tolstoy), then, intertextually, the point of view of A. Pushkin, as well as the point of view of N.M. Karamzin [33] and other historians.

Text 6

## A.K. Tolstoy, “Tsar Fyodor Ioanovitch”

Russian version	Interlinear translation
<p><i>Годунов: Высокая гора Был царь Иван. Из недр ее удары Подземные равнину потрясали Иль пламенный, вдруг вырываясь, снам С вершины смерть и гибель слал на землю. Царь Федор не таков! Его бы мог я Скорей сравнить с провалом в чистом поле. Расселины и рыхлая окрестность Цветущею травой сокрыты, но, Вблизи от них бродя неосторожно, Скользит в обрыв и стадо и пастух. Поверье есть такое в наших селах, Что церковь в землю некогда ушла, На месте ж том образовалась яма; Церковищем народ ее зовет, И ходит слух, что в тихую погоду Во глубине звонят колокола И клирное в ней пенье раздается. Таким святым, но ненадежным местом Мне Федор представляется. [31]</i></p>	<p><b>Godunov:</b> Tsar Ivan was like a high mountain. From its bowels the strokes quaked the valley, or the sheaf of fire breaking out of it and soaring upwards sent death and ruin to the earth. Tsar Fyodor is of a different turn. I could compare him with a hollow in an open field. Its clefts and friable soil are hidden in the flowering hay grass, but A herd with its herdsman strolling carelessly nearby slips into it. There is a legend in our villages, That once a church went deep into the earth And a hollow appeared there; People call it a church-hollow, There are also rumours that in a quiet weather One can hear chimes (bell tolling) coming from the depth, As well as liturgy singing. Like such place, holy, but insecure, seems to me tsar Fyodor,</p>

Here Boris Godunov speaks as a governor, whose office, due to the mental incapability of tsar Fyodor, is to rule over the state. It is he who has all the heavy burdens of *cares of the state* (*King Lear*). *Cares* (*soucis, Sorgen, ЗАБОТЫ*), as we have already seen in Shakespeare’s texts, are “attached” to the crown, they are a part of Power discourse (the discourse of Authority) and duties and determine the heaviness of the crown. Propositionally, in this episode of the tragedy by A.K. Tolstoy, Boris Godunov has nothing but cares out of all the privileges of Authority, and he speaks here as a ruler without a crown, conscious of his responsibility. Unlike King Richard III, Boris Godunov is presented here exclusively as a man of politics.

\* An allusion to the infanticide of Dmitry, the youngest son of Ivan IV. In popular eyes, Boris Godunov was to be accused of having secretly ordered the murder of the child to pave his way to the throne.

The metaphorical vertical which A.K. Tolstoy (Boris Godunov) has structured in this text with the attraction of images of a high mountain-volcano and a church-hollow, on the one hand, helps to oppose the might of tsar Ivan and tsar Fyodor, and on the other hand, it presents them as equally dangerous for their subjects. The metaphor of the tsar as the mountain, the source of earthquakes and volcanic fire that bring death and ruin, is integrated with the metaphor of the holy but insecure place that tsar Fyodor embodies. Here we observe the same blending as we have already seen in the Shakespearean comparison of the crown with the well with two buckets. The tsar as a volcanic mountain who is simultaneously a man of nature and a man of politics is at the same time opposed to and equated with a saintly sovereign who is unable to rule over his state. In Godunov's opinion, both are dangerous. The spatial metaphor that A.K. Tolstoy offers, and which rests upon the archetype of up and the down, can serve as further evidence of the interdependence of Power discourse and the category of Locus.

Thus, with the objective of examining the semiolinguistic links between Power Discourse and the category of locus, we have proved that this semantic fusion can be regarded as a conceptual "UNIVERSAL". All the deviations in rendering this universal into different languages are caused by semantic insufficiency or semantic redundancy.

#### REFERENCES

1. Another example could be found in the metonymic expression "Красный корпус" = Red building, (Red Brick Building), meaning Administration of Tyumen State University
2. The treaty was signed in Visculy (Bialowieza Forest) by senior officials and heads of the governments of the three union republics: Boris Yeltzin, and Gennady Burbulis (Russia), Stanislav Shushkevitch and Vyacheslav Kebitch (Belorussia), Leonid Kravtchuk and Vitold Fokin (the Ukraine).[ <http://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki>]
3. Statements LICs and SS of the RSFSR " , 19.12.1991, N 51, p. 1798 (Statement).
4. William Shakespeare: The Tragedy of King Lear, C. 6.
5. William Shakespeare: The Tragedy of King Lear (tr. B.Pasternak), p. 6. Shakespeare: complete works, p. 6797 (cp. Shakespeare: complete works, v. 6, P. 344).
6. William Shakespeare: The Tragedy of King Lear (tr. M.Kuzmin), p. 6. Shakespeare: complete works, v.5, p. 456)
7. [http://www.inlibroveritas.net/lire/oeuvre5120.html#page\\_13](http://www.inlibroveritas.net/lire/oeuvre5120.html#page_13)
8. <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/7240/pg7240.txt>
9. William Shakespeare: The Tragedy of Richard the Third, 237.
10. <http://www.bibliotekar.ru/encSlov/10/142.htm>
11. La vie et la mort du roi Richard III William Shakespeare, 1564-1616 <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/26759/pg26759.txt>
12. <http://www.zeno.org/Literatur/M/Shakespeare,+William/Historien/K%C3%B6nig+Richard+III./F%C3%BCnfte+Aufzug/Vierte+Szene>
13. <http://www.bibliotekar.ru/encSlov/10/142.htm>
14. [http://www.lords-prayer-words.com/luke\\_gospel\\_scripture.html](http://www.lords-prayer-words.com/luke_gospel_scripture.html)
15. Царство Божие (Kingdom of God) — Power and Authority of God (Heaven), revelation of God's Holy Office. It was predicted in the Old Testament (Dan.2:44; Dan.7:14),

revealed in Jesus Christ (Luke.1:33) and was the background of his teaching (in Gospel of Mathew, for instance, it is mentioned 50 times), yet, it is the equivalent of the Church. Encyclopedia / compiled and edited by A.A Gritzanov, G.V. Synilo. Minsk: Book House, 2007. 960 c. (The World of Encyclopedias

16. Definition, seme and etymology analysis was performed upon the following dictionaries: Fasmer M. The Etymology Dictionary of the Russian Language. Translation from German and complements by O. N. Trubachev. Second Edition. in four volumes. M.: Progress, 1986, volumes I–IV; Tchernykh P. Ya. Historical and Etymology Dictionary of Modern Russian: In 2 volumes. M.: “The Russian Language”, 2004; Semyonov A.V. The Etymology Dictionary of the Russian Language. YUNVES Publishers, Moscow, 2003; The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition. 2000. Published by the Houghton Mifflin Company Appendix I Indo-European Roots, <http://etymolog.ruslang.ru> ; <http://evartist.narod.ru>; Britannica. Encyclopaedia Britannica 2008 Deluxe Edition. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 2008; Nicot, Thresor de la langue française (1606), Dictionnaire de L’Académie française, 4th Edition (1762), Jean-François Féraud: Dictionnaire critique de la langue française (Marseille, Mossy 1787-1788), Dictionnaire de L’Académie française, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition (1798), Dictionnaire de L’Académie française, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition (1832-5), Dictionnaire de L’Académie française, 8th Edition (1932-5) [<http://www.atilf.fr>]; Moraw P., “Reich”, dans Brunner O., Conze W. et Koselleck R. (direction), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, vol. 5, Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, 1984 (ISBN 3-12-903890-6), p. 423–456; [<http://slovarus.info/grk.php>]

17. This word has also the seme: a queen, crown, the duties of the ruler dictionnaire Grec –Français d’Anatole BAILLY (11<sup>ème</sup> édition Hachette Paris), 1930.

18. it is noteworthy that in the 13<sup>th</sup> century a word REALM enters into the English language from Old French and Latin (ME realme, fr. AF, alter. of OF reiame, fr. L regimen control) in the meaning of “subservient territory”. It is in this meaning the word is used in the Tilbury speech of queen Elizabeth I. “...any prince of Europe, should dare to invade the borders of my realm” Delivered by Elizabeth to the land forces assembled at Tilbury (Essex) to repel the anticipated invasion of the Spanish Armada, 1588 [<http://www.luminarium.org/reulit/tilbury.htm>]

19. Herbert N. Schneidau, “Biblical Style and Western Literature,” in *Literature of Belief: Sacred Scripture and Religious Experience*, ed. Neal E. Lambert.

20. William Shakespeare: *The Tragedy of King Richard the Second*, C. 119, C. 11577 (cp. Shakespeare-Riverside, C. 829).

21. William Shakespeare: *The Tragedy of King Richard the Second*, C. 119, C. 11577 (cp. Shakespeare-Riverside, C. 829)

22. [www.shmoop.com/...ii/rising-falling-symbol.html](http://www.shmoop.com/...ii/rising-falling-symbol.html),

23. Kantorowicz, H. Ernst. *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957, 24–31.

24. William Shakespeare: *The Tragedy of King Richard the Second*, C. 124.

25. William Shakespeare: *The Tragedy of King Richard the Second*, C. 119, C. 11577 (cp. Shakespeare-Riverside, C. 829)

26. Cm. Marillaud P. LA SEMIOTIQUE: POUR QUOI FAIRE ?// LANGUAGE ECOLOGY AT THE CROSSROADS OF SCIENCES : Proceedings of the second international scientific conference: in 2 volumes v. 2, Tyumen: Tyumen University Press, 2011, pp. 15-32.

27. Turner Mark, Fauconnier Gilles: *The Way We Think. Conceptual Blending and the Mind’s Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books 2002.

---

28. Lakoff George. *Women, Fire, and. Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind.* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1987.

29. The same metonymy of heavy burden is to be found in A. Pushkin's Tragedy *Boris Godunov* (1825) "Ох, тяжела ты, шапка Мономаха! = Thou are heavy, crown of Monomakh"

30. This phrase can be uttered as "I know no I"

31. [http://az.lib.ru/t/tolstoj\\_a\\_k/text\\_0060.shtml](http://az.lib.ru/t/tolstoj_a_k/text_0060.shtml)

32. Kozlyakov V., *Boris Godunov. Tragedy of the Good Tzar.* M.: MOLODAYA GWARDIA, 2011. 320 p.

33. Karamzin N.M. *History of The Russian State. Volumes 9-10,* Saint Petersburg: Alexander Smirdin Publishing, 1851-1853.