ABSTRACT: The paper aims to identify the colligations of ‘terrorism’ with its ideological stances in WOTC corpus using John Sinclair’s model of extended lexical units. Specifically, the analysis focuses on the constructions ‘of’ and constructions ‘around’ the lemma ‘terrorism’ for this colligational analysis. To find out the main actors, actions, events and policies in the discourses of ‘war on terror’, the keywords analysis with detailed concordance analysis has also been conducted. The findings show that the Pak Anglo-American newspapers frequently invoke the ‘syntax of terror’ to legitimise and rationalise the global ‘war on terror’. The grammatical patterns identified in this study are classified into nine distinct syntactic structures. Finally, drawing from the belief that discursive practices are political practices, the research studies the syntax of the terror discourse that may have enabled, necessitated or disabled particular discourses or may have marginalized other discourses. The study helps us identify the politics of language working at the back end of post 9/11 media discourses.
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1. Introduction

The question of language and power has assumed a greater relevance and importance in the face of substantial political and social changes on the global level that occurred, as a result of a chain of events, in the last decade especially right after 9/11. The events of September 11, 2001 received an extensive coverage in the American, British and Pakistani print media. This study employs a detailed colligational analysis of specialised corpora [namely War on terror Corpus (WOTC)] of elite Pak Anglo-American newspapers editorials from September 11, 2001 to December 31, 2011 drawing largely from John Sinclair’s model of extended lexical units. The war on terror corpus (WOTC) of 4.2 million words (4,189,111 words), a specialized corpus, is compiled specifically by the researcher. To make the WOTC representative, the editorials of all the selected American [The New York Times (TNT) and The Washington Post (TWP)], British [The Guardian (TG) and The Times (TT)] and Pakistani [DAWN and The News(TN)] newspapers on the theme of ‘war on terror’ have been selected from a time span of 10 year and 4 months (i.e. from September 11, 2001-December 31, 2011). To identify the theme of WOT in the editorials key terms related to ‘war on terror’ like terror with any of its morphological inflections terror* (terror, terroris(ze), terrorist, terrorism), Osama bin Laden and Al-Qaeda are used.

To address the question of how is terrorism represented and characterised in WOTC, this paper investigates the word sketches of ‘terrorism’ through Sketch Engine [8] to identify the most frequent and salient lexical patterns of ‘terrorism’ within particular syntactic structures in the corpus. The word sketches are the grammatical patterns/syntactic structures of a particular word taken as a particular part of speech in the observed corpus. “A word sketch is an automatic corpus-derived summary of a word's grammatical and collocational behaviour” [7]. The word sketches in Sketch engine are actually the collocates of a word, grouped together, within particular syntactic and grammatical structures; a phenomenon that is very much similar to collocation. For example the collocations of ‘terrorism’ describe what roles it performs grammatically.

The research will significantly evaluate the politically motivated media practices especially of West in the art of ‘syntax formation’ to represent the actors, actions and policies in post 9/11 era.

2. Literature Review

The lexico-grammatical patterning that involves the concepts of collocation and colligation are central to the examination of media practices related to grammar and syntax in this study. The very early and the most accepted definition of collocation was given by Firth as in [3], who observes that ‘you shall know a word by the company it keeps’ (p. 179). Kjellmer as in [9] defines collocation as ‘a sequence of words that occurs more than once in identical form’ which is ‘grammatically well structured’ (p. 133). Clear as in [2] presents collocation as ‘a recurrent co-occurrence of words’ (p. 277). Despite the differences in these various definitions, the main focus is on co-occurrence, or likelihood of words to occur together. Hunston et al. as in [5] take collocation as a close interrelationship of grammar and lexis. John Sinclair as in [15] presents the concept of upward collocation and downward collocation; according to him upward collocates are mostly represented by adverbs, prepositions, pronouns and conjunctions, whereas downward collocates are nouns, adjectives and verbs (p. 116). For this study, both kind of collocates are taken into account for the analysis of grammatical patterns or colligations. Hoey as in [4] describes the phenomenon of collocation as the ‘grammatical company a word keeps and the positions it prefers; in other words, a word’s collocations describe what it typically does grammatically’ (p. 234).

The semantic preference explains the characteristics of the lexical items occurring together with the core word sharing the same semantic features. Semantic preference, in words of [6] is “the frequent co-occurrence of a lexical item with items expressing a particular evaluative meaning” (p. 266). It is also called ‘attitudinal preference’ [6]. [17] defines the same phenomena as "when a group of collocates of a particular word all seem to have a similar meaning or function, then this can be called a semantic preference of that word" (p. 65). For example, words such as atrocious, monstrous and hideous indicate that the node word 'terrorist' has a strong preference...
for the concept of evil. If we study and observe the set of related collocates in its specific context in which they are used, we will find out negative or positive evaluations and stances that reveal a discourse in action. This positive or negative stance carries discourse prosody [17] or sometimes referred to as semantic prosody.

For example, [1] observes, in his corpus based study of representation of Islam and Muslims in British newspapers that the words suspect, behead, accuse, arrest and jail collocate with the word Muslim (as an object); consequently, it shows negative discourse prosody related to criminality, as presented in the British newspapers. He asserts that a single word can have numerous semantic preferences and discourse prosodies, especially when the people are inclined to differ over how an idea or a theme should be represented. Semantic prosody is primarily a discourse realisation of a word whereas semantic preference gives empirical evidence about the realisation of a lemma/search term in a certain semantic field, the phenomenon of semantic prosody is helpful for presenting evidence of how it is realised in discourse, i.e. pragmatically [15]. He pointed out these phenomena in his spacious and exhaustive study of phrasal verb 'set in' in the Bank of English corpus. [14] found that a typical subject of the verb 'set in' was often related to unpleasant things like decay, rot, illness, decadence, malaria, impoverishment, disillusion, infection, anarchy, rigor mortis, prejudice, etc (pp. 155–6). Following [14’s] observation, Louw as in [11] described the phenomena as ‘semantic prosody’ and defined it as ‘a consistent aura of meaning with which a form is imbued by its collocates’ (p. 157). O’Halloran as in [12] observed that semantic prosody, as well as semantic preference, was genre/register-dependent. In his discussion of the word lavish in the Bank of English corpus, [13] found that it had an unfavourable prosody in news genres, however in the disciplines of arts and social sciences it was used with positive meaning. On the same lines, Tribble as in [19] suggested that there might be a universal or global semantic prosody for a word in relation to the whole language, and it might maintain a simultaneous local semantic prosody particular to the specialised context or genre.

The next section will briefly discuss the research methodology with the theoretical framework adopted for this study.

3. Research Methodology

The analysis of colligational patterns of terrorism is based on Sinclair’s as in [16] and Stubbs’ as in [18] theoretical model of ‘extended lexical units’ comprising collocation, colligation, semantic preference and semantic prosody also referred to as discourse prosody which describes the speaker’s evaluative attitude. The figure 3.1 shows the four phases of the model of extended lexical units as presented by [16] and modified by [18]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Discourse/Semantic Prosysody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colligation</td>
<td>Semantic Preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 Model of extended lexical units

The framework used for colligational analysis is derived mainly from [10]. The analysis will involve the following steps:

1. Automatic retrieval of grammatical sketches of lemma ‘terrorism’ from Sketch Engine
2. Identification of all the significant syntactic categories
3. Retrieval of collocates and further abstraction to colligation: investigation of lexical and grammatical relations between the lemma and words in the immediate surroundings
4. Detailed examination of concordances and collocational profiles
5. Identification of semantic prosodies through detailed study of concordances and extended context and classification into positives and negatives

Now all the significant grammatical patterns identified in WOTC will be analysed according to their collocational and colligational functionalities. The semantic preference of the collocational and colligational patterns along with their discourse prosodies (also referred to as semantic prosodies) will be discussed in detail providing the empirical evidence of their actual usage (negative, neutral or positive) from the WOT corpus through detailed concordance analysis with extended context.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

The most significant colligational (grammatical) patterns of lemma ‘terrorism’ as identified through Sketch Engine in WOTC are:

- [[verb] + terrorism] giving cases of ‘object_of’ - terrorism used as an object: as in ‘to fight terrorism’
- { terrorism +[verb] } giving cases of ‘subject_of’ - terrorism used as a subject/ doer of the action: as in ‘terrorism causes’
- { (Adjectival) Modifier + terrorism} giving cases of Adj. + terrorism: as in ‘state terrorism’
- {and/or} + terrorism giving cases of terrorism with conjunction on either sides: as in ‘extremism and terrorism/terrorism and extremism’
- {terrorism (Adjectival) + Noun} giving cases of terrorism as an adjective modifying a noun: as in ‘terrorism suspects’
- {pp_obj_of} + terrorism] giving cases of terrorism as an object of prepositional phrase: as in ‘age of terrorism’
- {pp_obj, against}+ terrorism giving cases of terrorism as an object of prepositional phrase: as in ‘coalition against terrorism’
- {pp_obj, to]+ terrorism] giving cases of terrorism as an object of prepositional phrase: as in ‘end to terrorism’
- {pp_obj, on]+ terrorism} giving cases of terrorism as an object of prepositional phrase: as in ‘war on terrorism’

Now all the above colligational patterns of WOTC will be discussed in detail in the subsequent sections.
The call to fight terrorism is given in a multiple lexical ways. The choice of most of the verbs selected shows the ideological stance behind the call. The military terms are frequently used to initiate a ‘war’ at hand: fight, combat, battle, and defeat. The narrative strategies, in using the vocabulary of war, aims at redirecting and mobilising the United States as the original belligerent warring state, Bush administration, the Washington and American foreign policy agenda toward going to a new war at hand in order to fight terrorism and combat states that have also been declared to be enemies of the United States, by being the state sponsor supporters of terrorism.

The semantic preferences of the colligational pattern ‘obj_of’, i.e. collocates of terrorism, are shown with their respective discourse prosodies in the WOTC in table 4.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Semantic Preferences</th>
<th>Discourse/Semantic Prosody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>terrorism</td>
<td>combat, fight, defeat, tackle, counter, sponsor, support, accomplish, condemn, eliminate, battle, prevent, bread, prevent, fuel, denounce, confront, stop, erode, crush, control, export, contain</td>
<td>sponsor, support, promote, state-sponsor, export, contain, bread, fuel contain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semantic preferences of terrorism in the ‘obj_of’ frame show that the discourse is mostly controlled by the powerful institutions that want to combat, fight, defeat, tackle, counter, renounce, curb, condemn, eliminate, battle, prevent, bread, prevent, fuel, denounce, confront, stop, erode, crush, control, and fuel terrorism suggesting the negative discourse prosody related to the expansion of the terror phenomena, as can be observed in the following concordance.

### Concordance 4.1 Verbs that take ‘terrorism’ as its object in WOTC

The above concordance shows the elements who sponsor, breed, support and fuel terrorism. It should be noted that a single lexical item can have numerous semantic preferences and consequent discourse prosodies especially in cases where the conflicting notions of the representation of a concept exist among the people.

The concordance 4.1 shows cases where terrorism is used as a direct object of a verb signifying how the discourse is driven by the actors involved. In L1.3, and 10 the terrorism is presented as ‘world terrorism’ and ‘international terrorism’ giving a universal dimension to the discourse assuring the global nature of the problem to invoke the worldwide support against the unspecified enemy ‘terrorism’.

### Concordance 4.2 Verbs that take ‘terrorism’ as its object in WOTC

In the concordances above the verbs taking ‘terrorism’ as an object are italicised. The main players can be identified in the concordances as United States, Moscow, Sharon, Osamun Laden, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Bush, Palestinian and unnamed ‘another camp’. The themes of international terrorism, domestic terrorism, cross-border terrorism, world terrorism, arms control and domestic recession can also be identified in the discourse of WOTC in the concordances.

The fight against terrorism has been started, but there could be several strategies to eliminate terrorism. Addressing a gathering at the Pentagon, President Bush said that the enemy is an international organisation of “resentful young men. Warehousing itself can breed terrorism; Afghanistan’s Taliban movement was born in the early 1990s among resentful young mujahidin fleeing Soviet occupation. The form of terrorism that the Afghan Taliban embraced was inspired by its radical Islamic allies, the Pakistani-based militant group, the Jamia Islami. In Pakistan, the Jamia Islami was far more pernicious than the Islamic groups that operated in the United States. It had also suggested a new curriculum developed in Pakistan that included the idea of “war against the West”. Mr. Sharon says he is hoping to prompt a similar response in the West. The call to fight terrorism is given in a multiple lexical ways. The choice of most of the verbs selected shows the ideological stance behind the call. The military terms are frequently used to initiate a ‘war’ at hand: fight, combat, battle, and defeat. The narrative strategies, in using the vocabulary of war, aims at redirecting and mobilising the United States as the original belligerent warring state, Bush administration, the Washington and American foreign policy agenda toward going to a new war at hand in order to fight terrorism and combat states that have also been declared to be enemies of the United States, by being the state sponsor supporters of terrorism.

The semantic preferences of the colligational pattern ‘obj_of’, i.e. collocates of terrorism, are shown with their respective discourse prosodies in the WOTC in table 4.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Semantic Preferences</th>
<th>Discourse/Semantic Prosody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>terrorism</td>
<td>combat, fight, defeat, tackle, counter, sponsor, support, accomplish, condemn, eliminate, battle, prevent, bread, prevent, fuel, denounce, confront, stop, erode, crush, control, export, contain</td>
<td>sponsor, support, promote, state-sponsor, export, contain, bread, fuel contain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semantic preferences of terrorism in the ‘obj_of’ frame show that the discourse is mostly controlled by the powerful institutions that want to combat, fight, defeat, tackle, counter, renounce, curb, condemn, eliminate, battle, prevent, bread, prevent, fuel, denounce, confront, stop, erode, crush, control, and fuel terrorism suggesting the negative discourse prosody related to the expansion of the terror phenomena, as can be observed in the following concordance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Semantic Preferences</th>
<th>Discourse/Semantic Prosody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>terrorism</td>
<td>combat, fight, defeat, tackle, counter, sponsor, support, accomplish, condemn, eliminate, battle, prevent, bread, prevent, fuel, denounce, confront, stop, erode, crush, control, export, contain</td>
<td>sponsor, support, promote, state-sponsor, export, contain, bread, fuel contain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terrorism as a subject continues, threatens, and poses serious challenges as can be observed in concordance 4.3:

Concordance 4.3 “terrorism” Continues...Threatens...Poses...

In WOTC, the terrorism is presented as a real threat just than a theoretical one capable of causing mass murder on an unimaginable scale: “...the threat of terrorism had come to seem to many as more theoretical than real. Yesterday's news ...the threat of terrorism had come to seem to many as more theoretical than real. Yesterday's news...” (TT, November 14, 2006). The nature of terrorism makes it very difficult to predict targets. Most of those which have been suggested in multiple leaks - Heathrow airport, the ferries traversing the English Channel and now the Tube - are fairly obvious ones in that they relate to national infrastructure (TT, November 18, 2002).

Concordance 4.4 Terrorism has emerged, done or taken...

DAWN presents the consequences of the Zionist terrorism that has taken the form of state terrorism (L20): “The tactics they employed were to burn Arab villages and kill men, women and children to drive the Palestinians out of their ancestral land. After the establishment of Israel, Zionist terrorism has taken the form of state terrorism, as is evident from what is going on in the occupied territories today” (DAWN, September 24, 2003). The preoccupations of terrorism in subjective case can further be seen in the following extracts where terrorism has been presented as a serious threat to national infrastructure: “Wars have been fought in the Balkans and the Middle East. Terrorism has taken a terrible toll. India and China have grown strong...core concerns of British foreign policy have remained largely the same” (TT, November 14, 2006). The nature of terrorism makes it very difficult to predict targets. Most of those which have been suggested in multiple leaks - Heathrow airport, the ferries traversing the English Channel and now the Tube - are fairly obvious ones in that they relate to national infrastructure (TT, November 18, 2002). However, a syntactic collocational structure has also been used frequently in WOTC where terrorism is used as an object of the present participle (gerund) but still a part of the nominative phrase: ‘like combating terrorism requires’, ‘curbing terrorism requires’, ‘checking terrorism needs’ etc. as shown in the concordance 4.5:...
4.3 (Adjectival Modifier + terrorism)

The second most frequent pattern in the WOTC is the adjectival and noun modifier pattern of Terrorism as shown in Table 4.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>WOTC freq.</th>
<th>WOTC freq.</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>WOTC freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cross-border</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>Palestinian</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamist</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>radical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>counter-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>suicidal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domestic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>nuclear</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>Chechen</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>encouraging</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homegrown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biological</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>sectarian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transnational</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>fight</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combat</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.5 shows the adjectival modifiers of Terrorism: cross-border, international, Islamist, global, Islamic, domestic, urban, cross, homegrown, biological, Irish, transnational, combat, state, Palestinian, radical, counter-, suicidal, nuclear, Chechen, encouraging, potential, sectarian and modern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colligation</th>
<th>Colligation</th>
<th>Semantic Preferences</th>
<th>Discover/Semantic Prosody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>terrorism</td>
<td>cross-border, international, Islamist, global, Islamic, domestic, urban, homegrown, biological, Irish, transnational, combat, state, Palestinian, radical, counter-, suicidal, nuclear, Chechen, fight, encouraging, potential, sectarian, modern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mostly the adjectives that act as modifier of terrorism can be identified as groups based on nationalities or religions like Irish, Chechen and Palestinian; and Islamist and Islamic. Here the ideological stances are evident as the empirical findings show the terrorism is primarily attached to Islam for which the West has always refused that ‘it is not war on Islam’. The concordance 4.6 below shows terrorism as an international, global and transnational phenomenon:

The ideological mode of ‘universalisation’ is manifest in the demonstration of the concordance lines where war on terror discourse is spread across the continents with a mention of countries involved from Philippines to United Kingdom, from Sri Lanka to Chechnya and from Pakistan, Iraq, Middle East and Africa to United States.

After the Bush declaration of ‘axis of evil’, the state terrorism became highlighted in the world elite media. It’s precedence can be seen in the table 4.4; the Israel’s state terrorism, Russian state terrorism and Indian state terrorism can be broadly identified in the concordance line. DAWN rightly remarks in the editorial titled ‘US statistical blindfold’ about the ‘perverted definition of terrorism’ by Western authorities and media who try to de-legitimize the Palestinian and Kashmiri peoples’ struggles by branding freedom fighters terrorists and ignore the state terrorism committed by Israel and India: “Another issue related to the definition of terrorism concerns the people fighting for freedom and resisting foreign occupation. In this category fall the people of Palestine and Kashmir. In the wake of 9/11, both Israel and India have exploited the US-led war on terrorism to make a case for their continued occupation of Palestine and Kashmir in violation of UN resolutions. Both have tried to de-legitimize the Palestinian and Kashmiri peoples’ struggles by branding freedom fighters terrorists. America has evidently acquiesced in this perverted definition of terrorism and ignored a more heinous form of it: state terrorism” (July 8, 2005). It is significant to note that the Pakistani and British newspapers frequently introduce the ‘cross-border terrorism’ also, in the context of Kashmir, in the war on terror discourse.

The theme of Islam with its varying morphological inflections (like Islamic, Islamist, Islamism, Islamophobe etc.) is throughout present in the WOTC as a challenge and threat as shown in concordance 4.7:
Discourse/Semantic Prosody

The discourse is mostly woven around the national security policies and law and legislation about the potential and suspected homegrown terrorists.

4.4 ([and/or] + terrorism): Terrorism with conjunction

The next most significant grammatical pattern in WOTC is ‘and/or’ pattern where terrorism is used as a phrase with and/or, for example: terrorism and violence etc. The following table shows the semantic preferences of this particular grammatical pattern with its discourse prosodies, positive, negative or neutral whatever:

Table 4.6 The colligations of “[(and/or) + terrorism]” in WOTC

The war on terror discourse is constructed around the theme of good vs. evil and natural vs. supernatural; in supernatural terms, the enemies are presented as ‘evil’, and the conflict revolves around the conflict between good and evil. They are sketched as violent extremists, militants, and anarchists. They are criminals, drug traffickers who want to wage war on freedom and liberty of the civilized world. Similarly, in natural terms, the conflict revolves around the themes of civilization and barbarism. The enemies are depicted as barbaric and animal-like, or they are portrayed as having some essentialist personality traits. For example, the enemies like to spread terror; they threat the freedom; they are criminals; or they assassinate the civilians indiscriminately. This political representation, the dichotomous discourse of good versus evil helped the Bush administration as well as the Western media to legitimise and rationalise the use of power in Afghanistan and Iraq that consequently killed hundred thousands of civilians, including the women and children, along with the so called US declared terrorists and it further inflicted damage and havoc to public lives and property in the war trodden areas.

In Concordance 4.9, the striking use of Islam is significant. All the nouns in this and/or grammatical construction are negative except ‘Islam’. Looking at the concordances the apologetic tone is present overtly, but covertly the collocations of Islam show a highly negative portrayal, as the empirical findings show.
It grappled with dispel the false connection between Islam and terrorism -- as well as demonstrating a reason to standards, refrain from equating Islam and terrorism, and thus help isolate the fanatics who motion by 9/11. It grappled with Islam and terrorism, the Middle East and Iran. It was vivid terrorism, the Middle East and Iran. Hraib are frequent in this colligational frame. The standards, refrain from equating associated with violence, bloodletting and terrorism, Islam and Afghanistan are acknowledged as principled and courageous terrorism showing “zero tolerance”: “Mr Blair’s voice will carry weight. For although his hectic travelling has grated with many voters at home, it has boosted his standing overseas. His clear-cut stands on terrorism, Islam and Afghanistan are acknowledged as principled and courageous” (TT, April 11, 2003).

In the wake of 7/7, TT goes on to represent Islam and Muslims associating it with violence, bloodletting and terrorism showing ‘zero tolerance’: “The tragedy of 7/7, perpetrated right in the heart of London, has further radicalized the western perception of Islam and the Muslims. What reigns supreme today on the minds of the West is a highly distorted and convoluted image of Islam. A religion of peace and tranquillity that Islam inherently is in its pristine sense is, regrettably, associated with violence, bloodletting and terrorism, Islam, today, is stuck in the western mind as a religion which has ‘zero tolerance’ for other religions and their followers. We all know that this is not what Islam stands for” (TT, July 15, 2005).

The same [[and/or] + terrorism] colligational pattern highlights the issues and conflicts annexed with terrorism, namely economy, security, issues & conflicts, climate change, and economy etc. Change is presented in terms of climate change, as a challenge, hence an enemy along with terrorism to fight with.

4.5 [Terrorism (Adjectival) + Noun]: Terrorism Modifying a Noun
In this frame terrorism modifies a noun, as in ‘terrorism suspects’. Here terrorism, though primarily a noun, acts as an adjective.

The most of the nouns here are related to the law and order, legislation, security, trial, policies and detention etc. Issues related to terror suspects and detention at Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib are frequent in this colligational frame. The terrorism probe is presented as having positive semantic prosody equating it with intelligence which is used positively throughout the corpus as contrasted against ‘espionage’ that is normally attributed to terrorists, with highly negative semantic prosody. The overall concordances of this colligational pattern show the themes of legality and efficacy of applying techniques, extreme interrogation techniques, and legislative provisions regarding the illegal detention of the terror suspects.


This colligational syntactic pattern {pp_obj_of + terrorism} is typically a pattern with highly negative semantic prosody, as can be seen in table 4.8:

Right after the 9/11 attacks, the rhetoric of ‘act of x’ (like act of war, act of terrorism etc.) became significant when Bush declared terrorist attacks as ‘acts of war’. The colligational frame gives a possessive attribute to ‘terrorism’, driving all the lexicon into the realm of negative discourse prosody. The Concordance 4.10 shows the rhetoric of ‘act of terrorism’ in WOTC:
This rhetoric of ‘act of’ is very prominent in WOTC; because act is also a strong collocate of terrorism in the corpus; furthermore, it is also included in the keywords with a very high keyness score. The bombing of a Jewish community center in Buenos Aires is Presented as act of anti-Semitic terrorism: “Slow-Motion Justice in Argentina Nearly nine years have passed since 85 people were killed in the bombing of a Jewish community center in Buenos Aires, the deadliest single act of anti-Semitic terrorism since World War II. Iran has long been a leading suspect in the crime…” (TNT, March 11, 2003). In the context of Lockerbie aviation disaster (1988) Libya is condemned for its ‘most notorious act of terrorism’, though Libyan authorities have always been denying the so-called allegations: “Libya seems to have gotten itself out of the busines of directly sponsoring international terrorism. It has been especially active in making amends for its most notorious act of terrorism, the 1988 bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, which killed 270 people” (TNT, December 20, 2003).

The contested debates around the definition of terrorism with its scope had been and even are still popular in the media circles. In WOTC all the selected newspapers have their own definitions on the origin of terrorism.
about the role of intelligence in the age of terrorism; that relate to the role of intelligence, national security and the issues related to law and order. In WOTC, Terrorism is presented as a monster with diverse metaphorical representations (concordance 4.13):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concordance 4.12 Rhetoric of ‘age of terrorism’ in WOTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>saying that Pakistan has to root out the monster of terrorism in its own interest. No profundity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterize the domestic scenario. The monster of terrorism stalks the land, and yet the monster of terrorism stalked the country. The targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the by-election. Throughout the year, the monster of terrorism stalked the country. The targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 14, 2005 Troubled times THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the national scene. There is first the monster of terrorism that strikes every now and then, and to which they are at the mercy of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governments redoubled their efforts to tackle the monster of terrorism jointly. Already, the normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on national consensus to tackle the monster of terrorism. The situation in Swat is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13, 2009 Monster of terrorism THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two, the general did try to control the monster of terrorism but was thwarted by the old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how difficult it is to tame the terrible monster of terrorism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation. To achieve victory over the monster of terrorism, it is necessary for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we will be able to swiftly overcome the monster of terrorism that is destroying society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We cannot put our own hope to conquer that exchange of barbs and jibes must stop. The monster of terrorism is too mighty to be defeated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The monster is presented as ‘too mighty to be defeated’ (L17), stalking the land and the country (L2, L3). The monster is presented as ‘creeping from the fringe’ (L11) and shadows that should be rooted out (L1). L13 voices an interesting idea of taming the monster of terrorism “how difficult it is to tame the terrible monster of terrorism” (TN, November 25, 2007).

4.7 [{pp_obj_against}+ terrorism} Frame: ‘War against Terrorism’

In WOTC, the colligation of [{pp_obj_against}+ terrorism} frame giving the instances of terrorism as an object of prepositional phrase, as in ‘coalition against terrorism’, is frequently used and its usage is ideologically determined. All the semantic preferences of this colligational grammatical pattern have positive discourse prosody, as can be seen in table 4.9.

Table 4.9 The colligations of “{pp_obj_against}+ terrorism}” in WOTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concordance 4.13 Rhetoric of monster of terrorism in WOTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is interesting to note that the following phrases were frequently used in WOTC as an alternative to ‘war on terror’. For example the despite using ‘war on terror’ or ‘war against terrorism’ the following phrases were used as a substitute but their use was ideologically significant: fight against terrorism, struggle against terrorism, coalition against terrorism, battle against terrorism, campaign against terrorism, defense against terrorism, drive against terrorism, action against terrorism, line against terrorism, measures against terrorism, ally against terrorism, and operation against terrorism; this ideological intentional substitution is called textual synonymy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 [{pp_obj_to}+ terrorism} Frame: ‘Support to Terrorism’

This colligational pattern gives the cases of terrorism as an object of prepositional phrase, as in ‘end to terrorism’. The positive and negative discourse prosodies of this grammatical structure can be seen in table 4.10:

Table 4.10 The colligations of “{pp_obj_to}+ terrorism}” in WOTC

The [{pp_obj_to}+ terrorism} frame in WOTC is linked with mostly negative discourse/semantic prosody; for
example: connection to terrorism, support to terrorism, link to terrorism, resort to terrorism, relate to terrorism, preparatory to terrorism, vulnerability to terrorism.

The node item 'end to terrorism' collocates with peace, stability, economic revival, clenching, investment, schools, and institutions. Though, it also collocates with turmoil, militancy, horrors and massacre.

The link, connection, support, resort and preparatory to terrorism show the pre occupation of discourse with the suspected individuals, groups or organisations and states that are represented as promoters of terror as shown in concordance 4.14.

Concordance 4.14  Rhetoric of 'connection to terrorism' in WOTC

4.9 {pp_obj_on}+ terrorism Frame: 'War on Terrorism'

The grammatical pattern {pp_obj_on}+ terrorism gives the cases of terrorism as an object of prepositional phrase: as in ‘policy on terrorism’. The war, tough, focus, speech and policy have positive discourse prosody; and soft, weak are presented as having negative semantic prosody (see table 4.11):

Table 4.11 The colligations of “[pp_obj_on]+ terrorism” in WOTC

The manipulation of war on terror discourse for political gains and designs, especially during the American presidential electoral campaigns is manifest in the concordance 4.15:

Concordance 4.15 Rhetoric of ‘soft on terrorism’ in WOTC

Criticising the Congress for being ‘soft on terrorism’ Bush administration, manipulated the war on terror discourse for its own political purposes in the name of inadequate defense for constitutional rights: “A polarized Congress, wary of being portrayed as soft on terrorism, is not an adequate defense for our constitutional rights” (TNT, March 24, 2003). The Republican’s chances of winning elections are based on ‘look soft on terrorism’ not by passing a good law but by forcing Democrats to vote against a bad one so they could be made to look soft on terrorism” (TWP, June 03, 2007). Obama is seen as being ‘soft on terrorism’ by his intentions of closing the Guantanamo Bay detention cell: “Republicans offered the usual charge that Mr. Obama is soft on terrorism. Senator John Cornyn of Texas said housing detainees in American cells ‘will put our citizens in unnecessary danger’” (TNT, December 15, 2009).

In contrast, the rhetoric of ‘tough on terrorism’ is also echoed in the political arena and media to manipulate their own political aims.

Concordance 4.16 Rhetoric of ‘tough on terrorism’ in WOTC

The stance of being ‘tough on terrorism’ is presented as a standard for winning the political gains in American politics and as ‘central to his (Bush) re-election campaign’: “Last week in his State of the Union address seemed to be political: to create the appearance of being tough on terrorism , which is central to his re-election campaign, while undercutting the chorus of critics, spanning the political spectrum, who are calling the act a threat to civil liberties” (TNT, January 27, 2004).
The outlook of the parties by being ‘tough on terrorism’ became vital for their political existence: “Both parties in Congress were eager to show they were tough on terrorism” (TNT, July 16, 2006). Saudi Arabia is advised to get ‘tougher on terrorism’ or to part of Bush’s ‘world freedom crusade’ to avoid Al-Qaeda’s horrific actions against its citizens: “The slaughter, mainly of Arab families from outside Saudi Arabia, in the al-Muhaya housing complex is indeed a horrific act stamped with the callous trademark of al-Qaida. Yet whether advising Saudi Arabia to get tougher on terrorism or to join Mr Bush’s world freedom crusade, the US lays itself open to scepticism and even ridicule” (TG, November 11, 2003). Even the ‘soft/tough on terrorism’ mantra is also present in British media before the elections with the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats choosing between the alternatives ‘soft’ or ‘tough’: “That a devastating terrorist attack occurs in Britain in the week before the general election is the stuff of Blairite nightmares. Their answer is to be seen, in advance, as being as ‘tough on terrorism’ as a government could be. If the Conservatives are thereby forced into supporting ID cards, because of the scheme’s popularity with the public, and the Liberal Democrats can be branded ‘soft on crime’ for opposing them…” (TT, November 30, 2004).

Even the so called American Justice and ‘way’ were threatened when the lawmakers ‘Stampeded by the fear of looking weak on terrorism’ hurriedly streamlined themselves by passing the anti-terrorism bill as directed by Bush: “Stampeded by the fear of looking ‘weak on terrorism’, lawmakers are rushing to pass a bill demanded by the president that would have minimal impact on antiterrorist operations but could cause profound damage to justice and the American way”.

In Short, the above analysis identified nine distinct significant grammatical patterns in WOTC and the researcher discussed each of them with elaborate and empirical results with concordance analysis while reading extended co-text while identifying the ideology embedded in the syntax.

5. Conclusion

The main aim of this paper was to identify the colligations of ‘terrorism’ with its ideological stances in WOTC corpus using John Sinclair’s model of extended lexical units. The study shows how the discourse of ‘war on terror’ in the elite Pak Anglo-American newspaper editorials, TNT-corpus, TWP-corpus, TG-corpus, TT-corpus, DAWN-corpus and TN-corpus use colligational syntax patterns to legitimate and rationalise the language, actions and policies in war times; specifically, mediating the construction of knowledge and meaning contributing to ideological stances. To find out the significant idiosyncrasies of the selected newspaper editorials in the choice of lexical items, word patterns, word sketches, semantic choices and semantic/discourse prosody, WOT corpora is analysed to identify the newspapers’ stance in ‘war on terror’ discourse. The investigation of the strongest syntactic patterns, combined with concordance analysis with extended context, gave useful indications of the respective ideological stances towards ongoing ‘war on terror’.

The findings show nine distinct syntax structures in the corpus with their semantic choices and semantic prosodies. These colligations/syntax patterns include: {{verb + terrorism}}, {{terrorism +[verb] }}, { (Adjectival) Modifier + terrorism}, {{and/or} + terrorism}, {terrorism (Adjectival) + Noun}, {[[pp_obj_of] + terrorism]}, {[[pp_obj_against]+ terrorism]}, {[[pp_obj_to]+ terrorism]} and {[[pp_obj_on]+ terrorism]}.

In conclusion, the research contributes to the fields of corpus linguistics, colligational analysis and ideology analysis by utilising a unique, synchronised version of extended lexical units, a methodological synergy, and by offering new insights into the discursive practices and the discursive representation of ideology in elite American, British and Pakistani newspaper editorials in the ongoing ‘war on terror’ discourse.
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