

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 02 Volume: 82

Published: 29.02.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Maftuna Shuhrat kizi Bigmatova

Uzbekistan state world languages university

2nd year MA student

ON SOME PECULIARITIES OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE: REVIEW

Abstract: The following paper claims that the contextual orientation in the identification of political discourse removes the most complex issues related to the lexical and grammatical features of political discourse. Political discourse is regarded as a speech activity of political entities in the field of their institutional communication. Distinctive features of political discourse are institutionalization, conventionality, ideology and intertextuality. It also deals with the lexical layer, which is the most sensitive to changes in society. The process of transforming the lexical space in a language is almost continuous, which proves the close connection of the linguistic system with other areas of public life – political, state, socio-economic, etc. Since the more intense changes in politics, the more significant the changes in vocabulary at each stage of its development.

Key words: socio-political discourse, political vocabulary, political text.

Language: English

Citation: Bigmatova, M. S. (2020). On some peculiarities of political discourse: review. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 02 (82), 278-281.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-02-82-50> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.02.82.50>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

The ontology of research on political discourse urges to deal with the problem of differentiating political discourse with respect to other types of discourse (legal, pedagogical, advertising, military, etc.). Political discourse is a phenomenon that has much greater frequency of manifestation in society in comparison with other types of discourses. In this regard, the phenomenon of political discourse does not have an unambiguous definition, since the category of *policy* itself currently does not have a clear definition, and secondly, the allocation of political discourse in the aggregate of linguistic features is not possible.

In political science, politics is defined as a set of certain actions aimed at distributing power and economic resources in the country [10; 371]. This official level of politics includes the media, the education system and all those social institutions that control the phenomena.

Webster defines politics as following:

- a: the art or science of government
- b: the art or science concerned with guiding or influencing governmental policy
- c: the art or science concerned with winning and holding control over a government

The following research deals with the term “politics” as the activity of state bodies, associations of citizens and individuals, relations between states, nations, large groups of people, which is aimed at realizing, upholding one’s interests and associated with the desire to the conquest and use of power.

Political communication is “any communication that affects the distribution and use of power in society, especially if these messages come from official government institutions” [5; 311].

Procedure as a Distinctive Sign of Political Discourse is a determining factor for highlighting political discourse as “a form of political action, part of the political process” [6; 224].

According to A. N. Baranov and E. G. Kazakevich, who believe that political discourse forms “the totality of all speech acts used in political discussions, as well as public policy rules illuminated by tradition and verified by experience ...” [8; 6].

From semiotic viewpoint, political discourse is defined as a kind of sign system in which the semantics and functions of different types of language units and standard speech actions are modified [15; 3]. Political discourse is interpreted as institutional communication, which, unlike the personality-oriented one, uses a certain system, expressed by the

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

formula “discourse = sublanguage + text + context” [15; 15]. Target dominant has become decisive in considering political discourse as a “set of political discussions of society: authorities discourse, counter-discussion of public rhetoric, fixing the system of public relations or destabilizing it.

Literature Review

The sources for studying political vocabulary are associated with the activities of American writers of journalists and sociologists W. Lippmann, P. Lazarsfeld, G. Lasswell, N. Leites. Later, in his monograph “Language in Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics”, G. Lasswell and his colleagues identified various interdependencies between the semantics of linguistic units, their frequency and political processes.

In 1948, D. Orwell wrote a dystopian novel in which the principle of “doublethink” and the dictionary of “newspeak”, i.e. how to manipulate human consciousness through vocabulary in order to gain and maintain political power in a totalitarian state.

In 1946, J. Orwell published the famous article “Politics and the English Language”, which can be attributed to the first experiments in the study of the English political vocabulary. J. Orwell drew attention to the fact that in political discourses such words as *democracy*, *socialism*, *freedom*, *patriotic*, *realistic*, *justice* do not have a definite meaning, and attempts to give them an unambiguous definition meet resistance among politicians. For example, the word *democracy* has only a universal evaluative characteristic, since in the listener's cognition this word reproduces a positive connotation. J.Orwell was one of the first to point out the widespread prevalence of certain words in the political communication of various states.

Following the West, after the Second World War, Russian scientists began to study the aspect of speech and vocabulary of the presidents. The reasons for the persuasiveness of presidential speeches were searched in phonetic and grammatical features, wit, simplicity, imagery and other qualities of speech.

There are assumptions of the special position of the grammatical political language, such as, for example, the tendency to eliminate the category of person [11; 1994], the inclusive use of personal pronouns *we*, *our*. However, we think that these grammatical features, unlike special vocabulary, are not traits inherent exclusively in political discourse, these forms and constructions are used in other types of communication (with a difference in frequency and pragmatic orientation).

The presence of general cognitive patterns of despecialization of political terms in political discourse enable its understanding in practice by all members of the language community. The widespread despecialization of political terms is that political communication, like no other domain of public

relations, is aimed at the mass consumer (addressee). On the other hand, the language of expression of relations of power in official discourse is a “strong language”, which indicates a rather high status of the speaker, satisfying the requirement of his/her positional role. Such a text testifies to the speaker's increased attention to linguistic expressiveness and the design of his/her message. Political oratorical speech also belongs to the category of such texts.

Some works suggest that the language of politics has a specific content, not a form. Formally, the language of politics is distinguished by only a small number of canonized expressions and clichés. P. Serio highlights the hypertrophied tendency to nominalization and composition as the grammatical features of Soviet political discourse [4; 1985]. He defines the Soviet political discourse as “a special use of the language to express a special mentality, ideology”.

As to T.A. van Dijk [1; 2001] there are possible stylistic, thematic and interactive markers that contribute to the identification of the distinction signs of political discourse; it does not seem possible to create any typology of political discourse based on only verbal properties. T.A. Van Dijk concludes that the fundamental category for highlighting political discourse is context, not the text itself.

Following this logic, T.A. van Dijk [1999a] characterizes political discourse as a combination of genres of the social domain of politics and contrasts it with educational discourse, media discourse, and legal discourse. At the same time, it is emphasized that the policy domain has rather vague boundaries, since the term “policy” is interpreted differently in different sources [1; 2001].

There are several works on the study of political lexis in the Uzbek language. Researchers mainly studied Turkology in comparison with Russian studies. Peculiarities of the vocabulary of socio-political strata in the Turkic languages appeared only at the end of the XX century.

Kh.A. Dadabaev in the monographic study “Socio-political and socio-economic terminology in Turkic written monuments of the XI-XIV centuries” (1991) analyzes the lexical-semantic group of socio-political terminology associated with the administrative-political state, activities of the foreign policy, social structures in the ancient Turkic scriptures. The author gives a historical and etymological analysis of the considered vocabulary. This work is considered the first monographic study in the framework of PL in the language of awareness of the Uzbek language.

In the monograph “Comparative historical grammar of Turkic languages. Vocabulary” (1997) explores the socio-political terms that have a common Turkic character.

In her PhD work A.Kh. Turakhozhaeva (2012) studies the language development system of political

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

lexis in the period of independence of the Republic of Uzbekistan. The researcher notes the subject of the study to be an open system which is subject to changes [3].

A number of works have been done by the Uzbek scientist E.D.Muratova, in which she demonstrates several techniques and methods to improve the quality of translation of political lexis.

A.D. Urazbaev's (2010) work is dedicated to the historical political lexis of the Uzbek language, where the author analyzes and generalizes the political lexis. A.D. Urazbaev gives a typology of political lexis on a thematic-semantic basis, analyzes the linguistic and extralinguistic factors of the vocabulary, methods of enrichment and development in synchronous and diachronous aspects [14].

A.A. Abdullaeva (2005) studies a diplomatic and foreign policy vocabulary in a comparable aspect in her thesis "Vocabulary of international relations sphere (based on the Russian and Uzbek languages)". The researcher studies the similarities and differences of the foreign policy terms in different languages, touches on the problems of the Uzbek terms in the fields of international relations. The study deals with regulatory and international documents for 1992-2002 [7].

Z.M. Isakova studies the composition of the political lexis using linguistic analysis in the framework of the work of Alisher Navoi "Majalis al-nafais" (Collection of the refined)" (2010). She divides this layer into groups and reveals some phrases based on genetic analysis and which were not included in the dictionary of works by A. Navai. She reveals the frequency of political lexis of this period.

Conclusion

Political lexis is an element of socio-political discourse; its peculiarity stems from the goals of political activity, in particular "the popularization of the ideal and practical dimension of the so-called *common interest*." Understanding the common interest, in turn, is associated with the value system of a particular society. The target sign of a political text is the purpose for influencing society through the propaganda of certain ideas, emotional influence on citizens of the country and their incitement to political actions. The content of a political text determines the use of a special group of words – the socio-political vocabulary (political phraseology, metaphor, terms, etc.). Based on the foregoing, in our opinion, the PL is loaded with cultural information, as it is used as an argument of persuasion.

References:

1. Dijk, T.A. van. (2001). *Political discourse and ideology*. www.let.uva.nl/~teun.Dijk
2. Dijk, T.A. van. (1999). *Discourse and Racism // The Blackwell Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*. (p.16). Oxford: Blackwell.
3. Orwell, G. (1946). *Politics and the English Language // The Norton anthology of English literature*. New York.
4. Sériot, P. (1985). *Analyse du discours politique soviétique*. (Cultures et sociétés de l'Est 2). (p.362). Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
5. Schudson, M. (1997). Sending a Political Message: Lessons from the American 1790s. *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol.19, № 3, pp. 311-330.
6. Wodak, R., & Seldak, M. (2000). *We demand that Foreigners Adapt to our Life-Style: Political Discourse on Immigration Laws in Austria and the United Kingdom*. Combating Racial Discrimination. (pp.217-237). Oxford.
7. Abdullaeva, A.A. (2005). *Leksika sfery mehdunarodnyh otnoshenij* (na materiale russkogo i uzbekskogo jazykov). Diss.kand.filol.nauk. (p.167). Tashkent.
8. Baranov, A. N., & Kazakevich, E. G. (1991). *Parlamentskie debaty: tradicii i novacii. Sovetskij politicheskij jazyk* (ot rituala k metafore). (p.42). Moscow: Znanie.
9. Dadaboev, H.A. (1991). *Obshhestvenno-politicheskaja i social'no-jekonomicheskaja terminologija v tjurkojazychnyh pis'mennyh pamjatnikah XI-XIV vv.* (p.185). Tashkent: «Jozuvchi».
10. Zelenskij, V.V. (1996). *Posleslovie k knige: V. Odajnik. Psihologija politiki. Psihologicheskie i social'nye idei Karla Gustava Junga*. (pp.368-380). SPb.: Juventa.
11. Rzhinashvili, I.U. (1994). *Lingvisticheskie mehanizmy tendencioznogo predstavlenija sobytij v anglo-amerikanskoy periodike*: Avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. (p.17). SPb..
12. Stepanov, Ju. S. (1995). *Al'ternativnyj mir, Diskurs, Fakt i princip prichinnosti / Jazyk i nauka konca 20 veka*. (pp.36-48). Moscow: Nauka.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

13. Turahozhaeva, A.H. (2012). *Mustaqillik sharoitida yzbek tili izhtimosij-sijosij leksikasining taraqqijoti*. Diss.kand.filol.nauk. (p.136). Tashkent.
14. Urazbaev, A.D. (2010). *Ogaxijning «Rijoz ud-davla» asarida izhtimosij-sijosij leksika*. Diss.kand.filol.nauk. (p.155). Tashkent.
15. Shejgal, E. I. (2000). *Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa*. Monografija. (p.368). Volgograd: Peremena.