

POLITICAL DISCOURSE AS A SUBJECT OF RESEARCH IN LINGUISTICS

Zyubina Irina

Southern Federal University

Rostov-on-Don, Russia

irinazyubina@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.52340/lac.2023.30.03>

The article examines political discourse as an object of study in linguistics. In this regard, various definitions of political discourse and an analysis of its main functions are given, which leads to consideration of this concept from the perspective of a narrow and broad understanding. Within a narrow understanding of political discourse, it is assumed that speech activity is actualized exclusively by a politician in a political situation. When broadly understood, political discourse includes a wide range of subjects and objects associated with the political sphere. Within this interpretation, either a sender, an addressee, or a topic of communication is related to politics. In this case, we are talking not only about official political communication, but also about messages on political topics in the media, various Internet resources related to politics (blogs, websites, comments), these can also be scientific articles about politics, etc. This understanding of political discourse is associated with the processes of globalization and the increasing influence of various types of media on people. Attention is paid to the distinctive features of political discourse as a special type of communication, since the solution to political problems largely depends on how these problems are reflected in the language.

Key words: communication, political discourse, function, political language.

Currently, interest in the study of political discourse has increased, and one of the main issues in this area has become the question of its definition. Political discourse is interpreted as a text taken in the event aspect [2: 136]; the unity of linguistic form, knowledge and action [3: 121]; speech immersed in life [1: 136]; speech activity in sound, graphic or electronic representation, included in the broad social, psychological, activity, etc. context [9: 16].

With all the interpretative richness of definitions, it should be noted that in the linguistic literature there is a narrow and broad understanding of political discourse. One of the proponents of a narrow understanding of political discourse is the Dutch linguist T. van Dijk. In his opinion, political discourse is a class of genres limited to the political sphere, which include parliamentary debates, government discussions, party programs of parties and speeches of politicians. At the same time, political discourse is a form of institutional discourse, i.e. this is a discourse reproduced in an institutional environment (a congress of a political party, a parliamentary session, a government meeting, etc.). T. van Dijk insists that discourse is political only if it acts as a tool of politicians, that is, it accompanies political communication

[3: 1989]. According to Zh.V. Siegmann, political discourse is verbal communication in which the sender and recipient are assigned social roles based on their participation in political life and the subject of communication is the political life of society [6: 6]. Thus, from the position of a narrow understanding, discourse is considered political when it accompanies a political act in a political setting [5: 1988].

A broad understanding of discourse interprets it as such speech formations, where either the subject, or the addressee, or the content belongs to the sphere of politics [10: 23]. Political discourse includes the political views of the communicant, his/her tasks when creating a text, ideas about the addressee and opponent, and the current political situation. The term political discourse has many specifics: rally discourse, parliamentary discourse, regional and federal discourse, the discourse of a particular election campaign or the discourse of a specific stage in the development of political language [8: 254]. When interpreted broadly, the concept of political discourse includes such types as: official political discourse; media political discourse; Internet texts on political topics (blogs, websites, comments); scientific articles on politics, etc. Thus, a broad understanding of political discourse correlates with the expansion of globalization processes, the increasing influence of the mass media and the development of new communication technologies.

It is important to consider the definition of political discourse based on the direct functioning of the politicians themselves, that is, the authors of political texts and speeches. Politicians in this sense are a group of people who are paid for their activities and who are elected or appointed to their positions as a result of public vote to convey political projects and proposals to the public. Therefore, at this stage of considering the concept of political discourse, it is important to mention the recipients participating in political communication events, that is, citizens of a certain state, people at whom political speech is aimed. All of these groups and individuals, as well as their organizations and institutions, can take part in the political process, and many of them are necessary to define political discourse [16: 700]. Politics is a social phenomenon and a sphere of human activity, which by its nature is a set of speech actions. Based on this, political discourse can be defined as institutional communication with its own sublanguage and its own system of signs (lexis, phraseology, paremiology), characterized by the presence of certain addressees and recipients, equally involved in the political communicative event [7: 281].

According to E.I. Shegal, the key functions of political discourse include the following functions: 1) integration and differentiation of group political agents; 2) development of conflict (agonism) and establishment of consensus; 3) carrying out verbal political actions and informing about them; 4) creation of a linguistic reality of the political field and its interpretation; 5) manipulation of consciousness and control of the actions of politicians and the electorate [10: 5].

The main functions of political discourse are the following ones: informative function, the purpose of which is to represent political events; argumentative function, which comes down to explaining political actions; persuasive function, which consists in persuading the mass addressee; control function aimed at manipulating public consciousness; interpretive function, which allows you to create many variable models

of political events; the function of social identification, designed to both integrate and differentiate the subjects of political communication; delimitive function, designed to emphasize the difference between one's own political group and political opponents; agonistic function, which manifests itself in verbal aggression directed against political opponents.

Since the main objective of any political discourse is the struggle for power, political language must be understandable and focused on a specific group [4: 42]. Most linguists believe that the persuasive function is fundamental to political discourse. The formulation and clarification of a political position (orientation), the search for and rallying of supporters (integration), the fight against the enemy (aggression as a manifestation of atonality) belong to the functional content of political communication. The main organizing principle of the semiotic space of political discourse becomes the semantic triad (orientation - integration - atonality), which underlies the basic opposition "ins - outs" [10:15].

Some scientists believe that political activity generally comes down to linguistic activity [11: 137]. Politicians need a language to inform, give instructions, legislate, persuade, manipulate, etc. Political discourse is not only about putting forward policy proposals. We are talking about a certain use of words and language in general. They are used in a given discourse to influence listeners and therefore political direction.

Lexical units in the organization of political speeches by their authors can be specifically selected not only because of the political correctness of some terms and compliance with universal criteria of decency, but also because they effectively emphasize political views and opinions, manipulate public opinion, help conclude agreements and compromises, and establish legal political power [16: 705].

Currently, there is a trend in political discourse that is anti-intellectual [15: 2008]. This phenomenon is known as populism, a tactic of directly flirting with the broad masses of the people, in which there is a departure from the idea of leadership of a predetermined politically elite group [14: 2016] and in which populists prefer to use the discourse of the lower class and the discourse of ordinary people, and not the official language [13: 2000]. To compose political speeches, as a rule, fairly clear and simple language is used so that the ideas put forward are easily perceived by the target audience and other people who may subsequently read or hear this or that speech by the politician in the media. In addition, political texts are written by a group of professional speechwriters who are trained to use specific strategies and structures to make the speech sound convincing from the speaker's mouth.

Convention is the main feature of political speech, which distinguishes it from other existing genres of speech. A political speech is almost always preceded by an event that gives rise to the creation of a political text. For this reason, the authors of political speeches are maximally involved in the content of their texts, which focus on presenting a reasoned and correct version of events as a commentary on the original event that gives rise to the speech.

The purpose of political language is to present reality as a platform for the realization of political interests. For this aim different means are used, for instance, facial expression, gestures, intonation,

emotional words, new words, and even slang. Political language is flexible and precise, which makes it ambivalent. With the help of flexibility, you can create ideological images, puns, use jargon, and make hints. On the other hand, its precision imposes a logical structure with the help of which speech is constructed.

In his work on the role of language in the English politics, Epstein wrote that “the struggle over whose voices and what forms of political language possess authority within the public sphere of discourse is essential to the reproduction of relationships of dominance and subordination in modern society” [12: 28]. This statement is equally important in the context of political contestation in any country where the conflict between officials and the opposition is ultimately a struggle for power based on a common set of linguistic idioms. This rivalry is necessary because of the incompatible views of society offered by these competing groups, each seeking to justify their actions against the other by articulating their policies through the construction of a discourse that would provide legitimacy to their cause.

Thus, issues related to political discourse are the subject of active scientific debate, and any contribution to the development of the study of the language of politics becomes important and necessary. The mechanisms of political language and its characteristics as a means of influence also require coverage; consideration of this topic is also dictated by the need for the audience to understand the true intentions and hidden techniques of linguistic manipulation on the part of politicians and how professional activities distinguish political leaders from ordinary citizens.

References:

1. Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора и дискурс // Теория метафоры. – М.: Наука, 1990. – С. 5-33.
2. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: Издательство «Советская энциклопедия», 1969.
3. Ван Дейк Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. – М., 1989.
4. Водак Р. Язык. Дискурс. Политика. – Волгоград: Перемена, 1997.
5. Дейк Т.А., Кинч В. Стратегии понимания связного текста // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып.23. Когнитивные аспекты языка. – М.: Прогресс, 1988. – С. 25-41.
6. Зигманн Ж.В. Структура современного политического дискурса: речевые жанры и речевые стратегии. Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., 2003.
7. Карасик В.И. Языковой округ: личность, концепты, дискурс. – М.: Гнозис, 2004.
8. Чудинов А.П. Политическая лингвистика. – М.: Флинта, Наука, 2006.
9. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса. – М.: Гнозис, 2004.
10. Шейгал Е.И. Театральность политического дискурса // Единицы языка в их функционировании. – Саратов, 2000. – С. 92-96.
11. Edelman M. Constructing the Political Spectacle. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

12. Epstein J. Radical Expression: Political Language, Ritual, and Symbol in England, 1790–1850. – Oxford: University Press, 1994.
13. Grey A. A breath of fresh air: tackling smoking through the media / A. Grey, L. Owen, K. Bolling. – Health Development Agency, 2000.
14. Inglehart R.F. Trump, Brexit, and the rise of populism: Economic have-nots and cultural backlash / R. F. Inglehart, P. Norris. – Cambridge University Pr., 2016.
15. Lim E.T. The anti-intellectual presidency: The decline of presidential rhetoric from George Washington to George W. Bush / E. T. Lim. – Oxford University Press, 2008.
16. Safwat S. Speech Acts in Political Speeches. Journal of Modern Education Review, USA July 2015, Volume 5, No. 7, pp. 699-706.

Ирина Зубина

Южный федеральный университет, Ростов-на-Дону

Политический дискурс как предмет исследования в лингвистике

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается политический дискурс в качестве объекта изучения в лингвистике. В связи с этим даются различные определения политического дискурса и анализ его основных функций, что приводит к рассмотрению данного понятия с позиции узкого и широкого понимания. При узком понимании политического дискурса предполагается актуализация речевой деятельности исключительно политика в политической ситуации. При широком понимании политический дискурс включает широкий спектр субъектов и объектов, связанных с политической сферой. При таком толковании или адресант, или адресат, или тема коммуникации связаны с политикой. При этом речь идет не только об официальной политической коммуникации, но и о сообщениях на политические темы в СМИ, различных интернет-ресурсах, связанных с политикой (блогах, сайтах, комментариях), это могут быть и научные статьи о политике и т.д. Такое понимание политического дискурса связано с процессами глобализации и все большим влиянием различных видов медиа сферы на человека. Уделено внимание отличительным чертам политического дискурса как особого типа общения, поскольку решение политических проблем во многом зависит от того, как эти проблемы отражаются в языке.

Ключевые слова: коммуникация, политический дискурс, функция, политический язык.

Рецензент: профессор Тамар Ломтадзе

