LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Djalilova Z.B.
Bukhara State University, a senior teacher of the
Department of English Linguistics, PhD
Ibotova M.K.
Bukhara State University,
a 1-year master of English Linguistics

Annotatsiya: Ushbu tezisda siyosiy nut:qning xususiyatlari, xususan, ingliz tilidagi siyosiy nutqlarning lingvistik jihatlari mushohada qilinadi. Siyosiy nutqlar ko'pincha ma'lum bir madaniy va ijtimoiy kontekstda shaklllanadi va turli lingvistik vositalardan foydalanadi, chunki ma'ruzachining maqsadlaridan biri jamoatchilikni ishontirishdir. Ushbu tadqiqot, birinchi navbatda, ba'zi mualliflarning fikrlarini taqdim etish orqali ingliz tilidagi siyosiy nutqning asosiy xususiyatlarini ta'kidlashni maqsad qilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: siyosiy nutq, siyosiy til, ritorika

Annotation: This thesis analyses the characteristics of political discourse, in particular, the linguistic features of political speeches in English. Political speeches are often formed in a specific cultural and social context and use a variety of linguistic means, being one of the speaker's goals is to convince the public. This study, firstly, intends to emphasize the main features of political discourse in English by presenting the views of some authors.

Key words: political discourse, political language, rhetoric

Аннотация: В диссертации анализируются особенности политического дискурса, в частности языковые особенности политических речей на английском языке. Политические выступления часто формируются в конкретном культурном и социальном контексте и используют разнообразные языковые средства, являясь одной из целей оратора - убедить публику. Данное исследование, во-первых, призвано подчеркнуть основные черты политического дискурса на английском языке путем представления взглядов некоторых авторов.

Ключевые слова: политический дискурс, политический язык, риторика.

The study of political languages dates back to ancient Greek and Roman times. Over the years the field has been continuously developed. At the end of the 17th century, Thomas Hobbes introduced modern political philosophy, which is considered to be the basis of today's political science discipline. Later, the concept of politics was associated with language   and introduced into the study of "political language" by many pioneers.[1] Many scholars, such as Lasswell, have argued that political language is considered a language of influence as it intends to influence people. Thus, Van Dijk stated that the language of politics is the language of power.[2] According to Schaffner and Chilton, the development of the field of political discourse is regarded as a complex human activity, so a deep study of political discourse is needed. Scholars further emphasize the importance of learning political language, along

---

[1] Claeys, G. (2013). *Encyclopedia of Modern Political Thought* (set). Page 776
[2] Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Discourse and Manipulation. Discourse & Society.* Page 362

with other important factors such as culture and audience that can influence political language.[3] Some scholars say that it is extremely difficult to define the concept since the range of meanings of political discourse is wide, but there are also scholars who believe that it is related to everything that is said publicly in relation to politics. Here we see that political discourse is not just a communication; it incorporates together clear goals and specific participants, functioning as power.

Feldman and Landshire argue that the most common term referring to communication in the political sphere is the term "political discourse". They define it as the way language is used in public communications found in newspapers, television, radio stations, congressional debates and election speeches, etc. The language in political discourse usually has great power since its aim is to evoke public reaction.[4] Thus, the political discourse of mass media has every possibility to control the views and attitudes of its audience.

Political speech is usually characterized as a complex, powerful and ambiguous type of language due to its richness in cultural and ideological components. As in any other field, political language has many terms, jargon and slogans, the meaning of which can vary from country to country. It is used to achieve specific political goals. Also, a very important feature of political speech is its tendency to use rhetorical language. According to Charteris-Black, the effectiveness in political speech is often the result of a combination of rhetorical strategies. Therefore, it is as interesting to observe the interaction of the various strategies as it is to consider each strategy individually.[5] Jones and Wareing argue that the ability to convey the message that the speaker and the listener want the same thing plays an important role in the process of establishing an ideology.[6] To achieve a sense of unity between the audience and the speaker, politicians often use symbols to strengthen national unity.[7]

A metaphor is a linguistic sign that gives a concrete label to an abstract idea. It can be possible because of the regarded similarity between objects and concepts with respect to the specific characteristics that a person wants to convey. Lakoff and Johnson consider human conceptual systems to be metaphorical. A metaphor is not just a linguistic tool. In fact, they permeate perception, thought, and behavior.[8] Common metaphors of politics come from sports and war fields. At the same time, a political campaign can be viewed as a military action, but a military action takes the form of an argument. In Western societies, the two concepts of "conflict" and "war" are understood to be closely related despite the fact that they generally refer to different types of problems.[9]

Thus, this thesis presents the features of political discourse and the brief overview of these features in English. It also identifies implicit statements in the political language and find examples of linguistic strategies. Taking into consideration the definitions of political discourse given by a variety of authors, we can say that political discourse is the unit of all speech acts.

---

[3] Chilton P. & Schaffner C. (2002). *Politics as Talk and Text: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse.* Page 21

[4] Ofer Feldman and Christ'I De Ladtsheer (1998). *Politically Speaking: A Worldwide Examination of Language Used in the Public Sphere.* Page 5

[5] Charteris-Black J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor.* Page 11

[6] Jones J, & Wareing S. (1999). *Language and Politics*. In L. Thomas (ed.), *Language, Society and Power*. Page 34

[7] Alan R. Ball & B. Guy Peters (2000). *Modern Politics and Government.* Page 81

[8] Lakoff G. & Johnson M. (1980) *Metaphors we live by*. Page 3

[9] Lakoff G. & Johnson M. (1980) *Metaphors we live by*. Page 5

References

1. Alan R. Ball & B. Guy Peters (2000). *Modern Politics and Government.* Chatham House. 322 pp
2. Beard A. (2000) *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge
3. Claeys G. (2013). *Encyclopedia of Modern Political Thought* (set). Washington: CQ Press. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452234168
4. Charteris-Black J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor.* Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230501706
5. Chilton P. & Schaffner C. (2002). *Politics as Talk and Text: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse.* 246 pp. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.4
6. Jones J, & Wareing S. (1999). *Language and Politics*. In L.Thomas (ed.), *Language, Society and Power*. London: Routledge.
7. Lakoff G. & Johnson M. (1980) *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
8. Lasswell H. (1949). *Style in the Language of Politics.*
9. Ofer Feldman and Christ'I De Ladtsheer (1998). *Politically Speaking: A Worldwide Examination of Language Used in the Public Sphere*. Westport, CT: Praeger. 1998. x + 212 pp
10. Teun A. van Dijk (2006). *Discourse and Manipulation. Discourse & Society,* 17(3), 359–383. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250
11. Djalilova, Z. B. (2020). FLORA IN EDMUND SPENSER'S POETRY. Theoretical & Applied Science, (4), 371-375. https://www.elibrary.ru/page_404.asp?qx=https%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Eelibrary%2Eru%2Fitem%2Easp%3Fid%3D42831520.
12. Bakhodirovna, D. Z. (2021). Description of Human Features and Feelings through Flora in English Poetry. CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE, 2(10), 6-9. https://cajlpc.centralasianstudies.org/index.php/CAJLPC/article/view/209.
13. Rasulov, Z. I. The problem of language economy from the perspective of language evolution. https://uniwork.buxdu.uz/resurs/14162_1_335A013FB811809E768BB3EC8D34729184AA276D.pdf
14. Баходировна , З. Д. . (2023). Выражение Модели "Эмоция – Растение" В Английской И Узбекской Поэзии . Miasto Przyszłości, 32, 147–150. Retrieved from http://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/1117
15. Djalilova, Z. (2022). ОПИСАНИЕ ЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСКОГО ОБРАЗА ПОСТРЕДСТВОМ ЦВЕТОВ В АНГЛИЙСКОЙ ПОЭЗИИ. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. Uz), 26, 26. https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/8567