

Pragmatic Intentions of Political Discourse

Makhdumakhon Safarova

Doctoral student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign languages

ABSTRACT

In modern researches, pragmatics is considered as a productive direction, and the pragmatic approach involves the analysis of speech acts as actions aimed at exerting a certain influence on the interlocutor.

KEYWORDS: intention, addresser, addressee, pragmatics, political discourse, communication.

Pragmatics (Greek. “pragma”, “pragmatos” – case, action) – the section of semiotics and linguistics, which studies the functioning of linguistic signs in the process and the attitude of speech subjects to the system of these signs (<https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pragmatika/>). The compilers of the encyclopedic dictionary believe that pragmatics, as a separate branch of linguistics, “has no clear boundaries, it includes a set of issues related to the speaking subject, the addresser, their interaction in communication, communication situations” (Языкознание. Большой энциклопедический словарь 1998: 390).

The famous American philosopher Ch. Morris, who proposed dividing semiotics into 3 sections - syntactics, semantics and pragmatics - defines pragmatics more broadly, that is, as a branch of linguistics that studies linguistic activity comprehensively (Моррис 1983).

The author of the book “Principles of Pragmatics” is the English scientist J. Leech considers pragmatics as the study of the meaning of a statement regarding a communication situation (Leech 1983). I.P. Susov was also inclined to associate pragmatics with context. The scientist notes that linguistic pragmatics “has as its subject a set of correlations between the units of the language system and the components of the communicative-pragmatic context of speech (and text) communication” (Сусов 1990: 125). Later, he defines pragmatics as a science that studies the ways of purposeful use of language, considers language as an instrument of social action and interaction based on certain postulates and strategies (Сусов 2006).

In the work of Uzbek pragmalinguists, the correlation of semantic and pragmatic aspects of speech phenomena occupies a special place. A. Nurmanov and N. Mahmudov, defining the text as an object of study of pragmatics, noted the importance of a pragmatic interpretation of a proposition in close connection with the speech situation and other conceptual indicators (Махмудов, Нурмонов 1995: 7).

The object of studying pragmalinguistics has a rather complex form, therefore, the development of general theoretical principles for the pragmatic analysis of linguistic phenomena is an important task of linguistic science. Professor M. Khakimov notes the following as general theoretical issues of pragmalinguistics:

1. the relation of an utterance to the context;
2. social aspects of speech activity;
3. linguistic coverage of the subjective modal meaning of utterances. Finally, the scientist believes that the discursive theory, which reflects the inner subjective state of the speaker, is also an object of study of pragmatics (Хакимов 2020: 40-42).

The importance of taking into account contextual data is emphasized in the definition proposed by Safarov: “Pragmatics is a separate linguistic direction, within which the question of the choice of linguistic units and

the impact of these units on participants in communication is investigated. These rules in relation to the conditions of communication are studied in a broad sense as a context” (Сафаров 2008: 81).

Linguopragmatic research covers a wide range of problems for the study of pragmatic content, paying attention to speech strategies and speech effects on the addresser, as well as ways and means of implementing a pragmatic attitude or intention. It is known that pragmatic intentions are represented in the choice of linguistic means.

The ability of political discourse to produce a communicative effect, i.e. to have a goal-setting effect on the addresser, is defined as the pragmatic aspect of this type of discourse.

The pragmatic intention determines both the choice of linguistic means and the structural organization of discourse. According to V.N. Teliya, in political discourse, the subject of speech tries to influence the recipient “pragmatically”, translates the author's intentions and assessment by expressive, figurative-emotive speech means (Телия 1996).

According to the researchers, the pragmatic effect of political communication manifests itself in manipulateness, which becomes the main goal-setting property of political discourse. The essence of the manipulative nature of political communication lies in the desire to influence the addressee, which is often carried out based on precedent formations.

Despite the fact that the problem of manipulating human consciousness and behavior has been considered within the framework of philosophy, sociology, psychology, communication theory and other humanities, however, there is still quite a lot unknown in the field of linguistic and pragmatic understanding of this phenomenon. There is a need to identify and substantiate meaningful features on the basis of which the ontology of this phenomenon can be determined.

The philosopher-methodologist Yu.A. Schrader believes that an archetype lies at the basis of each type of manipulation. Moreover, the concept of “type” is interpreted in two ways: in the first, “type” is defined as the most characteristic single, and in the second – as a prototype, the main form that allows deviations (archetype) (Шрейдер 1981: 12). Thus, in the case of manipulation, we are talking about offering a two-way cognitive action. The first part of which contains a requirement for the manipulated (addresser), the second part, in turn, contains the obligation of the manipulator (addressee). All this suggests that manipulation has an archetypal structure, which is expressed in various linguistic forms.

Some scientists associate the act of manipulation with the use of power. In particular, V.N. Sagatovsky considers manipulation as “an attitude towards another as a means, object, tool” (Сагатовский 1980: 8). With this approach, the goal and needs of the manipulator are achieved. A similar point of view is expressed by E. Shostrom, who understands manipulation as the management and control of another and the use of him as an object (Шостром 1992: 5).

Others tend to view manipulation as a hidden kind of influence. According to E.L. Dotsenko, manipulation is “a type of psychological influence used to achieve a one-sided gain by covertly encouraging another to commit certain actions” (Доценко 1997: 53).

Consider, for example, the following passage from political discourse:

Uy-joy siyosatida ijtimoiy adolat ustuvor bo'lmog'i kerak. Har bir insonning farovon va xotirjam yashashida ilm olish, kasb-hunar egallash, ishsizlikdan himoyalanih ham muhim o'rin tutadi. Ayniqsa, xalqimiz uyli-joyli bo'lishni munosib hayot kechirishning asosiy shartlaridan deb biladi. "Uyi birning o'yi bo'lmaydi", "Uy - vatan ichra vatan", „O'z uyim - o'lan to'shagim“ singari maqollaru, naqlar jamiyatimizga shu qadar singib ketganki, hali murg'ak o'g'liga ezgu niyat bilan imorat solish uchun terak ekshdek odatlarimiz zamonlar o'zgarsa-da, unutilgani yo'q. Chindan ham insonning hayoti ehtiyojlari, avvalo, muqim va qulay boshpanaga ega bo'lishdan boshlanadi. Darvoqe, yangi tahrirdagi

Konstitutsiyamizda ham har kimning uy-joyli bo'lish huquqi qat'iy belgilab qo'yildi (Zarafshon, 2023, 12-iyun).

This discursive passage hides the author's intention to convince voters of the prospects of the program of the presidential candidate of the Republic of Uzbekistan from the People's Democratic Party. The use of separate paremiological units contributes to the commission of such a manipulative action: *"Uyi birning o'yi bo'lmaydi", "Uy - vatan ichra vatan", „O'z uyim - o'lan to'shagim“*.

Dutch scientist T.A. van Dijk considers manipulation as a versatile action. According to him, manipulation is one of the forms of persuasion. The only difference is that in persuasion, communicants have the opportunity to act based on whether they accept or deny the arguments of the persuader. Manipulation deprives the addressee of the opportunity to understand the real intentions of the manipulator, and they may not realize all the consequences that the views imposed on them by the manipulator will entail (van Dijk 2006).

The specifics of manipulation and motivation are determined by the peculiarities of speech influence, in the process of which, in addition to the main goal – to verbalize the intention of the impulse, the speaker pursues the goal of achieving the maximum result associated with achieving a perlocative effect. The speech effect in a situation of manipulation is due, firstly, to the initial motive to induce the addresser to a certain physical or mental action; secondly, to the communicative intention to control the interaction process within the framework of the main goal for the implementation of successful communication.. This means that achieving the main goal of motivation is not far from the secondary goals associated with the need to adapt to the situation of communication in general.

Thus, the meaningful features of speech influence in certain types of political discourse are due to their semantic and pragmatic multilayeredness. If their semantic characteristic is associated with the identification of the content of the utterance, then the pragmatic one is associated with the identification of the communicative meaning. In this regard, from a semantic point of view, it is possible to distinguish between imperative and emotive effects.

For example:

Ayni payda hududlarning ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy rivojlanishini muayyan mezonlar asosida baholashga davriy va uzluksiz tuz bermog'imiz darkor. Jamladan, barqaror va mutanosib iqtisodiy taraqqiyotni ta'minlash, iqtisodiy islohotlar samaradorligini hisobga olish va yangi ish o'rinlari yaratish, ishsizlikni kamaytirish va mehnat bozori samaradorligini ta'minlashga alohida e'tiborni kuchaytirish zarur (Sh. Mirziyoyev. Yangi O'zbekiston taraqqiyot strategiyasi, 2022:165).

In this example, you can see the ways of expressing the imperative and emotive effects of special language forms. It is noticeable that emotive units, expressing assessments, at the same time convey the addressee's communicative intention to influence the addressee, persuade him to his position, convince him of the correctness of the judgment.

From a pragmatic point of view, that is, the effectiveness of the impact, the **main** impact and the **auxiliary** are distinguished. The main one should be considered the impact aimed at the implementation of the incentive intention. The role of auxiliary influence is reduced to the organization of dialogical interaction necessary to achieve a perlocative effect, for example, the creation of a special atmosphere of communication, argumentation of the stated motivation.

For example:

„Wir alle sind uns, glaube ich, einig, dass das Steuersystem ergiebig sein soll, damit der Staat seine Aufgaben erfüllen kann. Es soll zudem einfach und gerecht sein. Aber es muss auch fair sein. Ein

Steuersystem ist dann fair, wenn jeder, dem das Gesetz die Last der Steuerzahlung auferlegt, seine Steuern tatsächlich zahlt“. (Ralph Brinkhaus (CDU/CSU), Deutscher Bundestag, 06.11.2014).

As can be seen from the example, the main impact is aimed at the realization of the urge. At the same time, the use of the pronoun “wir alle” pushes the addresser to an agreement. The auxiliary effect is focused on modeling an emotional situation in order to evoke certain emotions in the listener. Such manipulation is of a converging nature and this is facilitated by an appeal to the form of subjective modality “ich glaube”, which reduces the categoricity of the statement.

Thus, language plays a dominant role in the desire to establish contact with the public. As a special semiotic system, language has the ability to reflect reality, which makes it possible to encode messages in different ways.

Within the framework of the pragmatic content of political discourse, the functions of influencing society are realized. The implementation of the impact function is determined by the quality of the implementation of the communicative intention through linguistic and non-linguistic means. However, the decisive role is played by the linguistic component, which includes a set of pragmatic methods of influence.

References

1. Brinkhaus R. (CDU/CSU) - Regierungserklärung zur Einigung auf wirksamere Regeln zur Bekämpfung von Steuerflucht - Deutscher Bundestag / 18. EP / Session 63 / Tagesordnungspunkt 4, 06.11.2014-
<https://de.openparliament.tv/media/DE-0180063007?personID%5B%5D=Q2129527&sort=date-desc&page=2> .
2. Dijk. T.A. van. Discourse and manipulation // Discourse and Society. 2006. №17 (2). – Pp. 359-383.
3. Karimov I. Ozodlik havosidan to‘tib nafas olgan xalq o‘z yo‘lidan hech qachon qaytmaydi. – T.: O‘zbekiston, 2016. – 28 b.
4. Leech G. N. Principles of Pragmatics. – L.: Longman, 1983. – 250 p.
5. Mirziyoyev Sh. Yangi O‘zbekiston tarrahiyot strategiyasi. – T.: O‘zbekiston, 2022. – 416 b.
6. Доценко Е.Л. Психология манипуляции: феномены, механизмы и защита. – М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1997.
7. Махмудов Н., Нумонов А. Ўзбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси (синтаксис). – Т.: Ўқитувчи, 1995. – 149 б.
8. Михалёва О.Л. Политический дискурс: Специфика манипулятивного воздействия. - М.: URSS. 2009. 256 с.
9. Моррис Ч. У. Основания теории знаков // Семиотика: сб. переводов под ред. Ю. С. Степанова. М.: Радуга, 1983. С. 17-89.
10. Сагатовский В.Н. Социальное проектирование (к основам теории) / Прикладная этика и управление нравственным воспитанием. Томск, 1980. С. 83-89.
11. Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. – Т.: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2008. – 300б.
12. Сусов И.П. Лингвистическая прагматика. – Винница, 2006.
13. Сусов И.П. Семиотика и лингвистическая прагматика // Язык, дискурс и личность: межвуз. сб. науч. тр.; Тверской гос. ун-т. –Тверь, 1990. – С.125-133.
14. Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. – М., 1996. – 286 с.

-
15. Ҳақимов М. Прагмалингвистик тадқиқотлар тарихи. – Фарғона: “Фарғона” нашриети, 2020. – 148 б.
 16. Ҳақимов М., Газиёва М. Прагмалингвистика асослари. – Фарғона: Classic, 2020. – 420 б.
 17. Шостром Э. Анти-Карнеги, или Человек-манипулятор. – Минск, 1992.
 18. Языкознание. Большой энциклопедический словарь / гл. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. 2-е изд. – М.: Большая российская энциклопедия, 1998. – 685 с.