

A. Shykalov, Student
G. Kuznyetsova, PhD in Phil, As. Prof., research and language advisor
Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University

THE NOTION OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE

In recent decades, political discourse has become one of the most popular linguistic and interdisciplinary research objects and it is the most studied institutional discourse type. The greatest contribution to this direction was made by Ukrainian and overseas researchers such as S.L. Slavova, V. Figaro, V.O. Chernyavska, O.P. Chudinov, D.V. Shapochkin, I.S. Shevchenko, O.I. Sheigal, V.Z. Demyankov, V.I. Karasyk, W. Okulska, P. Tsap, A. Sovinska and others [7, c. 176-181]. In general, interest to the political communication and PD study has led to the emergence of a new separate branch of philological research – political linguistics and political discourse [8, c. 121-124].

Political discourse (further PD) is one of the most influential phenomena in history since the first state with its political system has begun to exist. The question concerning the language and power interaction has found its expression in the PD, which has recently been in the centre of philosophers, political scientists, sociologists and linguists attention. This is due to the general trend towards democratization of all society spheres and media development it became possible to select PD into a separate sphere linguistic research.

The connection between the language and politics is manifested, first of all, in the fact that political regime cannot exist without communication. Politicians need the language to inform, give instructions, legislate, persuade, and so on. Political specificity, in contrast to a number of other human activity areas, lies in its predominantly discursive nature: a significant part of political activity is implemented through the speech.

According to I. Butova, PD became an important linguistic research object at that time when political communication acquired certain features of consciousness manipulation. It means that linguistic phenomena during public speeches of politicians, their propaganda speeches and texts can tell about the speaker much more than explicit expressions [4]. It should be noted that the language of political communication is extremely important, that is why there has always been a close connection between politics and language. PD linguistic interpretation fields are utterance, vocabulary, argumentation, grammar, stylistics, syntax, rhetoric and narrative in general.

There is no universal definition of PD in linguistic science. In particular, PD interpretations are often based on the theoretical foundations of the basic “discourse” concept. As emphasized by A.M. Baranov and E.G. Kazakevich, PD is a discourse of power, an exceptional form of political and social activity, which is defined as a linguistic acts combination in political discussions and public policy rules, which are formed according to the existing traditions and tested by experience. PD provides the need for managing the society, which can be achieved through politician’s self-realization of gaining power through certain strategies and tactics [1]. So, PD is a specific interaction act between a subject of politics (a politician, government or parliament), and a political object (a voter, audience, electorate).

Kondratenko N.V. singles out a number of aspects in PD research, in particular, the research of the form (written or oral); the research of goal (motivational, informative, expressive and incentive); the research of operation field (PR, television, newspaper, magazine and radio advertising); the research of speaker factor (directly or indirectly); the research of addressee factor (“mass addressed”), the research of functioning sphere (“television, newspaper and magazine, radio advertising, PR”) [6: С. 150 – 155].

Oral PD is understood as interviews with politicians, their speeches, official statements, but political texts published through the media are included in the written PD. We also consider campaign leaflets, booklets, image texts, and postal correspondence as a political discourse. In addition, E. Sheigal notes that every material that deals with politics should be called “political discourse” [10, с. 386]. The study of both oral and written PD is based on many factors, but conceptual factor is particularly essential, because the appropriate organization of concepts in PD ensures its success.

In communicative linguistics, the discourse studies and its types are related to speech genres. The “speech genre” concept was introduced into linguistics by the Russian literary critic M.M. Bakhtin, who defined speech genres “as relatively stable thematic, compositional and stylistic types of utterances” [2, с. 254].

Genre characteristics of a certain speaker's speech allow us to make an impression about his speech behavior, his ability to use means of speech to achieve certain communicative goals and the linguistic personality picture [9, с. 358].

Understanding the genre as a discourse element, which reflects social interaction features, correlates with the allocation of institutional and non-institutional discourses [5, с. 477]. The studied political discourse is one of the most representative institutional discourse types.

Linguists express different views on the number and set of genre subtypes of political discourse. T. van Deick considers political discourse as a class of genres limited by socio-political sphere, which includes government debates, parliamentary debates, political programs, politicians speeches [11, с. 11-52].

E.O. Chetvertak mentions that PD is a mean of manipulation of large people groups mind, the main purpose of which is to impose a certain opinion on a wide range of voters with the subsequent intention to win their votes during the election campaign [3, с. 42 – 43].

REFERENCES

1. Баранов А.Н., Казакевич Е.Г. Парламентские дебаты: традиции и новации. – М.: Знание, 1991.
2. Бахтин М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества: сб. избр. тр. / М.М. Бахтин. – [2-е изд]. – М.: Искусство, 1986. – 444с.
3. Бацевич Ф. Лінгвістична генологія: проблеми і перспективи / Ф. Бацевич. – Львів. – ПАІС, 2005. – 264с.
4. Бутова І. Політичний дискурс як об'єкт лінгвістичних досліджень. – Режим доступу: http://old.lingua.lnu.edu.ua/Visnyk/visnyk/Visnyk_16/articles/Butova.pdf
5. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты и дискурс / В.И. Карасик. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. – 477с.

6. Кондратенко Н.В. Український політичний дискурс: монографія: / Одес. нац. ун-т ім. І.І. Мечникова. – Одеса: Чорномор'я. – 2007. – С. 150 – 155.
7. Кузнецова Г.В. Адресат політичного дискурсу: стан вивчення й перспективи дослідження. – Актуальні питання іноземної філології: наук. журнал./ [редкол.: І.П. Біскуб (гол. ред.) та ін.] – Луцьк: Східноєвроп. нац. ун-т ім. Лесі Українки, 2019. – №10. – С. 176-181.
8. Плахотная Ю.И. Речевое воздействие в диалогическом дискурсе / Ю.И. Плахотная // Политическая лингвистика. – 2011. – № 4 (38). – С. 121–124.
9. Славова Л.Л. «Мовна особистість політика: когнітивно-дискурсивний аспект: монографія/ Л.Л.Славова. – Житомир: Вид-во ЖДУ ім. І.Франка, 2010. – 358с.
10. Шейгал Е. И. Семиотика политического дискурса: монография / Елена Шейгал. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. – 386 с.
11. Dijk van, Teun. 1998. “What is Political Discourse Analysis?” *Political Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins: 11-52, doi.org/10.1075/bjl.11.03dij