

Notion and Characteristic of Metaphor in Political discourse

Validə Kərimova,

Xəzər Universitetinin doktorantı
Humanitar, Təhsil və Sosial elmlər
fakültəsinin dekan müavini
kerimovavalide@yahoo.com

Research, entitled “Notion and Characteristics of Metaphor in Political discourse” deals with the issue of metaphor in linguistics. Based on studies, metaphors make linguistics, literature, and discourse more expressive and colorful. The research analyses several written articles, artifacts, and ideas focusing on a metaphor that has been produced since the last century, including both foreign and native research works on linguistics. The purpose of this research is to gain an in-depth understanding of the role metaphor plays and what the metaphor could mean for linguistics.

Keywords: *metaphor, figure of speech, metaphor in linguistics, the purpose of metaphor in political discourse.*

Açar sözlər: *metafora, məcazi məna, dilçilikdə metafora, siyasi diskursda metaforanın rolu.*

Ключевые слова: *метафора, риторическая фигура, лингвистическая метафора, роль метафоры в политическом дискурсе.*

Discourse consists of proposals or fragments thereof, and the content of the discourse is often, though not always, concentrated around some “support” concept, called the “topic of discourse”, or “discourse topic”. The logical content of individual proposals – components of discourse is called propositions; these propositions are joined by logical relations of conjunction, disjunction, and if – then, etc.). Understanding discourse, the interpreter builds elementary propositions in the common value, placing the new information contained in another interpreted proposal in the framework of the already received interim or preliminary interpretation, that is:

➤ establishes various links within the text – anatomic, semantic (type of synonymous and antonym), referential (reference names and descriptions to

objects of real or mental world) relations, functional perspective (the theme of the utterance and what it talks about), etc.;

Let's consider the following example from a piece of Barack Obama's victory speech:

"...If there is anyone out there who still doubts that America is a place where all things are possible; who still wonders if the dream of our founders is alive in our time; who still questions the power of our democracy, tonight is your answer..." [6].

➤ «adds» new information to the topic of the discourse. Let's take another example of Barack Obama's speech concerning the new information:

"...A little bit earlier this evening, I received an extraordinarily gracious call from Senator McCain. Senator McCain fought long and hard in this campaign, and he's fought even longer and harder for the country that he loves. He has endured sacrifices for America that most of us cannot begin to imagine. We are better off for the service rendered by this brave and selfless leader. I congratulate him; I congratulate Governor Palin for all that they've achieved, and I look forward to working with them to renew this nation's promise in the months ahead. ..." [7].

The result is (if necessary) referential ambiguity, is determined by the communicative purpose of each sentence and step by step it turns out the drama of the whole discourse. In the course of such re-interpretation is "reconstructed" – an imaginary world in which, on the presumption of the interpreter, the author designs discourse which describes the actual and desired (though not always achievable), unreal, etc. In this world we find characteristics of actors, objects, time, circumstances, events (in particular, actions of actors), etc. This mental world also includes thinking interpreter (with his unique life experience), items and evaluation.

This is what circumstance of the discourse which the author imposes his opinion to the addressee. After all, trying to understand the discourse, the interpreter at least for a moment moves in a strange mental world. An experienced author, especially a politician, preempts such verbal suggestion by the preparatory processing of another's consciousness so that a new relation to the object is harmonized with established beliefs – conscious or unconscious. The vague semantics of the language enables flexible implementation in the consciousness of others: a new look is modified (it is a kind of mimicry) under the influence of a

system of fixed opinions of the interpreter, and at the same time and changes the system, Ms. [1]

Next, we will try to show that the description of the political discourse in purely linguistic terms, without the use of literary techniques, is inadequate subject: political discourse is studied in a more general conceptual framework of philology. It is especially clearly seen when trying to characterize the effectiveness and insight of the political discourse.

1. Evaluative and aggressive political discourse. So, when trying to characterize the features of the “totalitarian” discourse, it inevitably enters into the description of ethical terms, for example [3]:

- “speaking in tongues”: dominates in declamatory style proclamation, advocacy triumphalism,
- idealization of all discussed, the extended use of the terms harmful for of logic,
- exaggerated abstraction and scientology,
- increased criticism and “flame”,
- slogans, addiction exorcism,
- agitated enthusiasm,
- the prevalence of “Super-I”,
- the formalism of partisanship,
- a claim to absolute truth.

Let’s consider the following example of Kim Jong Un's 2015 New Year's Speech, delivered on January 1 at the Workers' Party of Korea Central Committee Office Building:

“... Dear comrades!

Having seen out 2014, a year in which we clearly demonstrated the spirit and might of the great DPRK that advances by leaps and bounds with confidence in victory, we are seeing in the hope-filled New Year 2015. Reflecting the boundless loyalty of all the service personnel and people, I would like to pay the highest tribute and offer New Year greetings to President Kim Il Sung (Kim Il-so'ng) and General Kim Jong Il (Kim Cho'ng-il), the eternal leaders of our people and the sun of Chuch'e. I extend New Year greetings to the service personnel and people who are striving with devotion for the dignity and prosperity of the country with revolutionary faith and patriotic enthusiasm, and I wish the families throughout the country would overflow with warm affection and our lovely

children would have a brighter future. My New Year greetings go also to the compatriots in the south and abroad who are fighting for national concord and reunification and to the progressive peoples of the world and other foreign friends who aspire after independence and peace. Last year was a year of brilliant triumph in which the foundations for hastening final victory on all fronts of building a thriving nation were consolidated firmly and the invincible might of the DPRK was demonstrated under the leadership of the Party. Last year the harmonious whole of the Party and the masses of the people was solidified and the purity and might of the revolutionary ranks strengthened....” [8].

These properties show the insight that have characterized the political discourse and distinguishes it from other types of speech. This insight has implications for, for example, the choice of words [2] (and represents the transfer of military action from the battlefield on a theatrical stage. Such sublimation of aggressiveness is laid (according to some social psychologists) in human nature. Thus, the insight of political speech is a kind of theatrical aggression. The insight to the suggestion of a negative attitude is directed to political opponents of the speaker, to the imposition (as the most natural and uncontroversial) other values and evaluations. That is why the terms are evaluated positively by supporters’ one view, perceived negatively, sometimes even as a direct insult (Ms. communism, fascism, democracy).

This also explains the peculiarity of “political diglossia” [5] a totalitarian society where there seems to be two different languages – the language of official propaganda and the usual language. The terms of one language are used in another only with polar opposite rating or are expelled from usage at all. The following groups of statements are used in political discourse. [4]:

- ascertaining and regulating act,
- hiding statements supplied in the form of questions,
- answering selected questions (setting, on what questions of this discourse is, and what it leaves unanswered);
- interpretations and descriptions of the problems,
- describing the solution to the problems facing society in positive terms, “constructive” (“we must do such-and-such”), or negatively (“not for us so-and-so,” “can't live”),
- formulating ideas, the author seemingly innovates,

- remarking applied general truths: as a result of reflection or as a subject to identify the causes of this datum;
- requesting and demands to the authorities,
- calling to contribute to any decision and offer of assistance, etc.

The author came to this **conclusion** that, interpreting political discourse in its totality cannot be limited to purely linguistic moments; otherwise the essence and purpose of political discourse go unnoticed. Understanding political discourse presupposes knowledge of the background, the expectations of the author and the audience, ulterior motives, narrative schemas favorite and logical transitions occurring in a particular era. Therefore, although the term "political literature" sounds unusual today, and "political linguistics" has long earned its right to exist, it should be recognized that more interesting results can be achieved only in the framework of the merger of these disciplines, that is, from political philology.

References:

1. Badaloni N. 1984 – Politica, persuasione, decisione // Linguaggio, persuasione, verita. – Padova: Cedam (Milani), 1984. P. 3-18.
2. Garcia Santos J.F. 1987 – El lenguaje politico: En la Secunda Republica y en la Democracia // M. Alvar ed. El lenguaje politico. – Madrid: Fundacion Friedrich Ebert, Instituto de Cooperacion Iberoamericana, 1987. P. 89-122
3. Martinez Albertos J.-L. 1987 – El lenguaje de los politicos como vicio de la lengua periodistica // M. Alvar ed. El lenguaje politico. – Madrid: Fund.Fried. Ebert, Instituto de Cooper. Iberoamericana, 1987. P. 71-87.
4. Schrotta S., Visotschnig E. 1982 – Neue Wege zur Verstandigung: Der machtfreie Raum. – Wien; Hamburg: Zsolnay, 1982
5. Wierzbicka A. 1995 – Dictionaries and ideologies: Three examples from Eastern Europe // B.B. Kachru, H. Kahane eds. Cultures, ideologies, and the dictionary: Studies in honor of Ladislav Zgusta. – Tubingen: Niemeyer, 1995. P. 181-195.
6. www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/convention2008/barackobamavictoryspeech.htm
7. www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/convention2008/barackobamavictoryspeech.htm

8. www.ncnk.org/resources/news-items/kim-jong-uns-speeches-and-public-statements-1/2015-new-years-address

Validə Kərimova

**Siyasi diskursda metaforanın anlayışı və xüsusiyyətləri
Xülasə**

"Siyasi diskursda metaforanın anlayışı və xüsusiyyətləri" adlı tədqiqat işi metaforanın dilçilikdə rolundan bəhs etməkdədir. Araşdırmalara əsasən, metafora dilçiliyi, ədəbiyyatı və diskursu daha ifadəli və rəngarəng edir. Tədqiqat işi ötən metaforaya əsaslanan yazılı məqalələr, əsərlər və son illərdə yerli və xarici alimlərin irəli sürdüyü fikirlərinin ümumiləşdirilməsi əsasında ərsəyə gəlmişdir. Bu tədqiqatın əsas məqsədi metaforanın dilçilik və diskursda əsas rolunun nədən ibarət olduğunu oxucuya səlis və ətraflı çatdırmaqdan ibarətdir.

Валида Каримова

**Понятие и характеристика метафоры в политическом дискурсе
Резюме**

Исследование под названием «Понятие и характеристика метафоры в политическом дискурсе» посвящено проблеме метафоры в лингвистике. Основываясь на исследованиях, метафоры делают лингвистику, литературу и дискурс более выразительными и красочными. В исследовании анализируются несколько письменных статей, артефактов и идей, посвященных метафоре, созданной с прошлого столетия, включая как зарубежные, так и отечественные исследования по лингвистике. Цель этого исследования - получить глубокое понимание роли метафоры и того, что метафора может означать для лингвистики.