

СЕМИОТИЧЕСКИЙ ПОДХОД В АНАЛИЗЕ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА

Инесса Эльдаровна Алекберова (Москва, Россия)

АННОТАЦИЯ: Данная статья рассматривает вопрос о двух вариантах дискурсивного направления в политической лингвистике: критический анализ и дескриптивный анализ. Авторами анализируется семиотическое пространство политдискурса, которое включает три типа знаков: специализированные вербальные, специализированные невербальные и неспециализированные. Также делается вывод о том, что при семиотическом подходе политдискурс является знаковой системой, в которой информация циркулирует между различными элементами политической системы.

Ключевые слова: политдискурс, семиотика, ситуативный контекст, фреймовый анализ, интеграция, агональность.

ABSTRACT: The article deals with the question of two options of the discourse direction in political linguistics: critical analysis and descriptive analysis. Authors analyse semiotics space of the discourse including three types of signs: specialised verbal, specialised nonverbal and unspecialized sings. Also there is the conclusion that using the semiotics approach the political discourse is represented like sign system where the information circulates among various elements of political system.

Keywords: political discourse, semiotics, situational context, frame analysis, integration, political dispute.

Being one of active forms of knowledge language gives us a real image of the world which the person tries to aware throughout many centuries. Special attention at the same time is paid to the subject of speech activity (discourse). It is connected with the statement in linguistics of the second half of the XX century of new scientific paradigms where the center of attention – the description of language units in the aspect of a human factor.

Discourse – the category of linguistics of the text which is closely connected with concepts of the speech and the text. Having gained the development in foreign linguistics in works E. Benvenist, Z. Harris and M. Foucault, the discourse initially represented a difficult and multidimensional object of a research.

It is necessary to refer needs of legal entities and individuals, management to the motivating public purposes of studying the features of communicative process (in the political and professional sphere) in productive, effective communication. It

has caused also increased interest in rhetoric. Successful professional activity of the majority of specialties in many respects is defined by the correct, competent organization of business relations that depends on the competent organization, understanding and management of speech activity. It is necessary to develop skills for understanding and management the dialogue that is basic qualification for the majority of the interested professions. To teach, to participate in communication processes, to understand them, to influence the conversation course – one of the most difficult problems of training communicative competence. Therefore dialogue is an important object of studying.

According to the American linguist Z. Harris, the discourse is a simple coupling of phrases, the continuous statement. Proceeding from this definition he considered that those approaches which are applied by descriptive linguistics can be used also in relation to a discourse. Z. Harris used the term discourse analysis in 1952 for the first time in the article of the same name meaning the “method of the analysis of the connected speech” intended “for expansion of descriptive linguistics out of limits of one offer at present to time and for correlation of culture and language”.

It is known that there are two options of the discourse direction in political linguistics. The first is determined as the critical analysis of a political discourse, and the second - as the descriptive analysis of a political discourse. The critical analysis of a political discourse is focused on studying of ways by means where the social power carries out the influence in society. Experts try to find out how exactly social inequality is reproduced by means of communicative activity and also define ways of language resistance. Representatives of this direction take an active social position. Detailed studying of texts helps to reveal implicitly the expressed unconscious installations of communicants and on this basis to show results of impact of a discourse on perception of information.

The political discourse is treated as institutional communication which applies a certain system of the professional focused signs, i.e. possesses own sublanguage (lexicon, phraseology and paremiology). Within a situational and

cultural context the political discourse represents a phenomenon that sense can be expressed by a formula “discourse = sublanguage + text + context”.

Linguistic approaches to studying of a political discourse come down to three main types:

- descriptive (rhetorical analysis of language behavior of politicians)
- critical (identification of the social inequality expressed in a discourse)
- cognitive (analysis of frames and concepts of a political discourse)

The semiotics space of a political discourse includes three types of signs: specialized verbal (political terms), specialized nonverbal (political symbols) and unspecialized that initially haven't been oriented on this sphere of communication, but owing to steady functioning has gained substantial specifics.

Language particularities of policy consist now that the environment of its existence is made by mass information and owing to orientation of political communication to the mass addressee this language is deprived of the corporate actions inherent in any special language. The discourse is always historical process that is it always synchronically and diachronically connected with the communicative events which are taking place at the moment or have taken place before. The policy as the specific sphere of human activities for the nature is set of speech actions. As well as other discourse political one has a field structure. In the center there are those genres which at the maximum degree correspond to basic purpose of political communication - race for power. For example, they are parliamentary debates, speeches of politicians or vote.

Production, structure and functioning of various sign systems storing and transferring information are studied by scientific discipline like semiotics. So, what signs and symbols form the semiotics space of a political discourse? We will consider the classification of signs offered by A. A. Romanov in his book “Political Linguistics”. Signs in a political discourse can be divided into verbal, nonverbal and mixed ones. Words, statements, case texts belong to verbal signs. Nonverbal signs are flags, emblems, portraits, busts, buildings, certain actions, politicians. The anthem, the coat of arms or a patrimonial sign belong to the mixed signs. Romanov offers also the division of signs of a political discourse according

to functions paying attention that the same sign can participate in performance of any of them: integrating, agonal sign and signs of orientation. Therefore, the functional structure of semiotics space of a political discourse consists of the following signs:

- orientation signs
- integration signs
- agonal signs

So, signs of orientation are situational antonyms, for example: the people - the government. In most cases linguists analyze the integrating functions of slogans, mottoes, names of political movements and language markers: inclusive we, compatibility lexemes (unity, union), compatibility vocatives (friends, colleagues), participation formulas (I, as well as all...), forms of an indirect imperative (we won't allow...).

Also semantics of the agonal signs represents signs of verbal aggression reveals. Three main kinds of verbal aggression are established: expletive (abusive invectives, speech acts of threat, verdicts, etc.), manipulative (invective labels, means of a defamation, ban on the speech), implicit (indirect speech acts, indirect prediction, ban on the speech).

Signs of the state symbols (flag, emblem, the anthem, the coat of arms) are among the uniting signs. "Their function – self-identification of the identity of the politician with the nation, her business card, a peculiar "tag of the territory", an embodiment of independence and sovereignty of the country".

A. A. Romanov carries behavioral signs to the integrating signs of a political discourse – ritual political events. For example, inauguration, festive demonstration, parade, visit by the politician of actions, enterprises, military units. Actions of not ritual character – political actions that are the dramatized metaphor also belong to behavioral signs.

Politicians also treat symbols of the power including their "verbal and nonverbal correlates" (names, portraits, sculptures) and the activity fixed in the form of language (decrees, appeals, speeches).

The most important orientation signs of a political discourse are names of politicians. A specific place among antroponims is held by nicknames which are widely used by mass media for creation of images of politicians.

The important place in semiotics space of a political discourse is taken by an aphoristic of political communication which belongs to the focusing signs on which the politician is identified during a discourse. For example, the master of an aphoristic it is possible to call V. V. Zhirinovskiy who is memorable the bright statements: “The woman has to stay at home, clean and cook” (“Chiming clock” (Moscow), 3/19/2003); “Around the world there are officials idiots but ours differ in special nonsense” (“Labour” (Moscow), 7/26/2002); “About what democracy you speak if 65% of the territory of Russia – permafrost?!” (“MoskovskyKomsomolets” (Moscow), 12/23/2002).

Also signs of verbal aggression which include abusive lexicon and political labels are used in a political discourse. It is possible to carry such political terms to political labels as: migrants, invaders, ethnic minorities, Caucasians, communists. Into a label they are turned by ideological installation – an assessment of the political opponent from a position “ours-not ours”.

Borders of institutional kinds of communication are very conditional. Now there is the fastest change the interaction of types caused, first of all, by active expansion of mass and information communication to everyday life of people.

Within semiotics approach is expressed in language. And the policy is “no other than the codified signs developed by means of the act of the statement in social and semiotics process” – the interactive speech is understood as set speech, exerting impact on formation of idea of an object (the fact, the phenomena, process) which they represent.

Thus, according to semiotics approach the political discourse is sign system in which information circulates between various elements of political system. The important role in a political discourse is occupied by the political myths consisting of symbols. Success of political speeches in race for power is caused by as far as signs and symbols with which the politician in the speech operates coincide with opinions and estimates of the mass addressee of a political discourse.

List of references

1. Romanov, A.A. Political linguistics: Functional approach / A.A. Novels. – Moscow-Tver: Tver State University, 2002. – 191 pages.
2. Shapochkin, D. V. Cognitive aspects in a political discourse [An electronic resource]. – 2005. – Access mode: <http://www.russian.slavica.org/printout1668.html>
3. Sinelnikova, L. N. Lingvopolitologiya: coordinates of interdisciplinarity / L.N. Sinelnikova//Scientists of a note of the Taurian national university of V. I. Vernadsky. It is gray. Philology. – 2007. – T. 20 (59). – No. 3. – Page 461-469;
4. Sheynov, V. P. Psikhologiya of leadership, influences, power / Accusative Sheynov. – Minsk: Харвест, 2008. – 656 pages.
5. Lassvell, G. Yazyk of the power / G. Lassvell//Political linguistics. – 2006. – Issue 20. – Page 264-279.