Absamadova Munira Isroilovna

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Associate Professor

Qurbonaliyeva Qandalat, student at SamSIFL,

Department of English Philology

PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Abstract

The present article examines the pragmatic features of political speech in English and Uzbek, focusing on how language is used to influence, persuade, and construct political meaning. Political discourse is analyzed as a form of institutional communication in which pragmatic strategies play a key role in shaping speaker–audience interaction. The study investigates such pragmatic categories as speech acts, implicature, presupposition, deixis, politeness strategies, and rhetorical devices. A comparative and descriptive approach is employed to identify similarities and differences in the pragmatic organization of English and Uzbek political speeches. The findings reveal that English political discourse frequently employs indirectness, mitigation, and inclusive linguistic forms to establish solidarity, whereas Uzbek political speech demonstrates a stronger emphasis on collectivism, respect, and culturally specific politeness norms. These differences reflect the sociocultural and communicative traditions of the two language communities. The results of the study contribute to pragmatic and discourse-oriented analyses of political communication and may be useful for linguists, translators, and students engaged in cross-cultural discourse studies.

Keywords

pragmatics, political discourse, political speech, speech acts, politeness strategies, English and Uzbek, comparative analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Language has always been a central instrument of political power, serving not only to transmit information but also to shape attitudes, construct ideologies, and guide public behavior. In political communication, meaning is rarely confined to the literal interpretation of words; instead, it emerges through pragmatic mechanisms that allow speakers to influence audiences indirectly and strategically. As a result, the study of pragmatics has become an essential component in the analysis of political speech. Political discourse operates within specific institutional and cultural frameworks, where speakers carefully select linguistic forms to legitimize authority, express solidarity, and manage social relations. Pragmatic features such as speech acts, presupposition, implicature, deixis, and politeness strategies enable politicians to convey implicit meanings, avoid direct responsibility, and appeal to collective values. These features are particularly significant in multilingual and multicultural contexts, where communicative norms and expectations differ across societies.

A comparative examination of English and Uzbek political speech offers valuable insights into how pragmatic strategies are shaped by sociocultural traditions and political conventions. While

English political discourse often favors indirectness and inclusive rhetoric, Uzbek political communication reflects norms of respect, collectivism, and culturally grounded politeness. Investigating these pragmatic differences contributes to a deeper understanding of cross-cultural political interaction and enhances pragmatic competence in political discourse analysis. This study, therefore, seeks to explore the pragmatic features of political speech in English and Uzbek through a comparative linguistic perspective.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF POLITICAL TERMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

The importance of pragmatic features of political terms in English and Uzbek can be explained by the way these terms function in real communicative situations rather than by their ideological or value-laden meanings. Pragmatic analysis helps reveal how political terminology is used to clarify roles, describe processes, and regulate interaction within political discourse. Firstly, pragmatic features determine how political terms operate in context. In English, the term government may pragmatically refer to different entities depending on usage. For example, in the sentence “The government has announced new regulations,” the term does not denote all state institutions but specifically the executive authority. Similarly, in Uzbek, the term hukumat pragmatically narrows its reference based on context, as in “Hukumat qaror chiqardi,” where it implies the decision-making body rather than the entire state system. Secondly, political terms demonstrate pragmatic flexibility through context-dependent interpretation. The English term parliament can refer either to a physical institution or to its members, as in “Parliament debated the bill.” In Uzbek, parlament or Oliy Majlis functions in the same way, pragmatically representing the collective body of legislators rather than the building itself. This shows how pragmatic meaning extends beyond literal reference.

Another important aspect is functional usage in administrative and legal contexts. In English, the term policy may pragmatically indicate a general strategy rather than a single action, for example: “The education policy was revised.” In Uzbek, the equivalent siyosat functions similarly in “Ta’lim siyosati yangilandi,” where the term refers to a systematic approach, not individual decisions. Pragmatic features also play a role in translation and interpretation. Direct translation of political terms without pragmatic awareness may lead to misunderstanding. For instance, the English term state can mean a political entity or a regional unit, while Uzbek distinguishes between davlat and viloyat. Correct interpretation depends on pragmatic context rather than lexical form alone. In conclusion, the importance of pragmatic features of political terms in English and Uzbek lies in their role in ensuring accurate reference, contextual clarity, and effective communication. By focusing on pragmatic function rather than evaluative meaning, researchers and translators can better understand how political terminology operates within institutional and administrative discourse.

Today, many countries use different methods in language learning. It is known from history that the scientists who study the language wrote various literatures and made it useful for people. Interpreters are especially important in the political sphere in state administration. The relevance of this topic even today is especially important in the exchange of ideas between different nationalities and peoples. The conceptual system is reflected in the language, a metaphor that may not even be understood by the speakers. Despite the fact that at present there is no uniformity in understanding the relationship between the concept and the semantic structure of the word, a methodology for researching the concept based on the analysis of the basic representations of the word in the language is established. Words that express specific political euphemisms are called terms, the concept of certain areas of activity. The sciences of the period show the world the level of development in the antiquity of various realities in the 20th century, during the development of scientific and technological inventions and human ideas, despite the

need for new concepts and their precise interpretations for each field. The choice of language means in political discourse is determined by the situation of communication and communicative intention of the subjects of this discourse (politicians). As English linguist V. Karasik notes: "Although all people in the world form a single humanity, the difference between individual cultures, people, tribes and social groups is sometimes significant". By identifying of more specific and universal characteristics of national culture we can identify patterns in the speech of a separate linguistic and cultural society. History is reflected in the language not in the names of great events or descriptions of rulers activities but in the numerous nuances of daily life, recorded in the meanings of language units. Society which is capable of acting as both a subject and an object of power, demonstrates duality in metaphorics: the "subject" metaphors 'mechanism' and 'building‘ meaning, on the one hand, and personification with the actualization of features similar to those presented in the concepts of the people and the nation - on the other. So, for the concept hokimiyat (power), all three types of metaphors are relevant, for mamlakat (state) and jamiyat (society) structural metaphors and personification of priority importance, concepts xalq, millat (people and nation) are almost not metaphorized, metonymy and personification are common to them. However, different concepts use the same metaphors in different ways. In the collective consciousness of Uzbek people, xalq has absolutely positive connotation, both positive and negative assessments are possible to society and the nation, but concepts “hokimiyat” and “davlat” have recently gravitated towards a negative assessment. The concept xalq demonstrates the opposition in the collective consciousness of the object and subject of power.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, the pragmatic characteristics of political speech in Uzbek and English reflect both shared communicative goals and culturally specific approaches to political interaction. In both languages, politicians rely on pragmatic strategies to persuade audiences, reinforce legitimacy, and shape a favorable public image. In each context, political discourse commonly includes persuasive speech acts such as pledges, assurances, and calls for support. Speakers in both Uzbek and English often depend on indirect meanings, presuppositions, and rhetorical techniques to communicate intentions subtly, allowing room for interpretation while reducing the risk of overt conflict. Figurative language, emotional appeals, and memorable slogans are also widely used to make political messages more accessible and impactful. Nevertheless, the way these pragmatic elements are expressed differs significantly. Political speech in Uzbek culture generally highlights collective identity, respect for leadership, and social cohesion. This is evident in the frequent use of inclusive language, polite and honorific forms, culturally meaningful imagery, and indirect expressions, all of which align with traditional norms of respect and hierarchy. Such pragmatic choices aim to strengthen unity and shared responsibility between leaders and citizens. By comparison, political discourse in English-speaking contexts often reflects values of individual responsibility, openness, and straightforward communication. Politicians tend to use more direct evaluations, explicit criticism, and firm assertions to demonstrate decisiveness and credibility. Pragmatic devices such as irony, humor, and controlled ambiguity are also commonly employed, particularly in public debates and media discourse. Overall, examining the pragmatic features of Uzbek and English political speech shows that although persuasion and authority-building are universal aims of political language, their realization depends heavily on cultural conventions and political traditions. Awareness of these pragmatic differences is crucial for accurate interpretation, effective translation, and successful cross-cultural political communication.

REFERENCES:

1. Absamadova. M.I. Exploring the Utility of Diplomatic Terminology in International Relations - Excellencia: International Multi-Disciplinary Journal of …, 2024

2. Absamadova. M.I. The semantic intricacy of diplomatic terminology. - Развитие педагогических технологий в современных …, 2025

3. Absamadova. M.I. The impact of diplomatic language on international relations: A comprehensive analysis A. M - International Journal of Formal Education, 2024

4. Allan K., Burridge K. Forbidden words: Taboo and the censoring of language. – Cambridge University Press, 2007. –303 p.

5. Allan K., Burridge K. Euphemism and Dysphemism. Language used as shield and Weapon. – New York, 1991. –263 p.

6. Andrews E. Cultural Sensitivity and Political Correctness: The Linguistic Problem of Naming // American Speech: A Quarterly of Linguistic Usage. – Washington, 1996, № 4. – 399p

7. Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis. – Cambridge, 1983. – 118 p.

8. Cook J. Discourse, Ideology and Literature // The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics/ed. R. E. Asher. – Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press, 1994. – 965p.

9. Dieckmann W. Politische Sprache, politische Kommunikation: Vorträge, Aufsätze, Entwürfe. – Heidelberg: Winter, 1981. – 279 S.

10. Ergashov M.R. Siyosiy diskursda qo‘llanuvchi bog‘lovchi fe’llarning funksional-semantik tadqiqi. Filol.fan.b.fals.dok. …diss. –Farg‘ona, 2020. –162b.