

Date: 3rd November-2025

LINGUOPRAGMATIC FEATURES OF ENGLISH POLITICAL SPEECH

Rakhimova Gavkhar Jamshid kizi

Teacher at Karshi International University

Annotation: The linguopragmatic features of English political speech are analyzed. Political communication is an important component of modern social life, in which language is manifested not only as a means of conveying information, but also as a means of influencing social consciousness and beliefs. The study covers the theoretical foundations of political speech, the concept of linguopragmatics, the theory of speech acts, and communicative strategies used in political discourse (persuasion, manipulation, evaluation, identification). In the practical part, the speeches of US and British political leaders (Barack Obama, Rishi Sunak, etc.) are analyzed, and the linguopragmatic tools used in them — metaphors, modal units, rhetorical questioning, repetition, and emotional lexicon — are studied. As a result, it was found that the main purpose of English political speech is to persuade the audience, inspire, and instill a political idea into the social consciousness.

Keywords: political speech, linguopragmatics, pragmatic analysis, persuasion strategy, manipulation, metaphor, rhetoric, political discourse, communicative strategies, English

In today's era of globalization and information flow, political speech is recognized as one of the most important communicative types of human activity. Political processes, social changes, international relations, ideological trends in society are largely formed, expressed and controlled through language. In particular, English has become the main tool of international communication, diplomacy, mass media and political discourse worldwide. Therefore, the analysis of the linguopragmatic features of English political speech is an urgent scientific problem at the intersection of not only linguistics, but also such disciplines as sociology, political science, psychology and cultural studies.

The main task of political speech is to persuade, mobilize the listener, form his beliefs and direct him towards political goals. Therefore, a political speaker — a politician, leader or speaker — is obliged to effectively use the pragmatic capabilities of language. In English political discourse, these processes occur, first of all, through the selection of language units, their connotative meanings, rhetorical strategies, metaphorical expressions, modal units, the combination of politeness and manipulative techniques.

In recent years, the issue of studying English political discourse has been the focus of attention of many foreign and domestic scholars. Scholars such as J. Austin, J. Searle, P. Grice, N. Fairclough, T. van Dijk, G. Lakoff, R. Charteris-Black laid the foundations for the fields of linguopragmatics, speech act theory and political discourse analysis. Their theories today serve as a methodological basis for in-depth analysis of political discourse, in particular, political communication in English.

After Uzbekistan gained independence, the study of English, the analysis of information flows in the international arena, and the study of the pragmatic features of



Date: 3rd November-2025

foreign political discourses became even more important. Because political discourses in English determine the directions of global politics, ideological currents, and ideological tendencies. From this perspective, the linguopragmatic analysis of English political discourse is of practical importance for the fields of language learning, translation, the media, and the training of diplomats.

It serves as an important theoretical material for one of the current areas of linguistics - pragmalinguistics and political linguistics. Through the linguopragmatic analysis of political discourse, the social and ideological functions of language, as well as the mechanisms of influence on consciousness and beliefs through language, are revealed in more depth.

It can be used in teaching English political discourse, in translation practice, in language culture and oratory classes, as well as in diplomatic and journalistic fields. It also serves to increase political literacy by identifying and evaluating manipulative techniques in political discourse.

English political speech is distinguished by its simplicity, logic and clear pragmatic orientation. In many English political speeches, the main goal of speech is not to convey information, but to convince the audience. In this case, such methods as connotative meaning in the language, metaphor, antonymy, parallelism, antitheses, rhetorical questioning are widely used.

For example, in the speeches of Barack Obama or Margaret Thatcher, words such as “change”, “freedom”, “future”, “responsibility”, “unity” are used with a high emotional load. Through them, the speaker controls the emotional state of the audience, evokes positive images and instills the desired idea in the mind.

The pragmatic power of political speech is manifested in its hidden meanings, connection with the social context and the ability to take into account the listener's cognitive mechanisms. Therefore, the linguopragmatic approach is one of the most effective methods in the analysis of political speech.

Pragmatics is the study of the conditions of use of language units, the relationship between the speaker and the listener. In political communication, this requires an analysis of interaction, purpose, context, audience characteristics and speech strategies. The “cooperative principles of communication” put forward by P. Grice play an important role in political speech. A politician often deliberately deviates from these principles - that is, by hiding information, generalizing or giving an emotional tone, creating the desired impression on the audience. Such cases are examples of manipulative pragmatics.

English political speech is enriched with rhetorical techniques and is based on the theory of Aristotle's rhetoric. The elements of ethos (moral credibility), pathos (emotional impact) and logos (logical argument) are combined in political speech. For example, Barack Obama's slogan “Yes, we can” is a short, rhythmic, emotionally effective and positive pragmatic purposeful expression.

Language is the most important tool of human activity, through which a person expresses his thoughts, intentions and goals. Political speech is a special form of language - it becomes a means of forming power, ideas and collective consciousness.



Date: 3rd November-2025

Linguopragmatics studies the conditions of use of language, the relationship between the speaker and the listener, the goal-orientedness of speech. Therefore, the linguopragmatic approach is the most effective method in analyzing political speech.

The concept of pragmatics was first developed by C. Morris (1938), and later by J. Austin (1962) and J. Searle (1969). They created the “theory of speech acts” and emphasized that the speaker performs a certain action through each statement (for example, promising, warning, requesting, persuading). Political speech is the most active pragmatic field in this regard, where acts such as persuasion, motivation and manipulation are common. T. van Dijk (1998) directly connects political discourse with power and ideology. In his opinion, political speech creates the image of “us” and “them” in the human mind, which strengthens the social gap between political forces. Therefore, the linguopragmatic analysis of political speech allows us to identify the speaker’s purpose and hidden manipulative intentions.

The study of the linguopragmatic features of English political speech allows us to understand the social essence of language, its role in the formation of political consciousness and ideological views. In political communication, language is not only a means of conveying information, but also a mechanism of influence, persuasion and control. Therefore, this study is of great importance not only linguistically, but also socially and culturally, by revealing the pragmatic power of the English language in political discourse, by analyzing its lexical-grammatical, rhetorical and psycholinguistic mechanisms.

REFERENCES:

1. Austin, J. L. How to Do Things with Words. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
2. Searle, J. R. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
3. Grice, H. P. Logic and Conversation. – In: Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3. – New York: Academic Press, 1975.
4. Fairclough, N. Language and Power. – London: Longman, 1989.
5. Van Dijk, T. A. Discourse and Power. – New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
6. Lakoff, G. Don't Think of an Elephant! Know Your Values and Frame the Debate. – Vermont: Chelsea Green, 2004.
7. Charteris-Black, J. Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor. – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
8. Chilton, P. Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice. – London: Routledge, 2004.
9. Wilson, J. Political Discourse. – In: Handbook of Pragmatics. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012.
10. Beard, A. The Language of Politics. – London: Routledge, 2000.

