

POLITICAL DISCOURSE, AN ANALYSIS BETWEEN COMMUNICATION AND LINGUISTICS

Bianca Mădălina TEODORESCU

PhD Candidate, University of Craiova, Romania

Abstract

Political discourse has always fascinating, both from a social perspective, moral and linguistic. If we look in the past, we can see that the politicians have always chosen the words carefully, just to bring them almost to the people.

This paper is based on a meta-analytical method, in which it is identified an analysis of political discourse that is starting to begin with the meaning of a language used by political people, thus marking a research on a linguistic plan, and at the same time a returning to the origin of the words and how they have experienced transformations over time.

Currently, the political discourse consists in words who are carefully chosen having wa common language meant to attract audiences, but in the same trying, somehow, to create a new form of political language formula, using more a returning to the past, relying on the use of words that remind of moments in history.

Keywords: *political language, political speeches, linguistic, politics, Romanian*

1. Introduction

Professor Rodica Zafiu (2007) shows that the Philology and Linguistics had belonged to literature for many years, and the political speeches haven't been scientifically researched until around 1950. At the beginning of the 20's century, when the researches in linguistic are starting to create a studying for special forms of languages, the political one is becoming a new space to explore for the specialists. However, in Romania these studies appeared much later, because the communism, were responsible for the censorship of ideas and the way how people were supposed to think. Thus, it had begun to being study later, more precisely at the end of the twentieth century. In the time, the notion of "wood language" is starting to be known. Political language is encountered in politicians' speeches, where we can easily notice their need to attract the audience and to speak for a shorter or longer period of time without saying something necessarily coherent. If we are analyzing a political discourse from the point of view of language, we can see the lack of objectivity the political man is relying on a more usual addressing formula without many linguistic effects, the causes of which are found in an ideology. New methods are sought for influencing people, and political discourse acquires new values of law, proving that language is the most effective way to unite people in a common place. The receiver is manipulated by the one who masters the art of discourse, even if it is found in a plain language (Busu, Stan & Andrei, 2018; Voinea, 2015).

2. The political speech and its meaning

Starting from the idea that a language, in this case politically one, draws a seemingly moral line of communication between a politician and his people, I cannot help wondering where it has its originates, where we can find the

essence of the originates and how it can be divided if we only relate to a linguistic analysis without going into the plan of a political communication approach. Remaining in the sphere of philology and linguistics, the political discourse outstrips its force of persuasion, becoming a text loaded with nuances and essences, meant to stir up Romanian language and become an entity.

The nature of political language is to extract from people the essence, namely, the reproach in ideology or the assumption of a common path. However, political language becomes by word a starting point for many branches, always referring to meaning and to a return to the origins (Grigoraș, 2002; Irimiaș, 2003; Marinescu, 2010). If a political discourse uses only words to communicate directly with people, what really symbolizes the phrases that he says? By unwilling to enter into a sphere of communication, manipulation, and politics, I try to focus my research on a way of linguistic analysis, but also remaining in the sphere of philology. Political discourse are analyzed only from the point of view of linguistics, morphology, explaining their significance from a literary point of view and concentrating on the transformation of words with the passage of time. Political language can be identified with a standard language without going into the sphere of literacy, we can see that the words that politicians are using are considered “too poor”, which also denotes the lack of empathy for a wider stylistic value, lacking in using more stylized metaphors, epithets or others political discourse in an intellectual coat. The role of political language is to refer to the common man, the receiver being often a man without a rich vocabulary. However, the political language begins to resemble a journalistic one, but it does not have a specific terminology. Political language is loaded with ambiguities, simple forms of communication, without excellence through special language. The common, in the case of political language, is the essence of the recurrence of the common man (Siminica, Motoi & Dumitru, 2017).

Political language is that form of literary manifestation through which the transmission of emotion is achieved, but without entering a space of fantasy, in fact making a paradox. Those who use political discourse are introducing the words into a world closed to fantasy more than to reality. The lexicon of political language has a different, ambiguous terminology and I can say that it is atypical, being different from other special languages. There are a number of popular myths in the political lexicon, the words being seen as well as some attitudes. Political language brings with itself the novelty, thus reflecting the origin of language, its nature, but also its linguistic as well as social, historical identity (Keach, 2018; Negrea, 2018; Colhon, Vladutescu & Negrea, 2017). By studying political language, we can see how changes have been observed over time in terms of how it is communicated, what words are used more often and which have remained in the past, and the reaction of the receiver to the hearing of political discourse. By political discourse, it is meant both the reflection of the past, present and future in history, where words are starting to have a strong impact on the way of perceiving the language in general.

3. Political speech in Romania

Over time, Romanian has undergone many changes, many of which can also be found in political language. If in 1918 the language was more civilized, during the communist period it suffered a tragic rupture of the intellectual environment, becoming a series of wood-language communications, the purpose of which was to keep people close to the ideology without making them asking about the real situation. They were always resort to clichés and euphemistic strategies, where the stake is to be recognized by simply capturing the attention of the receiver and proving that regardless of the political language, the language remains the essence of all the discourses, relying on the lack of great words (Karpf, 2016; Ajumobi, 2018).

Thus, an explanation of the meaning of the political language is due to a drafting of the function of the language. The way how political language focuses on certain words is also due to the central point of the present where the history is starting to be written.

The transformation of words from the early 1900s to the present, where they have come to have another value, leads us to think that there may be a balance between the past and the future as long as the present brings an affront to history. However, there is a need for a re-learning of the language in order to be adapted to the political one and without influencing some of its purpose.

Language is a term that has a linguistic code (Dumitru, 2010). When talking about political language, one can say that there is already a code through which people communicate. The speech represents: "a set of linguistic strategies typically updating in a particular situation with a given purpose." Thus, the political language acquires a new perception about the idea of a linguistic code, which can easily be noticed in a speech.

However, political language is considered as an individualization, identifying itself with standard language, but at the same time resembling with a journalistic one. Although it resembles journalism, it also remains in its sphere of activity, with common terms. Political language is a set of multifaceted language: journalistic, administrative and legal.

If we are talking about the Romanian political language today, are its features private or sown with other countries? In fact, political language is general and we can find its traits in everyone, regardless of the spoken language. But what is its specificity? The Romanian language is known to be influenced by several countries, being not a 100% Latin language, with Slavic, Turkish influences and others. Then is the political language similar to the other people? We can tilt it not necessarily. Indeed, language is generally the same,

but the words are different. The fact that we speak Romanian makes us feel different from the rest in terms of the words used.

A political discourse is not limited only to its power of social or moral interpretation, but also to a linguistic one, given that it is achieved through a certain language (Crețu, 2010; Ietcu-Fairclough & Fairclough, 2013; Neumann, 2016).

Moving from one stage to the next, creating new words, or even excluding them from language, can only reflect the way Romanian becomes familiar with history and is influenced by it. Political people of the time are subject to the rules of the language, not seeking to highlight or invent a new words, but merely trying to exploit their use.

4. Political language as a form of communication

In their book, Wodak and Meyer (2009) were telling that it states that language is a social phenomenon and is not an individual one, formed in groups and considered a form of communication. Everything starts from the language. What is its significance? Considered a social part of political speeches, language is more a contract, ending between members of a community, being outside the individual. Since we are children, we learn the language spoken by our parents, but also by the people around us, assimilating it without asking too many questions about its structure and grammar. Later we are starting to learn about the rules of our language, how grammar is working and what the rules that we have to follow are. It is the main form of communication with society, succeeding in approaching others and at the same time receiving an identity (Vlăduțescu, 2019).

Language is linked to sound, being organized thinking. But what is the role of the language? It is an intermediary between thought and sound, where their unity is a delimitation of a mutual unity. Saussure thinks that language is

like a static system, not necessarily stable. It is characterized in a certain form, structure, which in turn functions based on certain laws. Language is also a system of linguistic signs, with relations between them. The rules of the system are based on two types of relationships: paradigmatic and syntagmatic, namely combining and selecting. Language signifies a part of the language, which is more homogeneous. It is a whole and at the same time a classification. In the facts of language, it is producing an order as a whole, proving to be natural and not aligned with any other classification.

5. Conclusion

Language is a continuity of an era to the future, not seen as belonging only to a certain time. The definition of today's language is due to a past, which, through its actions, both in language and in the form of behavior, owes its future into a similar form to it. However, the origin of language is not necessarily essential, considering that people using a certain language are not aware of it. Saussure think that every nation, regardless of its origin, is pleased with the language that they speaks it and they don't seek a linguistic explanation.

Language creates a bridge between people, helping them to create a language designed to bring society into a homogeneous formula. How does this work? If we go to Saussure's theory of linguistics, everything is reduced to a measure of interpretation of language through both a theoretical and a practical one.

REFERENCES

Busu, O. V., Stan, M. C., & Andrei, E. C. (2018). Clinical Psychological Aspects within The Concept of Pediatric Dentistry. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, V (1), p. 187-202.

Cmeciuc C. M. (2005). Strategii persuasive în discursul politic, Universitas XXI, Iași, 2005.

Colhon, M., Vlăduțescu, Ș., & Negrea, X. (2017). How Objective a Neutral Word Is? A Neutrosophic Approach for the Objectivity Degrees of Neutral Words. *Symmetry*, 9(11), 280.

Dumitru, A. (2010). *Limbaajul politic actual. Dimensiuni lingvistice și pragmatice*. Editura Tiparg.

Grigoraș, S. M. (2002). Puterea limbajului, între teorie, metodă și politică. Aspecte ale dinamicii limbii române actuale. Actele colocviului Catedrei de Limba Română, 27-28 noiembrie 2002.

Ietcu-Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2013). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. Routledge
Crețu, C. (2010). Noua limbă de lemn a discursului politic. *Philologica Jassyensia*, 6(1).

Irimiaș, G. (2003). *Structuri textuale ale discursului politic totalitar: studiu din perspectiva semioticii textului*. Clusium.

Karpf, A. (2016). *The persistence of the oral: on the enduring importance of the human voice* (Doctoral dissertation, London Metropolitan University)

Keach, L. (2018). *Investigating the Role of Liminality in the Cultural Transition of the Late Eighth Millennium BC on Cyprus*.

Marinescu, A. (2010). Prin mit, la realitate: discursul populist în România. *Științe politice*, 117.

Negrea, X. (2018). „Narrative and Emotional Structures in the Today Media”. *Creativity and language in Social Sciences*, 66-70.

Neumann, V. (2016). *Istoria României prin concepte: perspective alternative asupra limbajelor social-politice*. Polirom via PublishDrive. Sitech.

Siminica, M., Motoi, A. G., & Dumitru, A. (2017). Financial management as component of tactical management. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 15.

Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2018). *The first elements of verbal communication*. Craiova: Sitech.

Voinea, Dan Valeriu (2015). *Media, Social Media and Freedom of Speech Protection in Romanian Legislation*. In C. M. Bunăiașu, E. R. Opran, & D. V. Voinea, *Creativity in social sciences*. Editura Sitech.

Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2019). *First look deal about two types of discourse*. Saarbrücken: LAP.

Zafiu, R. (2007). *Limbaj și politică*. Editura Universității din București.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods for critical discourse analysis*. Sage.