

DOI: 10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2014.19.1.12484

**GRAMMATICAL AND LEXICAL CONSTITUENT OF
PRE-ELECTION DISCOURSE**

Yelena Popova, Yelena Yemelyanova, Natalia Prikhodko

Sumy State University

Е.В. Попова, Е.В.Емельянова, Н.А.Приходько

Сумский государственный университет

The article studies the peculiarities of text building within the framework of American pre-election discourse. The choice of definite grammar constructions and forms gives an opportunity to evaluate the potential of grammar meaning leading to cognitive and pragmatic constituent. Thus, the article aims not only at revealing the main peculiarities of morphological and syntactical construction of pre-election agitation texts, but also at revealing of stylistic potential of grammar meaning, dictated by the individual author's choice.

Key words: *addresser, addressee, pre-election discourse, cooperative strategy, strategy of self-presentation, extralingual, commissive, directive, mental image, cognitive and pragmatic constituent.*

Introduction. Political eloquence is the object of close attention nowadays. The representatives of different spheres of science (linguistics, psychology, sociology, politology) show their interest in studying of pre-election discourse, as political communication has turned into a means of manipulation of people's consciousness. Exactly these speech formations within the framework of lexical, grammatical and syntactical structures leading to cognitive and pragmatic constituents and extralinguistic factors, which give an opportunity to analyse the essence of pre-election discourse, identify its main functions and system-forming characteristics, as speech is the basis of politics.

The aim of meeting speech is to persuade and turn down. Speakers who deliver a speech in public either persuade or turn down [1: 25]. Politicians call for the main action, which is to vote for this or that candidate, party, political bloc, etc.

Methodology. The works of M. Alekseeva, A. Baranova, D. Bolinger, J. Diamond, A. Campbell, V. Karasik, Y. Karaulov, V. Konkov, V. Kostomarov, V. Odintsov, O. Parshina, Y. Popova, G. Pocheptsov, O. Revzina, D. Tannen, A. Chudinov, M. Schudson, Y. Sheigalare devoted to the research of political and pre-election discourse, their main characteristics and functions in particular.

Object of research is pre-election discourse, which demonstrates its own specifics due to speech realization and choice of special grammar constructions.

Subject is grammatical and stylistic representation of pre-election agitation, taking into consideration cognitive and pragmatic constituent.

Thus, **the task** of the given article is to:

- reveal main peculiarities of grammatical (morphological and syntactical) construction of pre-election agitation texts within the framework of pre-election discourse practice by means of componential analysis;
- research the stylistic markers of grammatical composition by means of functional and semantic analysis;
- lead to cognitive and pragmatic operations while choosing special grammar constructions by addresser.

Main part. The special position of grammatical constituent of politicians' speech within the framework of election agitation is explained by main functions and characteristics, which are fulfilled by pre-election discourse. Any politician uses the knowledge (linguistic and social) during the agitation campaign, which he acquired as an individual and a society representative on the given stage of development, and which is the potential for realization of discourse practice. At the same time one should not overestimate the significance of functions and characteristics of pre-election discourse as the anthropocentric factor – the addresser as a producer of a verbal text and a starting point of any linguistic research, remains its influential correcting factor.

Whether we're talking about cutting-edge energy solutions, the latest in biotechnology, innovative filmmakers or the development of state-of-the-art chip production facilities, you'll find 'em here in Texas[2].

The given example demonstrates lexical and stylistic richness: the usage of scientific lexis and terminology (*energy solutions, biotechnology, innovative filmmakers, chip production facilities*), its combining within the framework of cognitive metaphor and metonymy (*cutting-edge energy solutions, state-of-the-art chip production facilities, the latest in biotechnology*); and as a result it promotes elevation of general contextual semantics, modelling the image of a speaker – a strong and clever leader. The addresser guided by the macrointention–possible variations of communicative strategies, inherent in pre-election discourse, – appeals to cooperative strategy, solidarization with mass recipient with the help of antonymic register lowering. Such grammatical step opposite to lexical, is fulfilled by means of usage of colloquial shortened grammar forms (*we're, you'll find 'em*), which virtually bring closer addresser to mass listener as colloquial forms are absolutely clear and maximally acceptable. So, the addresser puts on a mask of an average American and thus wins trust of the recipient, for whom a politician, who uses colloquial speech forms, has come from the people and will defend the real needs of the people.

Guided by the self-presentation strategy, the authors of pre-election agitation texts often use inclusive forms of personal pronouns *we, our*, though the usage of such forms of deixis only underlines the cooperative tactics.

We don't need any more happy talk from the White House about "investing" in solar shingles and really fast trains. The White House shouldn't even bother floating these new spending programs. We can't afford them. We have to have an adult conversation about our spending commitments; circumstances have changed, and we must adapt[3].

If to take into consideration the form of 1st person singular of personal pronoun, which due to its explicitness makes the recipient correlate the heard and seen information with the concrete personality of a speaker, building in the addresser's cognition certain image. Depending on extralingual conditions, previous

experience (knowledge), the created mental image of addresser may acquire negative evaluation in recipient's cognition despite the presence of self-presentation strategy, which the speaker follows using deixis *I*. The usage of *we*, *our* presents the inclusion of addressee into action and interests of addresser, and that, in its turn, creates the mental image of unity and integrity of nation, as these constituents build up the concept "NATION". Thus, the choice of correspondent pronoun presents the component of manipulation within the framework of global theatrical strategy.

The pre-election discourse skillfully manipulates the notion of truth, presenting subjective as objective [4]. Taking into consideration that any communication is manipulative, as any language usage even neutral aims at influencing of perception of the world and the means of its structuring[5: 68], such manipulativity acquires special significance, including selection of facts, covering of certain news, image creation, stereotype formation, certain cultural and ideological context [6: 196], introducing new knowledge, thoughts and attitudes into to the world model of a recipient and modifying of already existing knowledge, thoughts and attitudes with the help of different strategies [7: 8]. Commissives are also included into the process, they give promises and commitments to fulfill the desired action for addressee [8].

On his first day in office, Romney will submit a jobs package to Congress consisting of at least five major proposals and will demand that Congress act on the package within 30 days, using every power at his disposal to ensure its passage. He will also take immediate and specific steps within his sole authority as president by issuing a series of executive orders that gets the U.S. government out of the economy's way. The goal: restore America to the path of robust economic growth necessary to create jobs[9].

The verbalization of a commissive is done by means of analytical form usage of the future tense of English verbs (*will submit*, *will demand*, *will take steps*), where we have an auxiliary verb *will* and a notional verb with lexical semantics of physical action, limited in time (*submit*, *demand*, *take*), and also by means of verbals (*using*, *to ensure*, *issuing*). Such form of verbal presentation, inherent in commissives, is the most wide spread, but it is not the only one possible within the framework of the

language system. The conceptual space of *will* due to its archaic nature takes in numerous modal qualities and leads to the domain “*desirable*” (lexical variant of *want* and correspondent synonymic row), which is determined by the cognitive and pragmatic choice of the addresser and to the domain “*physically or theoretically possible*” (lexical variant of *can* and correspondent synonymic row) which is determined not only by the cognitive and pragmatic choice of the addresser but also by the communicative situation. At the same time, commissives remain such speech acts, which should be believed [8].

The subject is expressed by the 3rd person singular pronoun (*he*) not without a reason in the given example. While using personal pronoun of 1st person singular and plural (*I, we*), the addressee decodes information in the search of conceptual network constituent, which is covered in the given communicative situation. And then he compares it with the knowledge he has and builds an addresser’s image in his cognition [10]. If the information is given from the 3rd person, the addressee accepts it as a proven data base, which is confirmed by social opinion and does not need additional cognitive verification.

Along with commissives, directives are favourite speech acts of pre-election discourse. They create the hypnotic effect and push addressee to making the desired decision [8].

Our government should work for us, not against us. It should help us, not hurt us. It should ensure opportunity not just for those with the most money and influence, but for every American who's willing to work [11].

Within the framework of imperative function of communicative strategies, one can define the frequency of modal verbs usage with meaning of compulsion (*must, should, have to, ought to*), verbs with actional semantics (*take, make, work, bring*). The frequency of such grammar construction as *it's time to*, functional correlate of the type *it's important, it is necessary* are underlined. Such correlates due to formal subject *it* function as rhetoric order, because they are aimed at mass addressee (*It's high time to stop acting process of economic falling, degradation... [11]*). If the concrete addressee is missed, the communicative status of speech is changed, turning

the order into apostrophe, ethic recommendation or maxims of indefinite character [12: 360], which is absolutely valorative verbal decision in the limits of theatrical, esoteric and phantom character of denotation row inherent in pre-election discourse.

Final Part. Among grammar peculiarities of pre-election discourse are named the following: dominance of nominalized constructions[13];specific weight of formal or indefinite-personal expression of subject, which accompanies the realization of attack strategy and delegitimization within the framework of impersonal accusation and exposure; spreading of grammar constructions, which represent violation of grammar norms of standard language; relative syntactic complexity, using composite sentences and subordinate constructions [14].

Conclusions. The conducted research underlines the wide spectrum of grammatical possibilities, executing the role of building constituent of pre-election discourse. The verbalization of intention in pre-election discourse and in any other discourse and syntagmatic construction demand from addressee knowledge of paradigmatic peculiarities of the given language system. The revealing of grammatical and stylistic peculiarities of pre-election discourse is possible due to complex syntagmatic, paradigmatic analysis leading to cognitive and pragmatic constituent of communicative process as a constituent of discourse practice.

References

1. Aristotel, 2000. Rhetoric. Poetics. M. : Labirint, pp. 224.
2. Page of Rick Perry [Electronic resource]. – Access :<http://www.rickperry.org/>
3. Page of Sarah Palin [Electronic resource]. – Access :<http://www.sarahpac.com/posts/conquering-the-storm>
4. Diamond J., 1996. Status and Power in Verbal Interaction : a Study of Discourse in a Close-knit Social Network. Amsterdam and Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publ. Co., pp: 178.
5. Zheltukhina M. P.,2001. Comic as Means of Harmonization in Political Discourse: Issues of Language Policy and Language Planning in the Information Society : Abstracts of the International Scientific Conference. Irkutsk : ISLU. P.4-47.

6. Dobrosklonskaya T. G., 2008. *Medialinguistics: System Approach to Media Language Study: Modern English Media Language*. M. : Flinta : Nauka, pp. 264.
7. Golubeva T. M., 2009. *Speech Manipulation in Pre-Election Discourse (on the Material of American English) : synopsis of diss. of candidate of philological sciences : specialty 10.02.04. Nizhegorodskiy State Linguistic University named after N. A. Dobrolyubov. N. Novgorod*, pp. 22.
8. Bolinger D., 1980. *Language – the Loaded Weapon : the Use and Abuse of Language Today*. London and New York : Longman, pp. 214.
9. Page of Mitt Romney [Electronic resource]. –
Access : <http://www.mittromney.com/>
10. Schudson M., 1997. *Sending a Political Message: Lessons from the American 1790s. Media, Culture and Society*. Vol.19. № 3. P. 311–330.
11. Page of Barack Obama [Electronic resource]. –
Access : <http://www.asksam.com/ebooks/obama-speeches/>
12. Arutyunova N. D., 1981. *Addressee Factor*. Izv. ASUSSR. Literature and Language Series. M. : Nauka. V. 40. № 4. P. 356–367.
13. Rizhynashvili I. U., 1994. *Linguistic Mechanisms of Tendentious Events Presentation in English and American Periodicals : synopsis of diss. of candidate of philological sciences : specialty 10.02.04 «Germanic Languages»*. St Petersburg, pp. 17.
14. Makarov M. L., 1988. *Social and Deictic Measurement of Style*. Linguistic Communication : Processes and Units : Interuniversity Collection of Scientific Works. Kalinin : Kalinin State University. P. 76–81.

Popova Y.V. Grammatical and Lexical Constituent of Pre-Election Discourse / Y.V.Popova, Y.V.Yemelyanova, N.A.Prikhodko // Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research. – 2014. – № 19 (1). – C. 48-51.