USE OF METAPHOR IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

F.J. Yakubov

Head of Humanitarian sciences, Kattakurgan branch of Samarkand State University

Abstract. *The article deals with usage of metaphors and types of metaphors in political discourse.*

Keywords: *discourse, political discourse, conceptual metaphors, orientational metaphors, opposition, cognitive metaphors, frame.*

One of the main problems of pragmatic and cognitive linguistics, recognized as new directions in modern linguistics, is the concept of discourse. Discourse is oral and written text. Discourse has two meanings: it is a text that actualizes under certain conditions and discourse in the quality of discursive practice. Discourse reflects culture, mentality as both general, national and individual as private. Political discourse is "the totality of all speech acts used in political debate" (12:55).

Our activities are conditioned by systems related to our concepts. John Lakoff and M. Johnson had proved convincingly that "metaphor is in our daily lives, it is reflected not only in our language, but also in our actions" (8:387). J. Lakoff's book "Metaphors we live by" drew the attention of linguists to the human system of metaphorical perception of the world. A large part of social realism is understood through the underlying metaphors adopted by members of a particular society. To evoke an idea of how metaphorical understanding constitutes human activity, J. Lakoff and M. Johnson examines the metaphor *argument is war*. This conceptual metaphor is said with reference to a large number of expressions, phrases in everyday life. We can not only talk about disputes with war terms, but also win or lose a match, look at the opponent as a rival, attack his positions and defend our own. "Much of what we do realistically in debates is understood in most cases in terms of war" (8:388).

Imaginary cultures with the base metaphor of "debate is dance" are able to perceive debate as harmonious and beautiful actions of partners. Metaphors can explain one concept in other terms of understanding, but ordering of realism metaphorically in these cases is partial rather than being broadly" (8:395). Metaphors help to think of one concept, blurring some other aspects: by accepting an opponent as an enemy, one can forget about cooperation in a debate.

In the metaphor of *orientation* (aiming), a whole system of concepts is organized in the terms of other systems (8:396), for example, "having power leads to the top, obeying to power – to the bottom gives orientation". Experiments involving physical objects, i.e. methods of explaining events, actions, emotions, ideas, etc., form the basis of *ontological metaphors* (8:408). Looking at inflation as a word of an independent nature gives permission to think about it, to classify it quantitatively, to distinguish one or another aspect of it, to consider it in our actions or to imagine that we understand its nature in our actions.

Thus, metaphors create visions of abstract concepts, penetrate naturally and deeply into our thinking, are understood as "a clear, direct picture of the world of the inner world" (8:412), but here metaphors determine the way of thinking, the ways of knowing the being. For this reason, metaphors are involved in the development of the text. The birth (emergence) of an ideologized text using conceptual metaphors was described in Eleonore Lassan's monograph. Adopting the

idea of discursive construction, because it is linked to the contrastive nature of human thinking, E. Lassan considers the structure of the text from the simplest type to the most complex structure.

As the basis of the first level, the binary (two) opposition of cognitive process is visible. In the text, the order of opposition is based on the analysis of social content. The degree of importance is compared with the amount of its application in discourse. The presence of opposites in the text is determined by the "sufficiently frequent occurrence of the nomination of opposite concepts" (8:44). The author shows the following oppositions that characterize Russian political discourse in the 60s: *communizm-anti-communizm, patriotizm-antipatriotizm, collectivizm-individualizm, zakonnost-bezzakoniye, gumanizm-antigumannost.*

The second stage of the emergence of the text is giving the oppositions regarding the concept through conceptual metaphors. Binary oppositions are made up of abstract concepts. These abstract concepts "must have a whole, be more understandable and able to translate into a certain language to all, and that is when metaphor arises" (8:47).

Base metaphors define our actions: *time is money*, we must preserve it, use it wisely and not waste it, cognitive units such as scenario (schemes) take on a metaphorical form.

If the opposition of *individualism – collectivism* is represented by the scenario of *individualism - human disease* metaphor, then the text after it paraphrases this metaphor, that is, expresses it in other words: the pursuit of individuality is a manifestation of disease, individuality is harmful to health and etc.

The concept metaphor's prediction of action of participants makes it similar to a predicate in the sentence's deep semantic structure, which also "defines" the roles of nominal groups. Participants in the movement receive the appropriate names.

In the text with the base metaphor *"The world is battle field between communism and anticommunism"* the speaker chooses language tools such as "enemies", "traitors", "war bonfires", influenced by this metaphor.

The third stage "triggers rhetorical mechanisms of text creation". E. Lassan sees the process of the emergence of nominations as a transition from the early structures of consciousness to real textual structures. Nominations associated with metaphors give rise to frames that correspond to them, for example, the "enemy" frame. Then the knowledge associated with it becomes verbalized (8:51). The activity of a person in a political text can be described by a "*causal frame*". Such a frame (forming frame units) contains 5 slots (8:51).

1) Subject, subject characteristics   *enemy, rascal*
2) subject values, goals   *to strike from behind*
3) circumstances, characteristics   *in ideological battles*
4) actions, characteristics   *set the ack-ack gun and*
                                                                      opened fire on his own
5) result of action, characteristics   *to provoke the legitimate*
 wrath of the people

Through the characteristics of the main element in each slot, the activity of the subject as an "enemy" is explained. Denotative meaningful language tools are not chosen, but lexical units are chosen in which the subject and everything related to it are interpreted in this case in accordance with the mark in the word 'enemy'.

E. Lassan compares the content of the text to two oppositions of ideas (binary opposition), since the speaker evaluates some phenomenon from the semantic point of view that exists in his

mind, and the thought with a scenario-metaphor, which concentrates all of it and then appears syntagmatically in the text.

Binary oppositions described by Lassan fills the factors highlighted by V. F. Petrenko and O. V. Mitina (13). These psychologists conducted researches in different cities of Russia in 1994-1995.

The construction of subjective semantic areas serves as a psycho-semantic method and at the same time as a form of representation of the subject's world view. The method being tested gives associations, and forms and evaluates the proposed material. The matrix of data being created reflects the individual experience being tested, for example, in politics. Factor analysis applied to the data matrix allows to separate interconnected markings, adds them to generalized (factors) categories. If we assume semantic areas as geometric, the factors are their coordinate axes.

The content of factors reflects the subject's ways of thinking the world [8, 93-94]. According to the respondents, the most important factors in Russian society are: *democratization of society – totalitarianism, spirituality – lack of spirituality and economic expediency – non-expediency* (8, 105).

Unlike Lassan, A.N. Baranov and Yu. N. Karaulov (15), who analyzed the validity of metaphors of the 60 s and their role in the emergence of political discourse, researched cognitive metaphors "living" together with modern Russian society.

A.N. Baranov explores the direction which attracts attention whethe metaphors are used in political discourse (8, 189). First of all, it is the role of metaphor in political argumentation (8, 189).

The metaphor is oriented towards the predicate position, for which the main thing is not the identification of objects, the function of characterization (classification) (2:154), the metaphor is "judicial judgment without trial" (3:28). *Judgment without comments*. Although it is not a (literally correct) judicial judgment, it is understood as such. N.D. Arutyunova argues that no reference to "classification errors" weakens the power of metaphors. Ivan Ivanovich Pererepenko tried in vain to show that he was recorded as a dvoryan (nobleman) on his birth certificate when he was called a "goose", because a goose is not a person anyway, it is a bird" (3:8).

Therefore, in order for a metaphor to be used in the discourse, there must be some agreement between the participants in the dialogue, one of which is the inequality, dissimilarity of the source frame and the whole frame, from the metaphor of the *ship* of *perestroika (restructuring)* the idea that rebuilding is a ship does not arise (5: 189). Violation of this condition is the main method of argumentative influence. Metaphors influence the way of knowing the being and become "the weapon of agitation" (9: 92), creating a public-political landscape that coincides with the actual or conjunctive views of its authors with the application of paints. Relying on the publications of the Russian press from 1986 to 1994, I. Kozhenevska-Berchinskaya lists word-symbols that group metaphors: lomka (breaking, demolition), confrontation, siloviye metodi (force methods), utopia, crisis, bolezn (illness), democracy, business, rinok (market), reforma (reform), borba-pobeda (fight – victory) (9: 96).

The direction of research, called as the second direction by Baranov, is the discursive component of metaphors. "In political discourse, metaphors are the most frequently referenced (quoted) component of discourse, which provides not only a topic of discussion, but also a pre-assessment" (5: 189).

It should be noted that "the ideological problem of the speech stamp is associated with the mythification of social consciousness. Ideological myths, concentrated in colloquial stereotypes, have served and serve as tools in manipulating social consciousness" (14: 106).

A.N. Baranov called the third line of research as "political metaphor and political discourse" (5: 190). The authors of the work on parliamentary debates consider it entirely natural that modern Russian political discourse is metaphorical, since the cognitive power of metaphor makes it an instrument in search of a solution (6:16). The metaphor is an element of crisis thinking, an element of thinking in problematic situations, and so they "give many ways to get out of crisis, which politicians later consider in the decision-making process" (5: 190).

A.N. Karaulov and Yu. N. Karaulov describes the influence of conceptual metaphor on the ethics of Russian politicians, the pressure of the continuing metaphorical field of war on social consciousness prepares the community for actions leading to the materialization of metaphors (7: 15-16). The first edition of the Russian dictionary of political metaphors is divided into two parts. The first part, "Metaphorical models of political realism", cites the semantic coupling of metaphors and shows which realism each metaphor corresponds to. For example, war and game metaphors are consistent with war, financial, and law-making activities (15:17-19, 39).

Metaphors of mechanism – economics, state, finance, democracy, openness, law making, army, society, reconstruction, with repression, metaphors of organism are connected with economics, market, state, history, political activity, government, society, are connected with conscience (there, 58). The second part of the dictionary is "The world of politics in the mirror of metaphor" – onomasiological; it shows what concepts and subjects (e.g.democracy, legislation, KGB, USSR, political leaders) can be metaphorized.

The fourth direction, "Political metaphor as a factor of political culture", is linked to the culture of general discourse, with the culture of argumentation (5: 190-191). Political discourse is given in the modern Russian and Uzbek social consciousness in many cases by oppositions. Understanding new values and re-evaluating old ones is usually done with the help of cognitive metaphors. This leads to excessive metaphorization of political discourse.

REFERENCES

1. Akimov V.P., Baranov A.N., Sergeev V.M. Kompyuternaya model tekushego soznaniya v sisteme Avgur. // Issledovaniya po kognitivnim aspektam yazika. – Tartu, 1990.
2. Арутюнова Н.Д. Языковая метафора. //Лингвистика и поэтика. – М., 1979. – С. 147 – 173.
3. Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора и дискурс. // Теория метафоры. – М., 1990. – С. 5 – 32.
4. Баранов А.Н. Политическая аргументация и ценностные структуры общественного сознания. // Язык и социальное познание. – М., 1990. – С. 166 – 176.
5. Баранов А.Н. Очерк когнитивной теории метафоры. // Баранов А.Н., Караулов Ю.Н. Русская политическая метафора. Материалы к словарю. - М., 1991. – С. 184 – 193.
6. Баранов А.Н., Казакевич Е.Г. Парламентские дебаты: традиции и новации. – М., 1991. – 64 с.
7. Баранов А.Н., Караулов Ю.Н. Политическая метафора как объект лингвистического исследования. // Баранов А.Н., Караулов Ю.Н. Русская политическая метафора. Материалы к словарю. - М., 1991. – С. 12 – 16.

8. Земская Е.А. Клише новояза и цитация в языке постсоветского общества. // Вопросы языкознания, 1996. – N 3. – С. 23 – 31.

9. Коженевска-Берчинская И. Новации в языковой картине мира российского человека: на основе современных публицистических текстов. – Ольштин, 1996. – 207 с.

10. Лакофф Дж., Джонсон М. Метафоры, которыми мы живём (главы 1 – 6). Теория метафоры. – М., 1990. – С. 387 – 415. Цитируется по этому изданию. Главы 1, 13, 21, 23, 24 напечатаны в сб.: Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия. – М., 1987. – С. 126 – 170.

11. Лассан Э. Дискурс власти и инакомыслия в СССР: когнитивно-риторический анализ. – Вильнюс, 1995. – 232 с.

12. Миронова Н.Н. Оценочный дискурс: проблемы семантического анализа. // Известия АН. Серия литературы и языка. – 1997. – Т. 56. – N 4. – С. 52 – 59.

13. Петренко В.Ф., Митина О.В. Образ политической и экономической теории в сознании россиян. // Общественные науки и современность. // 1997. – N 4. – С. 92 – 105.

14. Словарь. – Баранов А.Н., Караулов Ю.Н. Русская политическая метафора. Материалы к словарю. – М., 1991. 193 с.

15. Ruziyeva N.K. New innovative approaches to teaching foreign languages. Porta Linguarum 37, March 2022.