

**Tahmazova G. Y.**

International Language Center of the Karabakh University

## THE FORMATION OF MODERN POLITICAL DISCOURSE THROUGH GRAMMATICAL MEANS IN THE ENGLISH AND AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGES: A STUDY OF LEXICAL AND SYNTACTICAL CONNECTIONS

*The article under consideration addresses an important and pertinent subject. Its topicality is beyond question. In today's world, politics plays a significant role, which naturally influences language use. Therefore, the selected topic objectively generates genuine interest.*

*First and foremost, it is worth noting that this work has a professionally competent structure. The first two pages provide an interpretation of the central concept. Without this introductory section, any thoughts and generalizations by the author would be left hanging in the air; as there would be a background without a foundation.*

*Subsequently, the author delves into the core content of the principal idea, that is, the implementation of the topic outlined in the title.*

*In our opinion, the author should also be commended for the use of several grammatical devices. These include metaphorical expressions, complex syntactic structures, lexical redundancy, fixed expressions, and other linguistic features. These devices are consistently and thoroughly (within the limits of the article) illustrated when supporting the theoretical propositions with examples in both languages.*

*It is worth noting that the author goes beyond the usual translation and does not take the path of least resistance in his analysis. The inclusion of even a brief comparative analysis adds significance to the article, as the grammatical devices employed by the author help to clarify the meaning of a range of words and phrases used in political discourse from various perspectives. The mere presence of a list of tools has a positive impact on the conclusions, as it would be impractical in this type of work to limit oneself to a single means of proving the operation of the relevant regulations. This would result in a narrowing of the scope of the review. This is not the case due to the well-structured nature of the article's architectonics.*

**Key words:** *text, political discourse, linguistic analysis, stylistic connections, metaphorical statements.*

**Introduction.** In today's rapidly changing geopolitical landscape, significant transformations are occurring in various aspects of public life, including the political sphere. These developments have had a direct impact on political communication, which must now reflect the demands for language and discourse that are closely linked to economic and socio-political transformations.

This has led linguists at this critical juncture in history to rethink the scope and nature of various linguistic phenomena. The core issue is that the very paradigm of language in political discourse has been undergoing a notable transformation in recent years.

In theoretical terms, scholars are exploring more complex frameworks and models that integrate data from diverse scientific disciplines, such as linguistics, methods of teaching specialized subjects, ethno-linguistics, cultural and linguistic studies, historical analysis, and other relevant fields.

**The main purpose** is to show the formation of political discourse using grammatical means in multi-system languages.

**The main problem.** Before discussing the role and significance of grammatical features in political discourse in Azerbaijani and English in this article, it is necessary to define the central focus of the research. In the 21st century and, more specifically, during the first four years of the second decade of this century, political discourse has attracted the attention of numerous scholars. This is understandable, as the overall atmosphere of inter-civilization dialogue at the highest levels of international relations depends largely on the ability to perfectly master the language of political communication. Even in ancient times, Cicero was renowned for carefully selecting the appropriate words and phrases for his political speeches.

J. A. Safarova correctly emphasizes that “political discourse in the 21st century is today one of the most significant phenomena that we encounter on a daily basis” [8, p. 12]. This apparently categorical statement has its own unavoidable logic and truth. Indeed, the rapid increase in the number of political parties, including in Azerbaijan, is accompanied by the development and refinement of the language of politics. This is why not only professional politicians and social scientists are keenly interested in this kind of discourse, but also political analysts, journalists, political researchers, cultural scholars, historians, philosophers and writers. And this despite the obvious fact that our chosen article topic primarily concerns the interests of linguists. Such a broad field of activity for scientists of various specialties makes us wonder about what grammatical means actually drive the dynamics of this kind of discourse. To clarify this issue is a primary goal of our paper.

In contemporary cognitive linguistics, scholars from various countries are often more concerned with the analysis of interrelations between sentences, rather than individual sentences, as part of the larger syntactic whole, which is the maximum unit of phrase unity in the form of a paragraph. While it may be somewhat easier to emphasize aspects of language in fictional writing, it seems more difficult in political discourse due to the prevalence of professionalism.

If such a study involves a comparative analysis of English and Azerbaijani, it becomes a highly controversial issue for several reasons.

Firstly, these languages belong to different language families – Indo-European and Turkic, respectively, and therefore, direct translation is not sufficient for theoretical linguistics. Secondly, there is disagreement among scholars regarding the function of various grammatical features mentioned in the article’s title. Thirdly, the structure of complex syntactic structures and the translation of verbal collocations from other languages into English or Azerbaijani are not clearly defined. Fourthly, when using other grammatical structures in both languages, there are no clear criteria for their classification. This list can be expanded upon if desired, as even the boundaries between transitions within a single grammatical category or between categories are not clearly defined today.

However, everything is in order. The political discourse in the two languages under comparison is an integral communicative unit. It has its own criteria for evaluation, characterized by specific paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations between the units in the designated languages, but at the same time, it naturally differs in shades of meaning. For example, the seman-

tic organization of the text with political inclusions, the discreteness of discourse, modality, nature of the predicate, special pragmatic installation designed for press readers or (most often) listeners, etc.

It is significant that, in all cases and variations in modern Azerbaijani and English, the content and procedural nature of a political text are invariably brought to the forefront.

Suppose we analyze the structure of the components in modern English political discourse, which consists of a series of complex syntactic units interconnected both structurally and logically (according to S. Maugham’s idea).

“Go ahead, Johnny,” said my father. “You haven’t yet failed to return from the store with provisions, and you’ll be back in ten minutes with food fit for a king”.

“I don’t know”, I said. “Mr. Kosak tells me we are giving him a hard time. He wants to know what work I do”. “Well, go and tell him”, said my father. “I have nothing to hide. I am writing poetry. Tell Mr. Kosak that I write poetry day and night”.

First, the following question arises: using which grammatical form can we establish with the highest degree of accuracy that the father’s doubts (or lack of understanding of the matter – as expressed, for example, by the use of the “I don’t know” form in the second clause) are only possible if there is a close relationship with the subsequent syntactic unit? Nigar Babayeva’s argument is in the right direction, suggesting that this form should be interpreted as having a constant negative meaning only if a clear link is established with the preceding phrase in the complex syntactic unit [1, p. 11–12].

For what reason? Because they have a single grammatical marker (N. Babaeva calls it an “indicator”): *haven't yet failed*. It has a spectrum of constant action. According to the same scheme, we establish the meaning of “are doing”, since it is in very close lexical-semantic and at the same time grammatical connection with the following form according to Maugham’s political text – *«am writing»*. Only in this case the marker acts *выражение night and day*.

It is interesting to consider this complex syntactic structure, as M. Halliday and R. Hassan argue that the use of antonymous pairs such as “night” and “day” in this context serves as an “artistic indicator”, whereas from a strictly grammatical perspective, the dominant position is occupied by grammatical coherence [5, p. 101–102].

An analogous example in the Azerbaijani language can be found in a public speech given by the national writer Mirza Ibrahimov.

*Qaranlıq və kədərli bir aləm məşinin qaldırdığı toz buludları içində itir, arxada qalırdı. Qabaqda işə işiqli və nəhayətsiz bir yol açılırdı* (M. İbrahimov).

This example is provided by the modern linguist A. Mammadov, who confirms that the components of such a compound word are “interconnected by means of the conjunction “isə”” [9, p. 122].

In our opinion, the use of the conjunction “isə” in this context serves to strengthen the opposition expressed in the two parts of the complex sentence, on the one hand. On the other hand, this conjunction also reflects a certain degree of uncertainty, which allows the speaker to introduce “semantic ambiguity and uncertainty” into their political speech.

“While Republican candidates are scrapping it out in South Carolina, the powerful re-election machine behind President Barack Obama has already set a pace of fundraising almost certain to shatter records for the sheer amount of money flowing into American politics” [2].

It should be noted that this metaphorical approach is not a novel one, having long been actively employed in the speeches of both politicians and journalists.

Let us reveal the core of the matter in our own words. The core of the issue here is that any ambiguity in political speech on the part of the speaker has a certain purpose. Specifically, by using the technique of antonymous opposition (as exemplified in the above sentence by the conjunction “isə”), it can plant, so to speak, a “seed of doubt” in the minds of listeners. In modern literary analysis, this is typically expressed in a journalistic or philosophical interpretation of the speech. A similar phenomenon occurs in linguistics within political discourse. That is, the speaker presents their own viewpoint to the audience, thereby stimulating activity in the listener.

A person is simultaneously inspired with an analytical and critical stance, which is implemented in two opposing planes. This is the core of the opposition within the Azerbaijani context. In modern cognitive linguistics, this is a combination of structurally formative features in discourse, such as informativity (communication), institutionalization, and at the same time ambiguity. This creates a natural distance between speaker and listener. Political texts are generally based on this principle.

In our opinion, it is not difficult to draw a thematic connection between such polar meanings and the lexical-semantic opposition of verb-based stable expressions in English and Azerbaijani, which primarily allows us to determine the level of abstraction (i.e., the degree of ambiguity or uncertainty) in order to formulate one of the key concepts in political discourse.

Leaving aside any symbolic implications, which may be of interest only to literary critics, let us focus

on the actual possibility of translating this phrase from English into Azerbaijani within the context of a political text.

The phrase “peaceful fires” is used not only in symbolic and artistic texts, but also in political discourse, where it has a fairly broad semantic range. It is therefore automatically translated and adapted into Azerbaijani as well *sakit (xeyirxah) işıqlar*. However, in the political context, the phrase takes on a “double meaning”. This is not intended as a lighthearted comment and, of course, it is not meant in a literal sense. While it may sound cynical, it cannot be ignored: the correspondent for a well-known radio program interpreted the phrase not in a political sense, but rather in an artistic or symbolic one.

In our opinion, Leyla Hamidova’s work on the topic of language translation has provided a clear understanding of the phenomenon. She explains that when adopting concepts from an artistic or political text, there are at least two significant consequences. First, as explained by L. Hamidova, there is a clarification of different evaluative perspectives on the original situation. Second, there is the potential for differences in interpretation and understanding due to different cognitive systems.

We believe that the second point is particularly relevant for the process of translating the complex syntactic structures into Azerbaijani. A different interpretation would be expected due to the fact that for many knowledgeable Azerbaijanis, as with other Turkic speakers, the expression in question is associated with a sacred fire.

If stable combinations in political discourse are typically designed for a one-time impact (the informativity of an exploding bomb effect), the feature of lexical repetition is, by contrast, used more frequently and ideally serves to reinforce the core word from one sentence to the next. In simple terms, this repetition practically ensures the coherence of a text, or more precisely, a microtext. Notably, it can be effectively employed in political speech, which inherently varies in style depending on the speaker's delivery.

For example, A) Individual lexemes, groups of words, or even parts of a sentence may be repeated. This is evident not only in Azerbaijani and other languages; B) Repetitions may be contact or distant based on the specific location and distance from the object; C) Different parts of speech may be repeated, forming an international rule; D) An off-duty rule, mainly a one-person rule, may occur, with a logical chain connection between different sentence members. Object and subject are created through lexical repetition, as in:

1. The impression he could have on *Rosemary*: *Rosemary* had always seen him as a model of correctness.

2. Bu lap *Aşqabadın lap o istisinə oxşayırdı, Aşqabadın o istisinə ki, Zübeydə gəmiyə minib, Xəzəri üzüb gedib düşmüşdü o istiyə; qaragül xəzi almağa getmişdi ki, gətirib Bakıda satsın.*

Interestingly, it is possible to draw a connection between this type of chaining and metaphorical expressions. Azerbaijani linguist Tamilla Mammadova provides a striking example from political discourse: “The world is perilously transforming into a global space with no boundaries, where the first major upheaval may be the last. The world is crumbling like a sinking ship. Soon, the Titanic will have no place to dock” [7, p. 13].

Metaphors, as the author of the article points out, along with lexical repetition, generally contribute to the accuracy and clarity of political texts. If, in our previous work, we discussed stable structures and their representations in English and Azerbaijani, here we are discussing the harmony of discourse that lacks double standards or “double-bottomed” approaches, but rather highlights specific issues relevant to modern politics or clearly reveals strong connections between individual elements of proposals.

Another useful function of lexical repetition in this type of discourse is that it provides the speaker on the podium with a real opportunity to address not only general, but also specific issues. The former can be achieved by using common words, which, as they say, “pour water into politics.” The latter is more informative, as raising specific issues often requires their immediate interpretation. In such situations, lexical

repetition serves as a kind of mood enhancer for the listening or reading audience.

Let us take a simple example using such a grammatical device as phraseology as an illustration. For instance, the external form and semantics of the idiom “wash your hands” is often used in literature. As a rule, in figurative language, its meaning is so clear and straightforward that it does not require any additional explanation from the author.

Its use in political discourse is a different matter. In English, the phrase “to wash hands” is used primarily to mean pouring from empty to empty, carrying nonsense, or evading responsibility. According to the dictionary edited by V. K. Müller, this expression is most commonly used in colloquial speech.

In the Azerbaijani language, however, according to M. T. Taghiyev, it is often used in a political context to mean stepping aside, withdrawing one’s candidacy from office, or deviating from one’s previous position. This phraseological unit also indicates a lack of stable political ideals in an individual.

A number of phraseological units rooted in paremiological structures in the Azerbaijani language, particularly those relevant to the topic at hand, can be found in the informative article written by L. I. Hamidova.

**Conclusion.** In conclusion, we would like to emphasize that it is now deeply erroneous to judge modern political discourse as a purely “politicized” phenomenon. Instead, it is important to recognize that its linguistic aspects need to be expanded significantly. This includes not only the words, phrases, and sentences found in newspapers and magazines that are relevant to the topic, but also “institutional” or political communication in general. To take a more comprehensive approach to linguistic analysis, this type of communication should be included.

#### Bibliography:

1. Babayeva N.O. Linguo-stylistic connections between independent complex syntactic units in Russian, English and Azerbaijani languages. Abstract of dissertation of candidate of philological sciences. Baku, 2013, 28 p.
2. Barack Obama goes in search of cash for US 2012 election // The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/jan/21/obama-holds-three-fundraiserscampaign>
3. Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008.
4. Hamidova L.I. On the question of the formation of phraseological units based on paremiological constructions // Russian language and Literature in Azerbaijan, 2006, No. 1, pp. 25-29.
5. Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. London, 1976.
6. Hamidova L.I. Principles of translation of stable verbal constructions (SVC) from Russian into Azerbaijani // Scientific notes of the BSU. Language and Literature Series, No. 2, 2015, pp. 54-59.
7. Mammadova T.M. Functional features of metaphor in modern newspaper and journalistic style // Russian language and literature in Azerbaijan, 2013, No. 1, pp. 12-16.
8. Safarova J.A. Linguistic analysis of political discourse. Theoretical aspect // Russian language and Literature in Azerbaijan, 2005.
9. Məmmədov A. Y. Mətn yaranmasında formal əlaqə vasitələrinin sistemi. Bakı, Elm, 2001.

**Тахмазова Г. Я. ФОРМУВАННЯ СУЧАСНОГО ПОЛІТИЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ  
ГРАМАТИЧНИМИ ЗАСОБАМИ В АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ ТА АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСЬКІЙ МОВАХ:  
ВИВЧЕННЯ ЛЕКСИКО-СИНТАКСИЧНИХ ЗВ'ЯЗКІВ**

*Подана стаття написана на важливу та актуальну тему. Її своєчасність не викликає сумнівів. Сучасний світ є суцільно політизованим, що природно і закономірно відбивається і в мові. Тому обрана тема об'єктивно викликає непідробний інтерес. Насамперед слід зазначити, що ця робота професійно грамотно структурована. На перших двох сторінках дається тлумачення центрального терміна. Без такої вступної частини будь-які думки та узагальнення автора повисли б у повітрі, тому що є фон, але немає бази. Потім автор статті приступає до розкриття основного змісту головного поняття, тобто реалізації теми, винесеної в заголовок.*

*На заслугу автора, на нашу думку, слід також поставити використання кількох видів граматичних засобів. Це: метафоричні висловлювання, складне синтаксичне ціле, лексичний повтор, стійкі конструкції, фразеологізми та інші. Вони послідовно і досить докладно [зрозуміло, в рамках обсягу статті] розкрито при підтвердженні теоретичних положень, що висуваються, прикладами двома мовами. Примітно, що автор практично не обмежується звичайним перекладом, не йде лінією найменшого опору. Ускладнення статті шляхом навіть такого короткого порівняльно-порівняльного аналізу значуще, оскільки обрані автором граматичні засоби дозволяють роз'яснити суть низки слів та пропозицій політичного дискурсу з різних сторін. Сам собою перелік даних коштів позитивно позначається на висновках, оскільки у таких роботах недоцільно обмежуватися якимось засобом доказів функціонування відповідних положень. У такому разі огляд тематики виявився б збідненим. Цього не відбувається завдяки правильній архітектоніці статті. Ось чому цим типом дискурсу жваво цікавляться не лише професійні політики та соціологи, а й політичні оглядачі журналісти, політологи, культурологи, історики, філософи, літератори. І це незважаючи на той очевидний факт, що обрана нами тема статті насамперед безпосередньо стосується інтересів лінгвістів.*

**Ключові слова:** *текст, політичний дискурс, лінгвістичний аналіз, стилістичні зв'язки, метафоричні висловлювання.*