

<https://doi.org/10.47100/conferences.v1i1.1064>

## THE ROLE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL INTENSIFIERS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND THEIR NATIONAL-CULTURAL PECULARITIES

Nadejda Zubareva,

National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

[zubarevan@yahoo.com](mailto:zubarevan@yahoo.com)

+99 890 919 80 73

ORCID 0000-0001-7895-3301

**Annotation.** This article deals with phraseological intensifiers of the English language used in political discourse from the cultural linguistics point of view. The aim is to reveal similarities and differentials of phrase-semantic fields of English, Russian and Uzbek languages. Using the predecessors' concepts, the author enlarges the criteria of reference to phraseological intensifier of phraseological units. Besides that, the author described particular isomorph and allomorph conceptual fields by applying the method of comparative analysis of phraseological intensifiers to the given languages of diverse structures. The importance of phraseological intensifiers in political discourse is underlined.

**Keywords:** cultural linguistics, intensify, phraseology, culture, language, compare, political speech.

**Аннотация.** В статье рассматриваются фразеологические интенсификаторы английского языка, используемые в политическом дискурсе с точки зрения лингвокультурологии. Цель - выявить сходства и различия фразеосемантических полей английского, русского и узбекского языков. Используя концепции предшественников, автор расширяет критерии отнесения к фразеологическим усилителям фразеологизмов. Кроме того, автор описал отдельные изоморфные и алломорфные концептуальные поля,



применив метод сравнительного анализа фразеологических интенсификаторов к данным языкам разноплановой структуры. Подчеркивается важность фразеологических интенсификаторов в политическом дискурсе.

**Ключевые слова:** лингвокультурология, интенсификация, фразеология, культура, язык, сравнение, политическая речь.

**Аннотация.** Мақолада сиёсий нутқда ишлатиладиган инглиз тилининг фразеологик интенсификаторлари тилшунослик нуқтаи назаридан кўриб чиқилган. Мақсад инглиз, рус ва ўзбек тилларининг фразеологик семантик соҳаларидаги ўхшашлик ва фарқларни аниқлашдир. Ўрганилган назариялардан фойдланган ҳолда фразеологик бирликларнинг интенсификаторларига йўналтириш мезонлари кенгайтирилган. Бундан ташқари, муаллиф изоморфик ва алломорфик концептуал майдонларни тавсифлаб, турли хил тузилишдаги чет тилларига оид фразеологик бирликлар интенсификаторлари қиёсий таҳлил қилиш усулини қўллаган. Сиёсий нутқдаги интенсификаторларнинг аҳамияти очиқ берилган.

**Калит сўзлар:** лингвокультурология, интенсификатсия, фразеология, интенсификация, маданият, тил, қиёслаш, сиёсий нутқ.

A considerable part of our everyday language consists of formulaic expressions, idioms, and phrases. The main point of applying phraseological unit (PhU) in our everyday speech is to make it more bright and expressive. Therefore, a great majority of politicians as well as journalists use this stylistic device to produce their works/articles and create their speeches. Furthermore, in front of a speaking politician or writing journalist usually stands the task to accent some part of his or her verbal/written expression, to make stress on significant point of it. PhUs, which intensifying meaning, can deliver the above-mentioned function. By using phraseological intensifiers (PhI) politicians can describe particular



phenomena more brightly and colorfully, guide audience attention to the needed turn; politician, correspondent, and other members of our society make their performances, reports, speeches considerably clear, figurative, impressing people minds and capturing their hearts.

It is important to note that the problem of translation and acquiring political PhI's meaning arises while non-native speaker runs across given language units. Simple translation with the help of language units is not enough. It stands to reason that to acquire the meaning of PhI we should realize its underlying idea which couldn't be unveiled only by interpretation of given words.

Language is the mean of humans' expression of their knowledge about the world. There are a great number of different languages. Some part of which is similar while the other is different, as the people speaking in this languages. Bearers of languages see the world according to their concept about surrounding reality; by way of peculiar traditions; geographical location plays important role in the formation of culture and language realization of a nation.

Culture is reflected in the language and, in its' turn, language influences culture. If one takes language away from the nation, the nation will disappear. Culture is preserved and passed from generation to generation by way of language. "Language and culture developed together gradually influencing each other." [B.L. Whorf, 1960] We can safely assume that language and culture are interdependent in direct proportion. "Culture is more vital for language than its' bearing nation" [Ter-Minasova, 2000]. We can support this idea with the fact that Latin disappeared together with the overthrow of the Roman Empire when Roman culture became stagnant. The same happened to the Old Russian and Old Greek languages.

History and culture are perfectly observed in the phraseological level of language. Phraseological units are peculiar conglomerate of ancient experience and national self-awareness of nation. Bearers of one language very often express their thoughts, feelings, emotions with the help of PhI in laconic form. So the politicians



as presenters of their nations and cultures try to influence the audience by close to this nation's worldview realized by PhI.

PhI of English and other languages formed over time and absorbed all components of culture. According to prof. A.V. Kunin they always have conjunction *as* or *like*. The first one forms intensifiers of adjectives and adverbs while the latter one forms intensifiers of verbs: *as blind as a bat* – *слепая курица* – *shabqur odam*, *as dumb as a fish* – *нем как рыба* – *og'ziga suv olganday jim*, *as fat as a pig* – *жирный как свинья* – *chuchkadegi semiz*, *as fierce as a tiger* – *как разъяренный бык* – *g'azablangan yirqich*, *as gaudy as a peacock (butterfly)* – *разодетый в пух и прах (как павлин)* – *yasangan-tusangan*, *as graceful as a swan* – *стройный как лебедь* – *qaddi-qomati*, *as gruff as a bear* – *неуклюжий как медведь* – *beso'naqay ayiq*, *as obstinate as a mule* – *упрямый как осел* – *eshakday o'jar*, *like water off duck's back* – *как с гуся вода* – *suv yuqtirmaydi*, *like all get-out, like a house on fire* «молниеносно», «сломя голову», «o'lar-tirilariga qaramay». The given PhI have equivalents in Russian and Uzbek languages.

*Sweet as honey* – *сладкий как мед* – *asaldek shirin*, *to fear like the plague* – *бояться как огня* – *o'tdan qo'rqqanday qo'rqmoq* are comparative stable phrases which mirror present-day life. Honey is usually sweet, so it's used to intensify the capacity of sweetness. The fire burns so we need to be careful of it. The fear of fire is transferred to other dangerous objects. Conceptual fields of such concepts as *sweetness* and *to fear* are coinciding in the English, Russian and Uzbek languages.

But some PhI have lost their direct meaning now, for example: *hungry as a hunter* – *голодный как волк* – *bo'ridagi och*; *as thick as thieves* – *водой не разольешь* – *oralaridan kil o'tmaydi*.

*Hungry as a hunter* does not mean that comparison is made with to a hunter but points to the intensification – *very hungry*. However, stable comparisons do not always pass the sense with intensive 'very' meaning. Consequently, in such cases it is doubtful "are these phrases intensifiers?": *as white as sheet*, *as white as snow* – *белый как снег* – *qordegi oq*. According to A.V. Kunin's definition



mentioned comparisons are also in the raw of intensificators. This implies, that PhI may not have a superlative degree of intensification. It is enough to have a comparative one.

So, in the Remarks by the ex-President of USA, Barack Obama at DNC Hope Fund Dallas Reception in March 12, 2016 at Gilley's Club, Dallas, Texas we can observe:

*I'm telling you, Texas, we've been as busy as a hound in flea season. (Laughter.) We're busy. And we're still busy, still hustling. We're not letting the grass grow under our feet. We've got more work to do. We're still hustling. There's no grass growing under our feet. So the point, though, is that when the cynics told us we couldn't change the country, they were dead wrong. We proved them wrong. Think about it. If somebody told you seven years ago we'd have 4.9 percent unemployment, 20 million newly insured, gas at a buck-eighty, deficits cut by three-quarters, marriage equality a reality, bin Laden out of the picture, Wall Street reform in place -- you wouldn't have believed it. (Applause.) You would have said we were hollering down a well. (Applause.)* [obamawhitehouse.archives.gov, 2016].

Wherein, on the Russian language materials in political discourse we can assume almost the same intensification realized by PhI:

*«Мне не стыдно перед гражданами, которые голосовали за меня дважды, избирая на пост президента Российской Федерации. Все эти восемь лет я пахал, как раб на галерах, с утра до ночи, и делал это с полной отдачей сил», - said V.V. Putin on Big press-conference in Kremlin in February, 2008 [interfax.ru, 2012].*

Besides in the Uzbek language we find:

*“Zero, tadbirkor bu haqiqiy fidoiy inson. U o‘z ishi uchun kechayu kunduz ishlaydi va shu yo‘l bilan nafaqat oilasini, balki el-yurtini ham boqadi” [xs.uz, 2020].*



The classification to the superlative and comparison degrees was worked out by S. Greenbaum and N. Cliff on the material of intensifying words.

S. Greenbaum offered to distinguish two levels of intensification of meaning: high (badly, greatly, much) and the highest (perfect, completely, full, extremely).

N. Cliff gave the following levels of intensification: ample (quite, enough) and surplus (too, extremely).

Given classifications we can apply to the PhI as well: *like anything* – *сильно* – *qattiq*; *like hell* – *очень сильно* – *juda qattiq*.

A.V. Kunin defined PhI with conjunctions as/like but he left aside PhU which have intensifying meaning without given parts. They are also used to show a higher level of some capacity or action: *pig out* – *наедаться до отвала* – *burnidan chiqquncha yemoq*; *a labour of Hercules* – *титанический труд* – *nihoyatda mashaqqatli mehnat*; *all ears* – *во все уши* – *diqqat bilan quloq solmoq*. So, it makes sense to include them in PhI too.

As PhI are the part of PhU, so we can carry the classification of PhU, according to their origin, over to the PhI. They may be divided into phraseological borrowings and native English. The latter, according to our research, plays a major role. The English literature is rich for PhI which is trickily used by English-speaking politicians too.

PhI, bound with traditions, history, the way of life of Englishmen, demand deeper and detailed study as well as systematization. PhI of the bearers of one language very often don't coincide by their structure and content with their counterparts in another language. In some cases, they may even be absent in the discourse of the bearers of another language that proves the diversity of conceptual fields of different nations. Whereas concepts mirror the experience of nations they vary from one language to another.

In the English language *to run like a hare* means “to run very fast” as well as “to run away like a coward”. At the same time, in Russian comparison with a



hare is used to intensify the same quality of cowardice. Uzbek language also has the same negative meaning of hare: "*kuyon yurak*". However, this zoonym has a positive shade of meaning in Japan. Japanese people say "to fight like a hare" which means "very bravely".

In Russian language, speed is often expressed by the comparison with deer/doe (*лани*). Deer appear in the intensification of capacity of grace in Russian discourse too. At the same time in English we find negative meaning of comparison with deer:

*"Now, something as important as a press conference with the Chinese and American leaders, to have the President standing there looking like a deer in the headlights for a moment there, isn't that a pretty big faux pas by staff to leave the President hanging out there like that?"* [obamawhitehouse.archives.gov, 2011].

Let's consider the following PhI "*as firm as a rock*" which Englishmen employ to denote a steadfast resolute man. Meanwhile, the same comparison more speaks about cruel insensible person in Russian and Uzbek: "*сердце как камень*" – "*bag'ritosh (toshbag'ir) odam*".

*"Xi warned that corruption remained the greatest threat to the party's survival despite a five-year war on graft that he claimed had been "built into a crushing tide". "We must remain as firm as a rock ... and secure sweeping victory," he said, warning that "pleasure-seeking, inaction and sloth" were no longer acceptable. "We must ... rid ourselves of any virus that erodes the party's health."* [The Guardian, 2017].

The coincidence of Russian, Uzbek and English conceptual fields we can find in the observation of PhI '*as light as feather*' – '*легкий как перышко*' – '*parday yengil*'.

*As bright as a day* is used while we speak about lightroom, fair weather. In the Russian language, we say "as bright as day" while we have understood or realized something. In its' turn, PhU "*ясно как день*" from Russian is translated to its English counterpart "as clear as crystal".



Intensification is revealed by the detailed study of the concept. The concept includes extralinguistic objects. Research into PhI and unfolding representing them concepts employing transition from denoted object to the facilities of its denotation gives full understanding of cultural aspect. The onomasiological approach was applied in the earlier works where detailed descriptions received particular classes of intensifying words.

The problem of unveiling a higher degree of manifestation of any characteristic joint with national culture occupies great interest in the research of PhI [L.A. Lebedeva, 1999]. Politicians can brightly characterize objects, actions, features of objects with the help of intensifiers, which makes their speech more expressive.

Nowadays, science removes boundaries. It is less effective to study some fields of science apart from the others. Implied by native speaker's sense of utterance can be fully realized with the help of analysis of PhI under culture, history, and cognitive processes of man.

### References:

1. Whorf B.L. Otnosheniye norm povedeniya i myshleniya k yazyku. Moskva, 1960.
2. Kunin A.V. Frazeologiya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka. Moskva, 1972.
3. Kunin A.V. Anglo-russkiy frazeologicheskiy slovar'. Moskva, 2000.
4. Ubin I.I. Slovar' usilitel'nykh slovosochetaniy russkogo i angliyskogo yazykov. Moskva, 1987.
5. Lebedeva L.A. Ustoychivyye sravneniya russkogo yazyka vo frazeologii i frazeografii. Dis. dok. fil. nauk, Krasnodar, 1999.
6. Ter-Minasova S.G. YAzyk i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya. Moskva, 2000.
7. Cliff N. Adverbs as multipliers. Psychological Review, Los Angeles, 1959, Jan; 66 (1).



9. Greenbaum S. Verb-Intensifier Collocations in English: An Experimental Approach. Paris, 1970.
10. Interfax.ru (2012) <https://www.interfax.ru/russia/244535>.
11. Obamawhitehouse.archives.gov (2016) <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/03/14/remarks-president-dnc-hope-fund-dallas-reception>.
12. Xs.uz (2020) <https://xs.uz/uz/post/spiker-orinbosari-boshchiligidagi-deputatlar-namanganda-prezident-farmon-va-qarorlarining-izhrosini-organmoqda>
13. Obamawhitehouse.archives.gov (2011) <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/01/20/press-briefing-press-secretary-robert-gibbs-1202011>.
14. The Guardian (2017) <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/oct/18/xi-jinping-speech-new-era-chinese-power-party-congress>.

