

© DMITRY V. SHAPOCHKIN

Tyumen State University  
dmit\_shapochkin@mail.ru

UDK 811.112.2'242

### **DISCOURSE OF POWER: LINGUISTIC-CULTURAL ASPECT\***

*SUMMARY.* This article explores a discourse through the prism of cultural linguistics where the discourse of power appears for a particularly systemized and harmonized usage of language, behind which a special ideologically and socially conditioned mentality can be traced, i.e. some specific goal-oriented means such as cognition patterns and patterns of communicative practice. These patterns are related to implementation of a social power, i.e. a discourse is a manifestation of power, and the power is expressed via discourse through the system of interrelated verbal/textual means, which are forms and tools of influence. The paper presents the results of a definition analysis of the concept of power, which was made in order to define its semantic structure. After generalization of linguo-cultural interpretations, the following basic meanings were distinguished: 1) power in a broad sense; 2) political power; 3) particular representatives of political power (authorities and people clothed with power). Cognitive analysis of the concept "power" makes it obvious that it is universal, with a high level of importance and functional frequency within political discourse. Visions of power form a worldview of a politician, because it is the concept of power that constitutes an axiological core, and this concept to some extent organizes and determines all other features of the a person's worldview.

*KEY WORDS.* Cultural linguistics, lingua-cultural aspect, discourse of power, concept.

Analyzing language structures, many scientists view it through the prism of social and cultural dependence within the frame of linguistic culturology, which makes it possible to look at language and culture cooperation in a new way. The link between language and culture is a person, who is regarded as a language, speech and communicative personality, and whose maturation takes place during the process of his/her socialization[1; 32], [2; 30], [3; 23], [4; 28], [5; 43], [6; 59], [7; 13-17].

Within the frames of this article, linguistic culturology is understood as a philological science, which researches different methods of representation of knowledge of the world of this or that language of native speakers via studying language units of different levels, speech activity, speech behavior, and discourse, which allows us

---

\* This research was carried out under financial support of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation within the frame of the Federal Program "The scientific and scientific-pedagogical staff of the innovative Russia for 2009-2013 (State contract №14.740.11.1377)

to describe these objects and reveal the meaning of the analyzed units, their shades, connotations and associations reflecting the consciousness of native speakers.

Being the main means of human communication (the communicative function), the language is a means of information transference from the speaker to the listener (the addressee). Thus, language properties are naturally adjusted to the needs and conditions of a person's communicative activity, making up the most important aspect of his/her social behavior, as social and work activities are impossible without information exchange [8; 28]. Thus, the language is a naturally evolved and regularly developing semiotic system possessing the property of social allocation. The given system exists, though not for a separate individual, but for a certain environment [9; 604].

It seems reasonable to consider how this semiotic system demonstrates itself representing linguistic and cultural aspects at the level of the discourse of power.

According to V.E. Chernyavckaya, under the discourse of power we understand the use of language systematized and organized in a definite way, behind which one can trace an ideologically special and socially determined mentality which predetermines a person's way of thinking and his/her way of communication. In other words, discourse is the expression of power: the power is expressed through the system of interconnected speech/text means, forms and methods of influence in discourse [10; 68].

Discourse of power, in our opinion, includes the conceptual opposition "power — justice" [11; 132-136], on the basis of which a close connection of the given concepts is seen and their linguistic-cultural dependence is detected.

During the cognitive analysis of the concept "power", its versatility, high degree of importance and frequency of functioning in political discourse become evident. The perception of power shapes up a politician's picture of the world, as it is the concept of power which functions as its peculiar axiological center which organizes and defines its other characteristics. That is why it is not surprising that the attempt to comprehend the phenomenon of power is made by philosophers, sociologists, politologists, historians and culturologists. The works by linguists, who, as a rule, put reconstruction of the power perception as their task, are not an exception.

On the whole, from the point of view of linguistic culturology, the problem of correlation of language and power has two aspects: 1) how power is comprehended and conceptualized by language; 2) how power is manifested through language.

When considering the notional structure of the lexeme "power" on the basis of the data of dictionaries by S.I. Ozhegov and V.F. Khalipov, it becomes evident that presentations of the notion "power" do not have essential differences in common and scientific means.

The dictionary by S.I. Ozhegov: 1) the right and the opportunity to manage, to bend to one's own will; 2) political domination, state administration and its bodies; 3) (pl.) persons set in governmental and administrative authority [12; 154].

The dictionary by V.F. Khalipov: 1) capability, a right and an opportunity to manage smth/smb, influence significantly upon the destiny, behavior and activity of people by different means of the law, right, authority, will, court, force; 2) political

---

dominancy over people, their communities, organizations, countries and their groups; 3) a system of state authorities; 4) persons, bodies set in corresponding governmental and administrative authority, or having different types of influence, authority according to the custom, or assigned to them [13; 183]. If we generalize the above-mentioned notions, three main meanings come to the fore: 1) power in a broad sense; 2) political power; 3) certain representatives of political power (bodies and persons clothed in authority).

If the Russian lexeme “power” is etymologically connected with possession, the English word “power” originates from the Latin “potēre” which means “to be capable”. The definition analysis demonstrates that it is the component (ability) that stands out for the meaningful variant of the general notions of the lexeme “power” [14; 683]:

a possibility, capability; 2) force, power (an ability to influence greatly); 3) energy, power (an ability to execute a physical work); 4) power, influence, authority (an ability to control other people); 5) the political power (an ability of political bodies to control other subjects of politics); 6) a right, authority (an ability to act, which is given by the law or an official position); 7) a nation, country (especially about the one which has influence and authority, i.e. the one which is able to influence).

If we consider the meaning of the notion “power” the way it is explained in scientific works on politology and sociology, it will appear as a multi-faced and multi-aspect phenomenon [15; 96], manifested in different spheres of human life. It causes the variety of power types: the power of organizations, the power of the church, the power of parents, the power of a master, the administrative power (the power of a master over his worker), economic, political, spiritual, military power; the branches of state power are legislative, executive and judicial powers; the fourth power is mass media.

On the whole, all conceptual approaches to the interpretation of power can be divided into two groups: 1) an attributive-substantial group, treating the power as an attribute, a substantial property of the subject or just a self-efficient “object”, “thing”; 2) a relation group, describing the power as a social relation or cooperation [16; 115].

Thus, in the majority of definitions of power its relational character is detected; it is impossible to speak about power in terms of one person or institution: power is always a relation, cooperation, it is the power of somebody over someone, power is cooperation between those who have it and those, who do not have it [15; 96].

Accordingly, the general valences of the lexeme “power” will be the position of the subject and object of power; the power of parents, monopolies, magnates, people; the power of traditions, prejudices, ideas, money, love, etc., power over people, the power of the man over himself, over nature, etc. The object of power relations (the person power is directed at, the object of submission) can regard power, put up with power, support it, be devoted, loyal, be a devotee, a supporter of power or, vice versa, can be against it, fight against power, be an opponent, enemy, be in opposition to power.

It should be noted that the term “power” stands out as the most semantically significant and capacious in comparison with other terms, such as *strength*, *control*,

*superiority, influence, authority, dominance*, which in their turn, are more specific, expressing logically narrower, subordinated notions denoting the constituents of power or its attributes.

In mass consciousness power is an object of expropriation (to have power, to have no power). It can also be an object of obtainment, of passing, of loss as well as of usurpation [17; 44-48]. It can change people in power; it can be an object of inheritance, granting, exchange, purchase, sale, and usurpation; in English: possess, take, seize, keep, transfer, cede power, interchanges of power.

The subject of power is thought as its real possessor who can hold it with his/her teeth, but can refuse from it, lose it, as well as give, pass, entrust and submit it, or, as a contender, who fights for power, claims it, can seize power, usurp or win it (the English for it is: hold, share, leave, claim, confer power).

In the metaphors of power, two opposite images co-exist [15; 100]: on the one hand, it is described as something created by man (besides the metaphor of construction, a quite widespread metaphor is the metaphor of mechanism, with the help of which man possibly tries to imagine the process of power functioning: levers, a steering wheel, a control board, a clock mechanism, a spring of power, the machine of power). On the other hand, it emerges as some really existing live creature, a phenomenon (roots, branches, depths of power; prosperity, mutations, devolution of power, to preserve the state as a living organism). Moreover, in order to describe an unsatisfactory state of affairs, a metaphor of a disease is quite widely employed (the disease of power/ the temperature of power was 39,8°; the pulse of power, atrophy/dystrophy of power, palsy of power, feebleness of power, agony of power, collapse of power).

Thus, it should be emphasized that as a linguistic-cultural phenomenon, generally in sociology and polytology, the concept "power" is understood not only as some special kind of influence, but both as a capability to reach definite purposes, as a possibility to use these or those means and as special relations between the director and the directed. Apart from that, language is one of the tools of social power, for power is carried out through language and by language means as well.

#### REFERENCES

1. Boas, F. Some Problems of methodology of Social Sciences / Trans. Y.S. Terentjeva // *Antologija issledovanij kul'tury* [Anthology of Cultural Researches]. St-Petersburg, 1997. V. 1. Pp. 499-508. (in Russian).
2. Havranek, B. To the Problem of Fusion of Languages. *Novoe v lingvistike* [News in Linguistics]. Issue 6. Moscow, 1972. Pp. 94-111. (in Russian).
3. Humboldt, V. von. *Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju* [Selected works in Linguistics]. Moscow, 1984. (in Russian).
4. Zhirmunskij, V.M. To the Problem of Social Differentiation of Language. *Jazyk i obshhestvo* [Language and Society]. Moscow, 1968. Pp. 22-39. (in Russian).
5. Larin, B.A. Colloquial Language of the Moscovia // *Nachal'nyj jetap formirovanija russkogo nacional'nogo jazyka* [Infancy of Russian National Language]. Leningrad, 1961. Pp. 22-34. (in Russian).
6. Sapir, E. *Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju i kul'turologii* [Selected Works in Linguistics and Cultural Studies]. Moscow, 1993. 192 p. (in Russian).

7. Schweitser, A.D. Contemporary Social Linguistics // *Teorija, problemy, metody* [Theory, Issues, and Methods]. Moscow: Nauka, 1977. Pp. 58–63. (in Russian).

8. Shapochkin, D.V. *Kognitivnye aspekty političeskogo diskursa (na material britanskih, amerikanskih i nemeckih publicnyh političeskijh rečej)* (diss. kand.) [Cognitive Aspects of a Political Discourse (as exemplified in British, American, and German public political speeches (Cand. Diss.)). Tyumen, 2005. 244 p. (in Russian).

9. *Jazykoznanie. Bol'shoj jenciklopedičeskij slovar'* [Linguistics. Large Encyclopaedic Dictionary]. Moscow, 2000. 688 p. (in Russian).

10. Chernjavskaja, V.E. *Diskurs vlasti i vlast' diskursa. Problemy rečevogo vozdejstvija* [Discourse of Power and Power of Discourse. Problems of Verbal Effect]. Moscow: Flinta, 2006. 136 p. (in Russian).

11. Shapochkin, D.V. Conceptual Opposition: Power vs Justice in the International hymn lyrics. *Političeskaja lingvistika — Political Linguistics*. 2013. № 2. Pp. 132–136. (in Russian).

12. Ozhegov, S.I. *Slovar' russkogo jazyka* [Dictionary of the Russian Language]. Moscow, 1990. 921 p. (in Russian).

13. Halipov, V.F. *Politologičeskij slovar'* [Dictionary of Political Studies]. Moscow, 1995. 192 p. (in Russian).

14. Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. — Third College Edition. New York: Prentice Hall, 1994. 1574 p.

15. Shejgal, E.I. *Semiotika političeskogo diskursa* (diss. dokt.) [Semiotics of Political Discourse (Doct. Diss.)]. Volgograd, 2000. 440 p. (in Russian).

16. Degtjarev, A.A. Political Power as a Regulating Mechanism of Social Communication. *Polis — Polis*. 1996. № 3. Pp. 108–120. (in Russian).

17. Zhdanova, L.A., Revzina, O.G. Power: Linguistic Meaning and a Concept [Vlast': jazykovoe znachenie i koncept]. *Semantika jazykovykh edinic: M-ly 3-j mezhvuz. nauch.konf.* (Semantics of Language Units: Proc. of the III Scientific Conf.). Moscow, 1992. Pp. 44–48. (in Russian).