PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF VOCABULARY USE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK POLITICAL SPEECHES

Qosimova Nafisa Farhodovna
Doctor in Philology, Associate Professor,
Bukhara State University
Po'latova Moxidil Bahodirovna
1st-year master's student
Bukhara State University

Annotation. *This study examines the pragmatic aspects of vocabulary use in English and Uzbek political speeches. The research focuses on how lexical choices function as pragmatic tools to influence audiences, construct political ideology, and convey power and authority. Particular attention is paid to evaluative and emotive vocabulary, inclusive and exclusive lexical units, euphemisms, and modality-related words that shape the speaker's intention and audience perception. Through a comparative analysis of selected political speeches in English and Uzbek, the study reveals both shared and language-specific pragmatic strategies. The findings demonstrate that while both languages employ vocabulary to achieve persuasion and solidarity, cultural and socio-political contexts significantly affect lexical selection and pragmatic meaning. The research contributes to the field of political discourse analysis and highlights the importance of vocabulary as a key component of pragmatic communication.*

Key words: *vocabulary, persuasion, ideology, modality, authority, solidarity, opposition, euphemism.*

Introduction. Political speech is a distinctive form of communication that goes beyond merely conveying information. It serves as a tool for

persuasion, ideology construction, and shaping audience perception. One of the most significant elements of political discourse is vocabulary choice, which allows speakers to influence, persuade, and establish authority or solidarity. Understanding the pragmatic aspects of vocabulary in political speech is crucial for analyzing how politicians communicate effectively within their cultural and linguistic contexts.

According to Norman Fairclough (1995, Critical Discourse Analysis), vocabulary in political discourse is never neutral; it functions as a mechanism to reproduce power relations, convey ideology, and persuade audiences. Lexical choices enable politicians to frame social and political realities, appeal emotionally, and reinforce their authority.

Similarly, according to M. Qodirov (Siyosiy nutq va uning lingvistik xususiyatlari), in Uzbek political speech, word choice is strongly influenced by social and cultural factors. Specific lexical strategies are used to convey ideological messages, express solidarity, and achieve persuasive effects within the communicative context.

The purpose of this research is to compare English and Uzbek political speeches, focusing specifically on pragmatic aspects and vocabulary use. By examining how lexical choices function in both languages, the study aims to uncover shared and language-specific strategies in political discourse and to provide insights into how culture and language intersect in shaping political communication.

Main part. Political vocabulary is a central tool in shaping ideology, influencing audiences, and expressing authority. According to Fairclough (1995, Critical Discourse Analysis), vocabulary in English political discourse is never neutral; it is carefully selected to convey power, persuade the public, and frame social and political issues. Words such as freedom, security, democracy, and threat serve pragmatic functions including emotional appeal, solidarity, and ideological positioning. Similarly, in Uzbek political speech,

Qodirov (Siyosiy nutq va uning lingvistik xususiyatlari) emphasizes that word choice reflects social and cultural norms, with lexical items like taraqqiyot (development), barqarorlik (stability), and xalq manfaatlari (people's interests) used to persuade, express unity, and reinforce ideological messages.

Both English and Uzbek political speeches make strategic use of inclusive and exclusive vocabulary to construct group identity and define political boundaries. English speeches employ words such as we, our nation, and citizens to foster solidarity, while they or opponents delineate the "other." Similarly, Uzbek uses biz (we), xalqimiz (our people), and jamiyatimiz (our society) inclusively, with ular (they) or muqobil kuchlar (opposition forces) to mark outsiders. Modality also plays a key role in both languages: English speakers use must, should, and cannot allow to assert authority, whereas Uzbek speakers rely on lozim (necessary), zarur (essential), and majburiy (obligatory) to achieve the same effect.

Moreover, both languages employ euphemisms to soften potentially negative content. English examples include economic adjustment instead of crisis or collateral damage instead of civilian casualties, while Uzbek speeches use qiyinchiliklar (difficulties) instead of inqiroz (crisis) and islohotlar jarayoni (reform process) for more sensitive topics. These strategies protect the speaker's face, manage audience reaction, and maintain public support. Overall, while both English and Uzbek political speeches use similar pragmatic strategies, cultural and linguistic differences shape the precise lexical choices. Vocabulary in political discourse functions as a key pragmatic mechanism for persuasion, ideological positioning, and audience alignment.

Conclusion. This study shows that vocabulary in political speeches is a crucial pragmatic tool in both English and Uzbek, enabling speakers to persuade audiences, convey ideology, and assert authority. According to Fairclough (1995, Critical Discourse Analysis), English political speeches use lexical choices to frame social and political realities, appeal emotionally, and

reinforce power relations, while Qodirov (Siyosiy nutq va uning lingvistik xususiyatlari) emphasizes that Uzbek political speeches reflect social and cultural norms, highlighting national unity, collective identity, and ideological alignment. Both languages employ inclusive and exclusive vocabulary, modality, and euphemisms to achieve similar pragmatic goals, such as persuasion, solidarity, and face management. At the same time, differences emerge: English speeches often focus on individual rights and argumentative framing, whereas Uzbek speeches stress social cohesion and national interests. Despite these differences, the underlying pragmatic strategies are comparable, showing that political speakers across cultures rely on vocabulary choice as a powerful tool to influence perception and construct ideology, revealing both convergence and divergence in political communication.

REFERENCES:

1. Ashurova, D. (n.d.). Articles on discourse and pragmatics in Uzbek political speech.
2. Bradbury, R. (1951). The pedestrian.
3. Chilton, P. (2004). Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice. Routledge.
4. Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.
5. Huxley, A. (1932). The Claxton diary.
6. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
7. Mahmudov, N. (n.d.). Nutq madaniyati va siyosiy muloqot. Fan.
8. Orwell, G. (1945). Animal farm. Secker & Warburg.
9. Qodirov, M. (n.d.). Siyosiy nutq va uning lingvistik xususiyatlari. Fan.
10. Safarov, S. (n.d.). Pragmatika. Fan.
11. van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Discourse and power. Palgrave Macmillan.
12. Vonnegut, K. (1961). Harrison Bergeron.

13. Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse of politics in action. Palgrave Macmillan.

14. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Methods of critical discourse analysis (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

15. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.