

REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN

On the rights of the manuscript

ABSTRACT

of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**MELIORATIVE AND PEJORATIVE EVALUATION IN
MODERN POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

Speciality: 5704.01 – Language theory

Field of science: Philology

Applicant: **Sabina Gulmirza Nuraliyeva**

Baku – 2025

The work was performed at the Department of General Linguistics of Azerbaijan University of Languages.

Scientific supervisor: Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor
Habib Mamad Zarbaliyev

Official opponents: Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor
Mayil Binnet Asgarov

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology,
Associate Professor
Javanshir Khankishi Muradov

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology,
Associate Professor
Sabina Ali Suleymanova

Dissertation council ED 1.06 of Supreme Attestation Commission under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan operating at the Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi of the Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences

Chairman of the Dissertation council:  Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor
Nadir Balaoghlan Mammadli

Scientific secretary of the Dissertation council:  Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate professor
Sevinj Yusif Mammadova

Chairman of the scientific seminar:  Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor
Masud Ahmad Mahmudov

INTRODUCTION

The topicality of the research and the degree of its elaboration. At the present stage of civilization development, the vital importance of the world political situation has made politics and political discourse the subject of intensive interdisciplinary research. The growing academic interest in political discourse can be seen as a social demand aimed at studying not only the features of political thought and action, but also the linguistic and rhetorical means that politicians use to influence and control public opinion. The starting point of this work is the fact that modern political thinkers draw attention not to consensus and rationality, but to the role of emotions in politics.

Due to the special importance of the political situation in the modern world, political discourse and related problems have become the subject of interdisciplinary research. All information about ongoing processes and changes in the life of the country is conveyed by the speech of a politician. In this regard, the study of political speeches is becoming more relevant. A correctly constructed and tactfully conveyed speech of a politician plays a particularly important role, since it determines the relations between people and countries, including the solution of socio-political problems.

In political discourse, positive and negative strategies of face can be used. Politeness as an element of positive strategy is used to justify the general goal of legitimizing the political speaker and discrediting his opponents. In this case, political discourse acquires a meliorative evaluation. Political communication in many respects can be characterized by impoliteness rather than politeness. Often, antagonism and aggressiveness are the result of impolite communicative action, which gives political discourse a pejorative evaluation.

The linguistic means of expressing evaluativity in political discourse are diverse and include a wide range of lexical and grammatical devices. A politician's ability to select and employ the most appropriate linguistic means of conveying positive or negative evaluation serves as an indicator of their success or failure.

The concept of melioration was first introduced in the works of

Western linguists in the early 20th century. Various theoretical perspectives on politeness have been employed to analyze and explain discourse. Meliorative evaluation adds imagery and vividness to speech, making it more lively and impactful. Therefore, in order to achieve their goals by constructing a polite image, a politician must be aware of and adhere to the principles of melioration.

Pejorative language is also increasingly used in political discourse, giving political speech a disapproving tone. The essence of using such language in political communication lies in the fact that the politician expresses a negative evaluation not directly, but through a limited set of easily recognizable morphological and lexical means. Pejorativity represents a violation and disruption of the principles of melioration. Pejoration is defined as a semantic property of verbal expressions that evokes negative or derogatory connotations.

A considerable number of linguists, both past and present, have made significant contributions to the study of evaluativity in political discourse, including E.M. Wolf, G. Lakoff, V.N. Telia¹, among others. The study of the contextual nature of evaluation is, on the one hand, closely related to the levels of the word, phrase, and sentence, and on the other hand, to the levels of the text, macrotext, and discourse.

Meliorative evaluation has attracted the interest of many linguists, including M.M. Teleki, N.I. Formanovskaya, T.V. Larina, N.V. Khokhlova², as well as foreign scholars such as P. Brown, S.

¹ Вольф, Е.М. Функциональная семантика оценки /Е.М.Вольф. –Москва: Едиториал УРСС, –2002. –280 с.; Телия, В.Н. Метафора в языке и тексте/ В.Н.Телия. – Москва:Наука, –1988. –256 с.; Lakoff, R.T. Talking power: the politics of language in our lives / R.T. Lakoff. – New York: Basic Books, – 1990. – 324 p.

² Телеки, М.М. Вираження семантики заборони в писемній комунікації // – Міжнародний вісник. Культурологія. Філологія. Музикознавство, – 2014. Вип. II (3), – с. 198-205; Формановская, Н.И. Речевое взаимодействие: коммуникация и прагматика /Н.И.Формановская. – Москва: ИКАР, – 2007. – 480 с.; Ларина, Т.В. Категория вежливости и стиль коммуникации: Сопоставление английских и русских лингвокультурных традиций /Т.В.Ларина. –

Levinson, Y. Gu, G. Kasper, G. Lakoff, G.N. Leech, R. Watts³, and others.

Pejoration, as a phenomenon, is not isolated; it pertains to various fields within the humanities. Its general philosophical aspects were explored by W. von Humboldt, J. Derrida, and A.A. Potebnya⁴. The social, public, and moral-ethical dimensions of pejoration have been studied in the works of V.I. Zhelvis, J. Maybaur, and A.A. Furman.⁵ The psychological and emotional underpinnings of pejoration have been examined by A. Damasio, K.E. Izard, E.P. Ilyin, L. Fitch, E.D. Khomskaya, and C.G. Jung.⁶ Cognitive,

Москва : Рукописные памятники Древней Руси, –2009. –516 с.; Хохлова, Н.В. Способы и средства реализации коммуникативной категории угрозы в русском и английском языках:/дисс. ... канд. филол. наук/ –Самара, 2004. – 198 с.

³ Brown, P. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage / P.Brown, S.Levinson. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, –1987. – 358 p.; Gu, Y.G. Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese // – Journal of Pragmatics, – 1990. №3, – p. 237-257.; Kasper, G. Data collection in pragmatics research // – London: Continuum: Spencer-Oatey, H. Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk Across Cultures, –2000. – p.316-341.; Lakoff, R.T. Talking power: the politics of language in our lives / R.T.Lakoff. – New York: Basic Books, – 1990. –324p.; Leech, G.N. Principles of pragmatics / G.N.Leech. – London: Longman, –1983. – 250p.; Watts, R. Politeness /R.Watts. – UK: Cambridge University Press, –2003. – 318 p.

⁴ Гумбольдт, В. Язык и философия культуры /В. фон Гумбольдт. – Москва: Прогресс, – 1985. – 450 с.; Деррида, Ж. Письмо и различие/Ж.Деррида. – Москва: Академический Проект, – 2000. – 495 с.; Потебня, А.А. Полное собрание трудов: мысль и язык/А.А.Потебня. – М: Лабиринт, – 1999. – 300 с.

⁵ Жельвис, В.И. Грубость: проблемы классификации лексики // Материалы международной научно-практической конференции, посвященной юбилею д.ф.н., проф. А.М.Мелеровича, – Москва: Кострома, – 2008, – с. 71-76; Meibauer, J. Hassrede/ Hate Speech Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zu einer aktuellen Diskussion /J.Meibauer. –Gießener Elektronische Bibliothek, – 2013. – 289 S.; Фурман, А.А. Морально-етичні цінності в суспільному вимірі // – Тернопіль: Психологія і суспільство, – 2010. № 1, – с. 94-99.

⁶ Дамасио, А. Я. Мозг и возникновение сознания /А.Дамасио. – Москва : Карьера Пресс, – 2018. – 384 с.; Изард, К.Э. Психология эмоций /К.Э.Изард. – Санкт-Петербург: Питер, – 1999. – 464 с.; Ильин, Е.П. Психология творчества, креативности, одаренности / Е.П.Ильин. – Санкт-Петербург: Питер, – 2009. – 434 с.; Фич, Л. Азбука Эмоций – Эмоэнграмм /Л.Фич. -Москва: Издательские решения, – 2015. – 189 с.; Хомская, Е.Д. Нейропсихология: 4-е изда-

pragmatic, and sociocultural features of political discourse have been discussed in separate articles and dissertations by Azerbaijani linguists (A.Y. Mamedov, A.K. Rzaeva, P.M. Agazade, A.M. Allahverdiyeva, Z. Ahmedova, A.V. Aliyeva, K.A. Gabibova, V.E. Mamedova, D. Orudjeva, V.S. Salimova, F.A. Shiriev, E.A. Zeynalova, S.H. Rasulova).⁷

Object and subject of research. The object of the study is the speeches of political leaders that contain meliorative and pejorative evaluations. The subject of the study is the strategies, tactics, and linguistic means used to implement meliorative and pejorative evaluations in contemporary political discourse.

Goals and objectives of research. The aim of the study is to identify extralinguistic factors that influence the use of linguistic

ние /Е.Д.Хомская, – СПб.: Питер, – 2005. – 496 с.; Юнг, К.Г. Психологические типы /К.Г.Юнг. – СПб.: Прогресс-Универс, – 1995. – 718 с.

⁷ Məmmədov, A.Y. Diskursun təhlilinin kognitiv perspektivləri /A.Y.Məmmədov, M.Y.Məmmədov. – Bakı: Çaşıoğlu, – 2010. – 96 s.; Rzaeva, A.K. Прагматические и когнитивные аспекты англоязычного политического дискурса : /автореф. дис. доктора философии по филологии /-Баку, 2015. –24 с.; Ağzadə, P.M. Siyasi debatlarda linqvistik strategiyalar və taktikalar (2016-cı il ABŞ prezident seçkiləri debatları əsasında) // -Bakı: Humanitar elmlərin öyrənilməsinin aktual problemləri, - 2018, № 4, - s. 25-30.; Allahverdiyeva, A.M. Siyasi diskursda konseptuallaşma və onun metaforik representasiyası // - Bakı: Dilçilik araşdırmaları, - 2024, №2, -s. 84-93.; Əhmədova, Z. Dilçilikdə siyasi ünsiyyət // -Bakı: Filologiya məsələləri, - 2021, №14, - s.3-10.; Əliyeva, A.V. İtalyan və Azərbaycan dillərində ictimai-siyasi mətnlərin linqvokulturoloji tədqiqi: / filologiya üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru dis. avtoreferatı. / -Bakı, 2024. –28 s.; Həbibova, K.Ə. Siyasi diskursda nitqi manipulyasiyanın rolu: müasir strategiyaların təhlili // -Bakı: İpək yolu, - 2024, №3, - s.134-145.; Məmmədova, V.E. Müasir Azərbaycan və rus siyasi diskurs dilinin qarşılıqlı təhlili (XX əsrin sonu – XXI əsrin əvvəli) : / filologiya üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru dis. avtoreferatı. / -Bakı, 2017. – 21 s.; Orucova, D. Siyasi diskursda dini metafor və metanomiya / -Bakı: Filologiya məsələləri, -2022, №13, - s.263-270.; Səlimova, F.S. Diskursun formalaşmasında modallığın rolu (ingilis və Azərbaycan dillərinin materialları əsasında) : / filologiya üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru dis. avtoreferatı. / -Bakı, 2016. – 28 s.; Şiriyev, F.A. Siyasi diskurs və metonimiyalar // - Bakı: Bakı universitetinin xəbərləri, - 2009, №3, - s.32-36.; Zeynalov, E.A. Siyasi diskursda dəyərlər anlayışı / - Bakı: Filologiya məsələləri, - 2023, № 1,– s. 91-98. Rəsulova, C. X. Siyasi diskursda metaforlar // - Bakı: Qızlar Universitetinin elmi əsərlər. Cild 11, - 2020, №1, s. 33-38.

means of expressing meliorative and pejorative evaluations in contemporary political discourse, and to examine the peculiarities of the functioning of vocabulary with meliorative and pejorative evaluations as the main tool of influence in political speeches. The stated aim has led to the formulation of the following tasks:

- to investigate the structure and linguistic means of expressing evaluation in contemporary political discourse;
- to identify extralinguistic factors influencing the widespread use of linguistic means for expressing positive and negative evaluations in political speeches;
- to define the concepts of “meliorative evaluation” and “pejorative evaluation”;
- to examine the use of meliorative and pejorative evaluations in the speeches of political leaders;
- to analyze the semantic techniques used to convey meliorative and pejorative evaluations, ensuring successful communication between communicators in contemporary political discourse;
- to analyze the strategies and tactics employed by political leaders to enhance or reduce the effectiveness of their speeches;
- to determine the main factors that predetermine the choice of strategies and tactics in the speech behavior of the speaker;
- to investigate the communicative-interactive procedures arising from the implementation of strategies and tactics of melioration and pejoration in the speeches of political leaders.

Research methods. The goals and objectives of the dissertation determined the use of a set of general scientific and specialized research methods. The following general scientific methods were employed in the study: analysis and synthesis, the descriptive method, and the inductive method. A range of specialized research methods was also applied, namely, the analysis of lexicographic sources and dictionary definitions, pragmalinguistic analysis, discourse-interactional analysis, contextual analysis, and functional-stylistic analysis. Additionally, the study made use of linguistic observation techniques, as well as methods of classification and systematization.

The main provisions submitted for defense:

1. Political discourse is a set of political texts circulating within society, producing and reinforcing meanings related to politically significant symbols and concepts, which become criteria for judging the correctness or incorrectness of actions within a given social framework. Political discourse shapes public opinion and includes the text as a verbalized outcome of speech, the sociocultural and situational context, as well as specific linguistic means that correspond to the goals and objectives of the discourse.

2. Evaluation can be defined as the speaker's objective or subjective attitude toward a particular object, which may be explicitly or implicitly expressed through linguistic means.

3. Evaluation is realized in parts of words, exclamations, modal particles, content lexemes, phrases, word combinations, axiological categories, and speech acts.

4. Melioration is one of the significant communicative categories and plays a key role in the speech interaction between the addresser and the addressee.

6. Pejorativity conveys a negative emotional evaluation by creating images that, depending on moral and ethical norms, are perceived by a particular linguistic community as more or less negative.

5. Meliorative and pejorative evaluation is an important social and linguocultural factor that regulates the nature of speech behavior and is realized through various semantic techniques.

6. Strategies aimed at increasing or decreasing speech effectiveness involve the use of tactics that implicitly or explicitly express a positive or negative attitude toward the subject of communication.

Scientific novelty of the research lies in the comprehensive approach to examining the structural features of evaluation in contemporary political discourse. Moreover, it is one of the first attempts to analyze linguistic means with meliorative and pejorative evaluative qualities within such a complex, philosophical, psychological, and linguistic phenomenon as political discourse, thus contributing to the development of discourse analysis. For the first time, an attempt has been made to analyze the speech realization of

strategies and tactics of meliorative and pejorative evaluation in contemporary political discourse based on the speeches of political leaders. Additionally, for the first time, semantic techniques for conveying meliorative and pejorative vocabulary have been developed.

Theoretical and practical significance of the research. The theoretical significance of the dissertation lies in the fact that its theoretical propositions, the obtained results, and the principles used for analyzing linguistic means, semantic techniques, strategies, and tactics of meliorative and pejorative evaluation in contemporary political discourse can be applied in studies of discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, as well as pragmalinguistics, linguostylistics, and the theory of the linguistic personality. Some aspects of the work may also be used in the field of political science.

The practical value of the work lies in the possibility of using its materials for the preparation of lecture courses, textbooks, and methodological guides for students of philological faculties on general linguistics, communicative and cognitive linguistics, rhetoric, stylistics, text linguistics, discourse analysis, as well as specialized courses on pragmalinguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics.

Approbation and application. The main provisions of the research work are reflected in 6 articles published in scientific journals published in Azerbaijan and abroad (included in the list of publications recommended by the Supreme Attestation Commission under the President of Azerbaijan). Generalizations and results of analyses carried out within the framework of the dissertation work were presented at 8 international and republican scientific conferences.

The name of the organization in which the dissertation work was performed. The dissertation work was performed at the Department of General Linguistics of Azerbaijan University of Languages.

The structure and volume of the dissertation, in characters, with the volume of each structural section specified individually. The dissertation consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion, and a list of references. The introduction consists of 7 pages, 11419 characters; Chapter I is 53 pages, 91,993 characters;

Chapter II is 28 pages, 58632 characters; Chapter III is 41 pages, 71,145 characters; the conclusion consists of 2 pages, 2763 characters. As for the total volume of the dissertation, the study consists of 234 952 characters.

THE MAIN CONTENT OF THE WORK

In the Introduction, the relevance and the degree of elaboration of the topic are substantiated, the object and subject of the research are indicated, the aim, objectives, and research methods are defined, the scientific novelty, theoretical and practical significance are revealed, the main points submitted for defense are presented, and information is provided on the approbation, application, and structure of the study.

Chapter I of the dissertation, **“Structure and Linguistic Means of Expressing Evaluation”**, consists of two sections. This chapter explores various approaches to defining the structural features of evaluation and the linguistic means of their expression in political discourse.

The first section, **“Structural Features of Evaluation in Political Discourse”**, discusses various definitions of political discourse. Political discourse is a complex linguistic phenomenon that is directly or indirectly aimed at the distribution and exercise of political power, as well as the making of political decisions. According to T.A. van Dijk, *“recipients of political information, such as the public, citizens, and voters, should also be included in discourse analysis”*.⁸ According to A.N. Baranov, *“political discourse encompasses all speech acts of political discussions and the rules of public policy that possess specific conventions”*.⁹

A political speech consists of an introduction, a main part, and a conclusion. The introduction is oriented toward the audience. The

⁸ Van Dijk, T.A. What is Political Discourse Analysis? // – Amsterdam: Belgian Journal of Linguistics, – 1997, 11(1), – p. 13.

⁹ Баранов, А.Н., Паршин, П.Б. К построению словаря терминов когнитивной науки // – Москва: Когнитивные исследования за рубежом. Методы искусственного интеллекта, – 1990. – с. 140.

main part focuses on the informational aspect and is built upon the use of pro- and counter-arguments, in accordance with a temporal framework: the past is presented as the cause of the current situation, which can be transformed into a prosperous future. The conclusion once again addresses the audience and summarizes what has been said. A political speech that deals with the resolution of a specific problem modifies this model. Typically, the problem is clearly identified in the introduction and/or at the beginning of the main part, followed by the causes that led to it and the measures proposed for its resolution. The conclusion usually contains a call to eliminate the problem using the proposed means.¹⁰

Political discourse is not just communication, it unites specific goals and particular participants. The setting of goals and the selection of participants depend on the specifics of a given discourse. Therefore, in this case, the goal of political discourse is the acquisition and maintenance of power, and its participants are political figures and the people. According to F.Ya. Veisiali, *“the instrumental function of political discourse is the struggle for political power. This also passes through the oppositions of integration/differentiation, agonism/harmonization, action/information, interpretation/orientation, and control/motivation”*.¹¹ K. Serajim defines political discourse as a linguistic practice *“carried out in the political space (a set of extralinguistic factors influencing the formation of political discourse)”*.¹² According to A.Ya. Mamedov, *“the specificity of political discourse lies in the fact that it is formed in the process of interaction between the sender of the political text and the corresponding audience, and its enriching ethnocultural content*

¹⁰ Семенюк, О.А. Основи теорії мовної комунікації : навч. посіб. для студ. вищ. навч. закл./О.А.Семенюк. – К.: Ін Юре, – 2009. – 276 с.

¹¹ Veysalli, F.Y. Diskurs təhlilinə giriş / F.Y.Veysalli. -Bakı: Təhsil: NPM, -2010. - s.42.

¹² Серажим, К.С. Дискурс як соціолінгвальне явище: методологія, архітектура, варіативність [на матеріалах сучасної газетної публіцистики]: /К.С.Серажим, за ред. В.Різуна. – К.: Нац. ун-т ім. Т.Шевченка, – 2002. – с.177.

*plays the role of a stimulus for the cognitive behavior of another person in the forms of linguistic knowledge”.*¹³

According to E. Kozhemyakin and E. Pereverzev, political discourse can be regarded as a specially organized and thematically focused sequence of statements that occur within specific historical and social frameworks and have the potential to change power relations in society.¹⁴

Political discourse is a thematic network of political texts united by a common theme, which determines the interconnection of discourse with pragmatic, sociological, psychological, cultural, linguistic, and other domains. It is a symbolic reality that emerges during communication. Communication, in turn, is a process. Political texts are actualized in the process of political communication; however, political discourse itself is not a process but a complex symbolic activity in which the political sphere as a whole functions. In other words, political discourse represents a collection of political texts circulating in society, producing and consolidating meanings around politically significant symbols and concepts, which become criteria for the rightness or wrongness of actions within a particular society. This textual reality is created by political subjects, and on the other hand, it creates them.

Considering the variety of approaches to defining political discourse, this concept is illuminated by a set of defining characteristics. The following features of political discourse are highlighted: informativeness, communicativeness, integrity, symbolism, politicality, rationality, argumentativeness, cultural determinism, evolutionary nature, temporality, spatiality, structure, and abstractness.

Political discourse shapes and reproduces power relations in society. According to L. Phillips, *“power and politics are two sides of the same coin, as power creates social activity, while politics, by*

¹³ Мəммədov, А.Ү. Diskursun təhlilinin koqnitiv perspektivləri /А.Ү.Мəммədov, М.Ү.Мəммədov. – Bakı: Çaşıoğlu, – 2010. – s.15.

¹⁴ Переверзев, Е.В., Кожемякин, Е.А. Политический дискурс: многопараметральная модель // –Воронеж: Вестник ВГУ Серия: Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация, – 2008. №2, – с. 74-79.

changing and creating meaning, alters social activity, structuring it".¹⁵ It should be added that this structuring never happens once and for all, it is a continuous process of imbuing concepts belonging to political discourse with new meanings.

Evaluation can be defined as the objective or subjective attitude of the speaker towards a certain object, which can be explicitly or implicitly expressed through linguistic means. However, before immediately proceeding to the examination of its structural features in political discourse, a definition of the term "*category of evaluation*" is provided.

In the "Dictionary of Linguistic Terms", the concept of "*evaluation*" is described as "*the speaker's viewpoint, their relationship – agreement or disagreement, desire, encouragement, etc. – as one of the main components of stylistic meaning*".¹⁶ M.R. Zheltukhina defines evaluation as "*an act of human consciousness, consisting of comparing objects, comparing their properties, determining their role in the life of the subject and the consequences, which are preserved in consciousness and language in positive, negative, and neutral forms*".¹⁷

Evaluation, observed in all areas of human life, has a universal linguistic nature. It is considered a semantic and pragmatic category and can be one of the most powerful means of influencing the audience. This allows the study of evaluation as a complex of its linguistic and communicative features, as well as a semantic and pragmatic category.

Evaluation or the evaluative act has its structure, consisting of the subject, object, evaluative stereotype, axiological scale (good/bad), and the aspect or basis of evaluation. The main component is the subject of evaluation, who determines the significance of what is being evaluated. The pragmatic orientation of

¹⁵ Там же, с. 67.

¹⁶ Ахманова, О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов/О.С.Ахманова. – М. : Сов. Энциклопедия, – 1969. – с.310.

¹⁷ Желтухина, М.Р. Тропологическая суггестивность масс-медиального дискурса: о проблеме речевого воздействия тропов в языке СМИ / М.Р.Желтухина. – Москва : Волгоград: ВФ МУПК, – 2003. –с.223.

evaluation is also expressed in the following distinctive features of political discourse: “1) *aggressiveness*; 2) *agonistic ability*; 3) *polemical nature*; 4) *ideological character*”.¹⁸

The demand for evaluative vocabulary in political discourse remains consistently high, if only because politicians' statements are often marked by sharp judgments regarding their political opponents. Analyzing political discourse in terms of the functioning of evaluative semantics allows for the identification of both universal and culturally specific features within the semantic space of the individual.

Political discourse functions as an independent communicative phenomenon. Features such as intentionality, mass orientation, national and cultural specificity, ideological distinctiveness, informativeness, subjectivity, aggressiveness, competitiveness, agonistic capacity, theatricality, emotionality, modality, intertextuality, the addressee factor, and conventionality create the necessary conditions for manipulating public consciousness. Political discourse possesses all the tools needed to influence the views and attitudes of the audience in a way that serves the interests of the speaker.

The second paragraph, titled “**Linguistic Means of Expressing Evaluation in Political Discourse**”, explores the linguistic tools used to convey evaluation in political discourse.

The analysis of political discourse involves the study of mechanisms of speech influence, the unfolding of communicative vectors of interaction, and the planning of communicative engagement. Politicians, whether consciously or unconsciously, choose linguistic means that are the most powerful and effective in terms of influencing the addressee. This possibility of choice, embedded in the very nature of communicative interaction, is determined by the subject-oriented focus of discourse on both the speaker and the recipient.

¹⁸ Kenzhekanova, K.K. Linguistic Features of Political Discourse // – Rome-Italy: Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, – 2015. Vol. 6, № 6, – p. 198.

In political discourse, evaluation as the value-based aspect of semantics can be expressed either explicitly or implicitly through various means and may serve as a signal of evaluative information. The pragmatic effect of a message and its influence is ensured by the presence of evaluative content. According to the norms of discursive practices, which allow for both implication and explication of meaning, the evaluative concept may take on a purely evaluative, evaluative-descriptive, or purely descriptive form—outwardly devoid of evaluation. However, it always remains a stable and essential component of the cognitive model of the text, driven by the need to shape the audience’s evaluative stance.

In his address on the occasion of the beginning of the new academic year and the Day of Knowledge on September 15, 2020, the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Ilham Aliyev, highlighted the values that are important for every individual: “*Eyni zamanda, onu da xüsusi qeyd etməliyəm ki, bizim gənclərimiz, uşaqlarımız vətənpərvərlik ruhunda, milli ruhda, milli dəyərlər – ənənəvi Azərbaycan dəyərləri əsasında tərbiyə almalıdırlar. Burada, əlbəttə ki, ailələrin rolu müstəsna əhəmiyyət kəsb edir. Eyni zamanda, bütün məktəblərdə müəllimlər şagirdləri milli ruhda, ənənəvi dəyərlər ruhunda tərbiyə etməlidirlər*”.¹⁹

The explicit nomination of the concept by the lexical unit “*dəyərlər*” (values), which is repeated three times, serves to heighten the emotional intensity of the speech. This emotionality is further reinforced by the use of lexemes that carry a positive evaluative sense, such as “*vətənpərvərlik ruhu*” (spirit of patriotism) and “*milli ruh*” (national spirit). These expressions contain an emotional-intellectual component formed through the harmony of rational-evaluative judgments and emotions.

In the statement made by UK Prime Minister David Cameron following the terrorist attacks in Paris, we can also observe the use of nouns that represent shared values: “*And they were killed and injured*

¹⁹ <https://www.president.az>

*by brutal, callous murderers who want to destroy everything our two countries stand for. **Peace. Tolerance. Liberty***”²⁰

In political discourse, evaluative representation depends on extralinguistic factors of the political context—such as the specifics of the communication sphere, the communicative goal, and the addressee factor. The functional-semantic domain of evaluation reflects the value orientation of the speaker and guides the evaluative interpretation of the addressee (listener or reader) based on the choice of linguistic means, with the aim of enhancing the impact of communication in political discourse.

In political discourse, evaluative metaphors serve as a means of expressing implicit evaluation. Their main function is to convey to the recipient a vivid, memorable image and, through it, to create either a positive or negative value-based attitude and shape public opinion. Evaluative metaphors compel the reader to perceive information from the perspective intended by the author. As A.Ya. Mamedov precisely puts it, *“the role of metaphor in political discourse is of exceptional importance, helping to reveal hidden meanings in the system of values and traditions that shape thinking, serving as a means of forming the culture and ideology of society, preserving and transmitting cultural and historical experience from generation to generation”*.²¹

It should be noted that metaphor is closely connected with the psychological, cultural, and political-ideological context and, therefore, is often used in political discourses. It creates vivid implications among the masses.

Politicians use the personal pronoun “I” to express their personal views and feelings, while “we” is used to gain the trust and support of the audience. Through the pronominal form of the first person plural, politicians demonstrate their belief in cooperation and mutual understanding with the people, thus convincing voters to support their ideas. They directly address the audience and indirectly present

²⁰ <https://www.washingtonpost.com>

²¹ Məmmədov, A.Y. Diskursun təhlilinin koqnitiv perspektivləri /A.Y.Məmmədov, M.Y.Məmmədov. – Bakı: Çarşıoğlu, – 2010. – s.6.

themselves and their program: “*We should be drawing down, not ramping up, and redeploying our forces that remain in Iraq*”.²²

At the syntactic level of political discourse, politicians prefer simple sentences for better persuasion of the people. Such sentences create the appearance of reflection with a subsequent conclusion and carry an affirmative, appeal-oriented tone. This allows the president-orator to be more expressive and persuasive, bringing them closer to the people. Their speech becomes clearer and more accessible to various social strata of the population: “*Biz onu dağıtmamışıq. Biz onu qoruyuruq. Biz orada minlərlə erməni kitabı saxlayırıq*”.²³

These linguistic tools allow politicians to capture the audience's attention, facilitate the perception of political speech or addresses, diversify the politician's language with means of influence, shape the political consciousness of recipients, and also motivate them to take specific actions beneficial to the politician.

Chapter II of the work, “**Meliorative Evaluation in Political Discourse**”, consists of three paragraphs. This chapter discusses various concepts of melioration and approaches to it, meliorative evaluation in the speech of political leaders, semantic techniques for reproducing melioration in political speech, as well as enhancing the effectiveness of speech through the transmission of strategies and tactics.

In the first paragraph, “**The Development of Concepts of Melioration and Approaches to It**”, various definitions of meliorative evaluation in political discourse are presented. Meliorativity is considered a universal communicative category and a complex system of nationally specific strategies aimed at harmonious and conflict-free communication that meets the expectations of the interlocutor. It serves as a manifestation of the desire to maintain an optimal balance—between distancing and rapprochement, formality and informality—which varies depending on the situation and cultural background. In other words, the point of

²² <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu>

²³ <https://www.president.az>

this balance shifts not only according to the specific communicative context but also in accordance with the culture as a whole.

The concept of meliorativity as a universal communicative phenomenon is present in all the languages of the world, constantly changing the means and forms of its realization in speech. In a general sense, “meliorativity” refers to the ability of a communication participant to behave and speak in accordance with the communicative situation, taking into account the feelings and needs of the interlocutor. The phenomenon of politeness varies in its manifestation in speech depending on territorial, social, age, and professional affiliation, and is shaped by the ethnic and cultural values that dominate a given society. For example, Yueguo Gu notes that in Mandarin Chinese, the concept of “*politeness*” consists of four components: respectfulness, modesty, evaluative warmth, and refinement. According to the author, being polite means “*living in accordance with certain sets of behavioral norms*”.²⁴

A speaker’s friendly attitude toward the audience creates the impression of a positive persona. Melioration helps a politician conceal any potential gap that may exist between the speaker and the audience. Meliorative speech minimizes the prominence of the speaker and enhances the significance of the audience. Such speeches are usually carefully prepared in advance, with speakers being fully aware of the messages they deliver. Orators soften their address using mitigating strategies, as they aim to win over the audience.

The category of politeness can generally be defined as a type of social interaction based on respect for the individual as an interlocutor. As N.M. Zhuravleva notes, “*the internal respect we feel for another person is reflected in linguistic politeness*”.²⁵

According to T.V. Larina, politeness is seen as “*a manifestation of the desire to maintain an optimal balance, an equilibrium between*

²⁴ Yueguo, G. Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese // – Journal of Pragmatics, – 1990. № 14, – p. 237.

²⁵ Журавлева, Н.М. Поэтика украинского эпистолярного вежливости XIX – начала XX века /Н.М.Журавлева. – Запорожье:Запорожский национальный университет, – 2012. – с.7.

distancing and closeness, between formality and familiarity, which varies depending on the situation and cultural background".²⁶

According to J.M. Babayev, politeness *"is the embodiment of respect for others. Politeness is an explicitly dialogical phenomenon, as it is two-sided — both as respect for the addressee and as the presence of the speaker: it reflects the relationship between the 'self' and the 'other'"*.²⁷ Politeness is a universal communicative category, a complex system of culturally specific strategies aimed at harmonious and conflict-free communication that meets the expectations of the interlocutor. We believe that politeness, as a pragmalinguistic category, includes meaningful information represented through external elements of polite speech, such as respect and goodwill, as well as the expression plan, which is embodied in communicative strategies and tactics realized through linguistic means.

In the second paragraph, **"Meliorative Evaluation in the Speech of Political Leaders"**, the semantic techniques used to reproduce melioration in political speech are examined.

The use of meliorative assessment is an important social and linguacultural factor that regulates the nature of speech behavior, promotes successful contact imposition and is realized through various semantic techniques. *"These semantic techniques"*, according to N.I. Formanovskaya, *"are reproduced in typical situations of interpersonal communication such as greetings, farewells, apologies, gratitude, wishes, requests, etc., and are used to express a polite and friendly attitude toward the interlocutor"*.²⁸

Greeting is an expressive act of speech, which is always carried out at the beginning of communication and therefore is of great importance, since the correct beginning of communication and

²⁶ Ларина, Т.В. Категория вежливости и стиль коммуникации: Сопоставление английских и русских лингвокультурных традиций /Т.В.Ларина. – Москва : Рукописные памятники Древней Руси, – 2009. – с.27.

²⁷ Babayev, С.М. Прагмалингвистиканын əsasları / С.М.Бабəyев. – Вак: Mütərcim, - 2024, - s.205.

²⁸Формановская, Н.И. Речевой этикет и культура общения /Н.И. Формановская. – Москва: Высш. шк., – 1989. – с.50.

knowledge of social norms determine communication. In this communicative situation, President İlham Aliyev greets the representatives of the public in Jabrayil using the semantic greeting phrases “*salamlayıram*” and “*xoş gəlmisiniz*”. With the help of these polite phrases, strategies of paying attention to the addressee and verbally expressing respect are realized. This speech act performs a phatic function, as its goal is to establish contact and maintain interpersonal social relationships: “*Əziz cəbrayillılar, əziz dostlar, sizi səmimiyyətlə salamlayıram və “Cəbrayıla xoş gəlmisiniz” deyirəm*”.²⁹

The speech act of farewell marks the completion of verbal interaction and serves as an indicator of further communicative engagement between the speakers: “*Sizin simanızda bütün cəbrayillıları qucaqlayıram, öpürəm. Allah sizə can sağlığı versin. Bundan sonra cəbrayillılar Cəbrayıl da yaşayacaqlar. Sağ olun!*”.³⁰

In the given example, İlham Aliyev, during a meeting with representatives of the public from Jabrayil, performs the speech act of farewell using the etiquette phrase “*Sağ olun!*” which serves as a means of implementing strategies for formal expression of respect and attention to the addressee.

Thus, farewell speech acts, like greeting speech acts, serve a phatic function, as even in a situation of parting, speakers construct their etiquette expressions, taking into account the possibility of further contact.

Melioration is a category aimed at expressing respect and a positive attitude toward the interlocutor during communication. The primary task in communicative interaction is to establish a connection and then achieve agreement, which contributes to the adherence to speech etiquette. Speech etiquette refers to norms created by society during cultural development that regulate speech behavior within specific communicative situations.

This paragraph also discusses the strategies and tactics used by political leaders to enhance the effectiveness of their speeches.

²⁹ <https://www.president.az>

³⁰ <https://www.president.az>

Among them, particular attention is given to strategies and tactics of presentation, deflecting criticism, complimenting, praising, expressing trust, supporting the addressee, solidarity with the addressee, and so on.

The problem of strategic organization of communication is one of the key issues in linguistics. In addressing this scientific question, three approaches are typically distinguished. According to T.A. van Dijk³¹, the process of communication is strategic and conscious. J. Gumperz believes that the choice of strategy is related to the speaker's interpretation of a specific communicative situation, and it influences the intuitive selection of verbal and non-verbal means when creating an utterance.³² The third perspective on this issue is held by O.S. Issers, according to whom, *"although communication is mostly strategic, sometimes it can also be non-strategic"*.³³

The strategy involves structuring communicative actions and communication goals. Thus, the speaker, depending on the type of strategy chosen, develops an action plan that aligns with the objective. T.A. van Dijk also believes that in the process of communication, the speaker adheres to only one tactic, which has a direct impact on the course of communication.³⁴

According to V. Demyankov, *"communication strategy is practical rules and norms for constructing communication, which are part of a certain sequence of communicative actions, developed and understood by the speaker subconsciously. Such a sequence is implemented in the form of one or several speech tactics"*.³⁵

We adhere to the definition of strategy by F.S. Batsevych, according to which *"a communicative strategy is the best realization*

³¹ Дейк, ван Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация /Т.А. ван Дейк. – Москва: Прогресс, – 1989. – 312 с.

³² Gumperz, J. Discourse Strategies /J.Gumperz. –Cambridge: CUP, –1982. - 402p.

³³Иссерс, О.С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи / О.С.Иссерс. – Москва: Издательство ЛКИ, – 2008. Изд. 5-е. – с.103.

³⁴ Ван Дейк, Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация/Т.А.Ван Дейк. – Москва: Прогресс, – 1989. – 312 с.

³⁵ Демьянков, В.З. Интерпретация текста и стратегемы поведения // – Москва: Институт языкознания АН СССР: Семантика языковых единиц и текста (лингвистические и психолингвистические исследования), – 1979. – с. 18.

of the speaker's intentions in achieving a specific communication goal, i.e., controlling and choosing effective communicative moves and their flexible adaptation in a particular situation”.³⁶

By combining cognitive, activity-based, and intentional aspects, a communicative strategy can be described as the best realization of the speaker's intentions, aimed at achieving a specific communication goal, aligned with the personal and psychological characteristics of the participants in the communicative process.

The implementation of a particular strategy occurs through tactics, which represent a concrete stage in the realization of a communicative strategy, characterized by a specific set of techniques determining the use of certain linguistic means. The term “*tactics*” is interpreted by scholars as: 1) the main part of military art, encompassing the theory and practice of preparation, organization, and conduct of battle; 2) a set of methods and approaches for managing social and political struggle; 3) in a figurative sense – methods, techniques, or ways to achieve a specific goal; a characteristic of someone's behavior.

In linguistic literature, “*tactics*” is understood as a speech technique that enables the achievement of specific goals in a given situation. The choice of speech tactics varies between communicative situations in everyday or business communication. The social heterogeneity of the participants in the communication also influences the selection of appropriate speech tactics, with none of them being universally effective in all situations.

Meliorative evaluation is implemented through the following tactics: 1) the analysis-plus tactic; 2) the presentation tactic. For example, Ilham Aliyev demonstrated that one of the most effective tactics in political struggle is this one, based on an appeal to rationality and facts: “*Xalq birləşdi, xalq həmrəylik göstərdi, bir yumruq kimi birləşdi və bu Qələbəni Azərbaycan xalqı qazandı. Bu, bizim hamımızın qələbəsidir*”.³⁷ In this example, the President of Azerbaijan, Ilham Aliyev, justifies his viewpoint by persuading the

³⁶ Бацевич, Ф.С. Основи комунікативної лінгвістики / Ф.С.Бацевич. – К.: Видавничий центр “Академія”, – 2004. –с.121.

³⁷ <https://www.president.az>

audience of the validity of his statements: “*Xalq birləşdi, xalq həmrəylik göstərdi, Azərbaycan xalqı qazandı*”; 3) deflection of criticism; 4) compliment tactic; 5) praise tactic; 6) trust-building tactic; 7) tactic of supporting the addressee; 8) tactic of solidarity with the addressee, which helps to create a psychologically comfortable atmosphere for the interlocutor and sets the mood for cooperation, for example: “*Siz gənclər və idman naziri vəzifəsinə təyin edirsiniz, sizə böyük etimad göstərilir. Əminəm ki, siz bu etimadı doğruldacaqsınız. Ölkəmizin idman ictimaiyyəti sizi yaxşı tanıyır*”³⁸; 9) tactic of capturing the addressee through the use of words with meliorative evaluative semantics; 10) tactic of referring to statistical data, which expresses the speaker’s implicit interest in the interlocutors and is reinforced by credible facts. For example: “*125 artilleriya topu, 366 tank, 7 “S-300” zenit-raket kompleksi, 50-dən çox digər zenit-raket kompleksləri, 522 yük avtomasını və digər texnikalar məhv edilmişdir və qənimət kimi götürülmüşdür*”.³⁹

The examples provided show that the meliorative evaluation of the addressee by the speaker is based on feelings of attachment and sympathy, and contributes to the harmonization of relations between the interlocutors.

In the third chapter of the work “**Pejorative Evaluation in Political Discourse**”, various concepts and approaches to pejoration are examined, including pejorative evaluation in the speech of political leaders, semantic techniques of conveying pejoration in political discourse, as well as the reduction of speech effectiveness through the transmission of strategies and tactics.

The first paragraph, “**The Development of Concepts of Pejoration and Approaches to It**”, presents various definitions of pejorative evaluation in political discourse. It identifies three main approaches to interpreting the phenomenon of pejoration. Supporters of the first approach (V.I. Karasik, A.V. Kovalevskaya⁴⁰) view

³⁸ <https://www.president.az>

³⁹ <https://www.president.az>

⁴⁰ Карасик, В.И. Язык социального статуса/В.И. Карасик. – Москва: Гнозис, – 2002. –330 с.; Ковалевская, А.В. Пейоративные наименования лица в немецкой фразеологии: /дисс. ... канд. филол. наук/– Москва, 2008. – 247 с.

pejorativeness as the speaker's attitude toward the object of denotation and as a manifestation of pragmatic intention: *"Pejoration is associated with the communicator's evaluation of something as being bad"*.⁴¹ It should be noted that this approach is the broadest in understanding the phenomenon of pejoration.

Supporters of the second approach, - R. Conrad and A. F. Müller⁴² interpret pejoration as the formal reduction of the value relationship of the denotation object. Representatives of this approach define pejoration as a word with a degraded primary meaning. Supporters of the third approach (O. S. Akhmanova, I. I. Kremikh, V. D. Devkin⁴³) combine the two previous approaches. A typical definition of the term *"pejoration"* can be stated as follows: *"Pejoration is a complex linguistic phenomenon that represents the reduction of the evaluative value of the semantics of a word as a result of the negative attitude of the speaker towards the object of evaluation"*.⁴⁴

"Pejoration", writes E.S. Kubryakova, *"satisfies the individual's need to express disapproving, ironic, condemning, or other attitudes toward their opponent as the anthropocenter of communication"*.⁴⁵ Pejoratives are an integral part of stylistically debased vocabulary. As L.I. Chernysheva notes, *"substandard*

⁴¹ Голянич, М.І. Лінгвістичний аналіз тексту: словник термінів/ М.І.Голянич, Н.Я.Іванишин, Р.Л.Ріжко, Р.І.Стефурак. - Івано-Франківськ:Сімик, -2012. - с.11.

⁴² Conrad, R. Lexikon sprachwissenschaftlicher Termini // – Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut, – 1988. – 280 s. Partridge, E. Usage and Abuse: A Guide to Good English/E Partridge. – London: Penguin Books, – 1999. – 401 p.

⁴³ Ахманова, О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов / О.С.Ахманова. – Москва : Сов. Энциклопедия, – 1969. – 607 с.; Девкин, В.Д. Немецкая разговорная лексика /В.Д.Девкин. – Москва: МГПИ им. В. И. Ленина, – 1973. – 286 с.; Кремих, И.И. Отрицательный оценочный компонент в семантической структуре слова // Москва: МГПИ им. В.И. Ленина: Прагматика слова: сб. науч. тр., – 1985. – с. 28-40

⁴⁴ Селіванова, О.О. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія/ О.О.Селіванова. – Київ: Полтава; Довкілля, – 2006. – с.2.

⁴⁵ Кубрякова, Е.С. Язык и знание. На пути получения знаний о языке: части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира / Е.С.Кубрякова. – Москва: Языки славянской культуры, – 2004. – с.379.

vocabulary as a whole is characterized by the use of rude, expressively colored words, usually characterized by a negative evaluation”.⁴⁶

It can be added that the lower they are positioned on the moral scale, the more vivid and intense the pejorative, dismissive expression becomes.

Summarizing the approaches of linguists, we define the phenomenon of pejoration as a negative, emotionally charged expressive evaluation. The semantic structure of pejoratives includes a connotative aspect (negative emotive seme) through which the speaker's negative attitude toward the addressee is expressed. Pejorative vocabulary seems to absorb any information embodied in emotive, evaluative, and stylistic functions.

Pejoration is understood as a category that expresses a negative emotional evaluation by creating images that, depending on moral and ethical norms, are perceived more or less negatively by a specific linguistic community. This determination highlights a property of the semantics of pejoratives that allows them to be distinguished from the layer of evaluative vocabulary. The marker is the presence of an emotional component in the meaning of certain lexical units, which sets pejorative vocabulary apart from negative or evaluatively negative language.

The activation and expansion of the stylistic functions of substandard vocabulary, which includes pejorative terms, provide grounds for concluding that a pejorative word contains not only a denotative component but also an expressive, emotionally evaluative characteristic. Pejorative vocabulary can be studied from the perspective of verbal aggression, as the manifestation of the speaker's negative emotional state is verbalized through the use of negative, expressive-evaluative language in the flow of speech.

Pejorative vocabulary has the ability to alter the tone and convey different shades of emotions and feelings. This is one of the reasons why the study of pejorative language is a complex and multifaceted

⁴⁶ Чернышова, Л.И. Субстандартная лексика и культура речи // – Вісник Донбаської національної академії С.А., – 2016. – с. 79.

issue, which requires consideration not only of its semantic but also of its anthropocentric nature. Just as there is no consensus on the interpretation of the concept of pejorativity, there is also no unified approach to describing its semantic field. For this reason, the issue of systematizing all the criteria for defining pejoratives remains a relevant and open problem.

It is indisputable that pejorativity must be considered in the context of categories such as emotionality, evaluativeness, and expressiveness. The semantic nature of all these categories is interpreted differently in linguistics. In particular, there is an opinion that such components can be applied to a word's meaning either in its full extent or partially.

Pejoratives influence the creation of the pragmatic orientation of an expression. Under the influence of context, lexemes often undergo changes that enhance the pragmatic focus of the text. When a lexeme is introduced into context, the paradigmatic meaning is often replaced by the actual (syntagmatic) one. There are two possible cases of interaction between the following meanings: 1) the paradigmatic and syntagmatic meanings may coincide, in which case the lexeme acquires its usual meaning; 2) the meaning of the lexeme can change under the influence of the contextual environment. This influence often leads to discrepancies between paradigmatic and syntagmatic meanings. Context can affect the connotative-pragmatic features of the lexeme, which, in turn, can result in: a) the lexeme acquiring a meliorative or pejorative evaluation; b) the lexeme shifting into the opposite evaluative field (pejoratives becoming melioratives, and vice versa); c) intensification of the pejorative or meliorative meaning of the lexeme.⁴⁷

Pejorative vocabulary has the ability to change its tone and convey a variety of emotional nuances and feelings. Wherever there is a pejorative, sarcasm, irony, mockery, anger, outrage, disappointment, and dissatisfaction are always present. Ambivalence, polyfunctionality, and the ability to sound differently depending on

⁴⁷ Харламова, М.В. Контекст как актуализатор фразеологического значения (на материале французской молодёжной прессы) // – Вестник МГИМО-Университета, – 2014. Том 34, № 1, – с. 285-289.

the speaker's emotional state or the specific situation are other characteristics of pejorative vocabulary. This largely depends on the stylistic layer to which a particular pejorative belongs.

Pejorative vocabulary can be classified into various categories, namely: subjectivity vs. objectivity of the evaluation; activity vs. passivity of the object; presence vs. absence of control over behavior; completeness vs. incompleteness; social vs. antisocial; general vs. specific evaluation; evaluation of the individual vs. evaluation of the group representative; evaluation based on external characteristics vs. internal world; evaluation by the degree of social danger; evaluation based on public opinion; evaluation according to duties; evaluation by degree of commitment and its adequacy to the individual's capabilities.

The predominant induction of negative evaluation can be explained by the fact that most pejorative word meanings have an anthropocentric orientation – that is, they mainly provide a negative characterization of a person, their physical and mental state, behavior, and life activities. Positive manifestations of a person are perceived as conforming to the norm and therefore do not require special emphasis. Negative evaluation of an object is perceived as a deviation from the norm and is motivated by two principal factors: first, the imperfection and inability of a person to perform certain actions, their individual or socially unacceptable flaws and defects; and second, disrespectful or dismissive behavior towards others.

In the second paragraph, *“Pejorative Evaluation in the Speech of Political Leaders”*, the semantic techniques used to reproduce pejoration in political speech are discussed. Pejorative evaluation is realized through various semantic techniques such as irony, sarcasm, agonality, aggression, disapproval, contempt, disdain, swearing, etc., and they are used to express a negative and unfavorable attitude towards the interlocutor.

Irony is most often used as a technique of verbal aggression, during which neutral linguistic means acquire an expressive meaning. The globalization processes in the modern political world, the growing need for political debates, continuous tense communication, and the need for negotiations among political figures

have led to the transformation of irony and sarcasm into communication tools for participants in political discourse. These tools serve as a means of criticizing the political views and programs of opponents and reinforcing one's own position in the political arena. Speech acts by participants in political discourse with an ironic or sarcastic tone perform specific functions.

To create a negative speech portrait of the opponent and to express criticism, objection, reproach, or mockery, politicians often use ironic or even sarcastic forms such as addresses, greetings, compliments, expressions of gratitude, condolences, or offers of help. It is important to distinguish between the concepts of irony and sarcasm. Irony is understood as an utterance with a hidden meaning that is opposite to the meaning that is directly expressed. Therefore, a key feature of ironic meaning is the presence of two semantic levels—the expressed and the latent. Irony is most often constructed by using a positive evaluation on the surface level, while conveying a negative evaluation at the deeper, intended level. This is because a positive judgment is generally regarded as normative, while a critical one is seen as an exception or deviation from the norm.

An essential function of political discourse that contains irony or sarcasm is the regulatory function, which consists in the fact that the speaker, either consciously or unconsciously, tries to influence the addressee in order to achieve certain goals, for example: “*İndi gedirsən onun-bunun dabanını yalaya-yalaya, özünü alçalda-alçalda öz xalqını alçaldırsan*”.⁴⁸ To give his irony a more figurative tone, the president successfully uses the idiomatic expression «*dabanını yalaya-yalaya*» (sucking up). By using a phraseological unit with a pejorative meaning in the process of conveying emotional attitude toward the addressee who is being verbally influenced, the speaker criticizes their behavior. The presence of a negative connotation is characterized primarily by the nominative nature of the expression.

Another function of irony is the emotional-evaluative function, the purpose of which is the speaker's assessment of the behavior of the addressee at whom the ironic statement is directed: “*Bəs, nə oldu,*

⁴⁸ <https://www.president.az>

*Paşinyan? Deyirdin ki, “Dağlıq Qarabağ respublikası” o cümlədən işğal edilmiş bütün torpaqları əhatə edir. (...) Kim qaldı ki, zəhləsini tökməsin. Bir məsləhət verərdim ki, bəlkə, şamanlara zəng etsin”.*⁴⁹

We also distinguish the function of ridicule, which consists in expressing mockery towards the addressee, their actions, behavior, or previous statements: *“Düşmən öz xalqına nağıllar danışır, yalan danışır. Faktıları saxtalaşdırır, öz xalqını aldatmaq istəyir, beynəlxalq aləmi aldatmaq istəyir ki, guya onlar hücumu keçirlər, onlar bizim bəzi mövqelərimizi geri alıblar. Hamısı yalandır”.*⁵⁰ This example illustrates how the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, İlham Aliyev, uses irony by stating that none of the opinions expressed by his opponent regarding the war were ever correct or worth heeding.

This paragraph also examines the strategies and tactics employed by political leaders to undermine the effectiveness of speech. Among these, particular emphasis is placed on strategies of discreditation, disagreement, warning, prohibition, and demand, as well as tactics such as accusation, insult, threat, criticism, and self-criticism.

Pejoratives constitute an integral part of the language's negatively evaluative system, possessing the capacity to convey criticism, disrespect, disapproval, dissatisfaction, and the like, toward individuals whose personal characteristics or behavior are subject to condemnation. Since conflict communication inherently lacks positive content, comfort, or satisfaction, and is oriented toward each party's pursuit of 'victory', speakers actively employ such lexis. The study revealed that the system of these linguistic signs is highly diverse, encompassing both conventional (usual) and occasional (context-specific) formations, as well as lexemes with seemingly neutral connotations that are used to implement a speaker's conflict-driven strategy or tactic.

Strategies to reduce the effectiveness of speech involve the use of tactics that implicitly and explicitly express a negative attitude

⁴⁹ <https://www.president.az>

⁵⁰ <https://www.president.az>

toward the subject of communication. Linguists note that participants in political discourse choose tactics to achieve their own goals or to focus on the goals of their partner.

Linguistic creativity in conflict interaction is presented through occasional vocabulary. For example: “*Dilinden Kürtleri düşürmeyen HDP’nin çoluk çocuk demeden onları katleden Ermeni çetecilerin borazanlığını yapmasının takdirini milletimize bırakıyoruz*”.⁵¹ In this example, with the aim of discrediting the political opponent, the lexeme with a negative evaluative meaning “*katleden*” is used, which enters into a contextual semantic opposition with the positively evaluative lexeme “*çocuk*”.

Discrediting can also be implicit: there is neither direct address nor an appeal to a specific person using their name or surname. In such cases, negatively evaluative lexemes are used to refer to opponents in general or to describe the current situation in the country. For example: “*Violence and endemic corruption, particularly in Central America, are causing desperate people to uproot their lives and families in hopes of a better future elsewhere*”.⁵²

The main tactics of the communicative strategy of discrediting are accusation, insult, and threat. For those using the accusation tactic, explicit reference to the opponent is characteristic. For example: “*Buna son qoyulmalıdır. Bu adam faşist olub. Bu adam callad olub. Bu adam günahsız azərbaycanlıların və ondan sonra İkinci Dünya müharibəsi zamanı sovet ordusunun əsgərlərini, zabitlərini qətlə yetirib. Bu Njde faşistdir və bunu hər kəs bilməlidir*”.⁵³

The examples given show that all strategies and tactics are characterized by the speaker’s desire to ruin the opponent’s reputation, for which stylistically debased and uncoded linguistic means are used.

⁵¹ <https://www.tccb.gov.tr>

⁵² <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu>

⁵³ <https://www.president.az>

An analysis of the research conducted on the problem, as well as a generalization of our research, allows us to come to the following conclusions.

1. Political discourse acts as an independent communicative phenomenon. Such features as intentionality, mass orientation, national-cultural specificity, ideological peculiarity, informativeness, subjectivity, aggressiveness, competitiveness, agonistic abilities, theatricality, emotionality, modality, intertextuality, the addressee factor and conventionality create the necessary prerequisites for manipulating public consciousness.

2. Evaluation as the main detail of political discourse helps political figures to verbally express their attitude to the surrounding reality, monitoring for the future and prospects for the configuration of the situation in the whole world on the basis of their hierarchy and system of values. Evaluation is a philosophical, logical, psychological, linguistic category, the uniqueness of which not only reflects the essence of the value of the object for the subject, but also in some way influences the recipient, who changes his mental space, forming a worldview.

3. In political discourse, the evaluative meaning is the main component of the content and serves as a decisive factor in the implementation of the communicative-pragmatic goal of influence; political discourse, in particular, contributes to the expansion of the fund of axiological means: units that are neutral in terms of evaluative meaning are capable of acquiring evaluative content in a political context. Evaluation in political discourse demonstrates the ability to be implemented with the help of multi-level linguistic and speech means - word-formation (degrees of comparison of adjectives and expressive prefixes), pragmatic (precedent statements and names), lexical and grammatical (adjectives, nouns). In addition to lexical means, the category of evaluation can be expressed with the help of stylistic and syntactic means.

4. Meliorativity as a pragmalinguistic category contains a substantive component, represented by such external elements of polite speech as respect, goodwill, as well as a plan of expression,

embodied in communicative strategies and tactics, the implementation of which occurs with the help of linguistic means.

5. Pejorativity manifests itself through the interaction of such categories as emotiveness, expressiveness, emotionality, and evaluativeness, which allowed us to define pejorative vocabulary as negatively charged, emotionally and expressively loaded evaluativeness.


6. The semantic techniques for reproducing melioration and pejoration are defined as hidden appeals and prompts for the addressee to perform a certain action.

7. The strategies and tactics used to decrease or increase the effectiveness of speech are characterized by implicit and explicit negative or positive attitudes toward the situation and the opponent. All strategies and tactics aim to either damage or improve the reputation of the opponent, for which stylistically lowered or elevated uncodified linguistic means are employed.

The main content of the study, the provisions submitted for defense, as well as scientific conclusions and generalizations obtained during the study, are reflected in the following articles and theses of the author:

1. Языковые средства выражения оценки в политическом дискурсе (на основе выступлений президента Азербайджанской Республики Ильхама Алиева) // *Filologiya məsələləri*, – 2021. №6, – с. 174-179.
2. Прагматическая направленность оценки в политическом дискурсе // *ХАБАРШЫ Филология сериясы*, Алматы, – 2021. №2(182), – с. 57-64.
3. Концептуальные метафоры в современном политическом дискурсе // *AU, İpək Yolu*, – 2022. №1, – с. 133-139.
4. Содержание и структура политического языка // *Terminologiya Məsələləri*, – 2022. №1, – с. 102-108.
5. Адресант и адресат политического текста // *BDU, Dil və Ədəbiyyat*, – 2022. №1(118), – s. 496-498.
6. Повышение эффективности речи путем передачи тактик // *ADU, Elmi Xəbərlər jurnalı*, – 2022. №1, – p. 71-75.

7. О некоторых особенностях политического дискурса // Doktorantların və gənc tədqiqatçıların XXIII Respublika Elmi Konfransı, Azərbaycan Memarlıq və İnşaat Universiteti, – 2019. – с. 204-206.
8. Раскрытие понятия языковой мелиорации и подходы к нему // Ümummilli Lider Heydər Əliyevin anadan olmasının 97-ci ildönümünə həsr olunmuş Azərbaycanşünaslığın Aktual Problemləri XI Beynəlxalq Elmi Konfransı, Bakı Slavyan Universiteti, – 2020. – с. 245-248.
9. Роль языка в политическом дискурсе // Scientific Collection «InterConf»: with the Proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference «Theory and Practice of Science: Key Aspects», Rome, Italy / – 2021. №49, – p. 351-357.
10. Категория мелиоративности в лингвистических исследованиях // The XV International Scientific Symposium, “Intercultural relations in the modern world”, Kars/Turkey – Tehran/Iran – 2021. – p. 110-113.
11. Оценка с точки зрения ее контекстуальности // Doktorantların və gənc tədqiqatçıların XXIV Respublika Elmi Konfransı, Azərbaycan Texniki Universiteti, Bakı – 2021. – p. 332-333.
12. Информационно-убеждающая функция в политическом дискурсе // Gənc tədqiqatçıların V Respublika Elmi-Praktik Konfransı, Azərbaycan Universiteti, Bakı – 2022. – p. 204-206.
13. Идеологический и национально-культурный компоненты в семантической структуре лексики политического дискурса // Ümummilli lider Heydər Əliyevin anadan olmasının 99-cu ildönümünə həsr olunmuş “Heydər Əliyev: Multikulturalizm Və Tolerantlıq İdeologiyası” V Beynəlxalq elmi konfransı, Azərbaycan Dillər Universiteti, Bakı – 2022. – p. 151-152.
14. Политический дискурс как объект лингвистического исследования // Gənc tədqiqatçıların VI Respublika Elmi Konfransı, Azərbaycan Universiteti, Bakı – 2023. – p. 204-206.



The defence will be held on 23 September 2025 at 13:00 at the meeting of the Dissertation Council ED 1.06 of Supreme Attestation Commission under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan operating at Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi of the Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences

Address: Az1143, Baku city, H.Javid avenue 115, V floor, Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi of ANAS

Dissertation is accessible at the Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi of the Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences Library.

Electronic versions of the abstract is available on the official website of the Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi of the Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences

Abstract was sent to the required addresses on 13 June 2025.

Signed for print: 22.05.2025
Paper format: 60x84 1/16
Volume: 47 329
Number of hard copies: 20