

PHRASEOLOGY AND INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE: ANGELA MERKEL

Dr. Arkadiy Petrovich Sedykh

Belgorod National Research University, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0001-6604-3722
sedykh@bsu.edu.ru

Ph. D. (C) Natalia Mikhailovna Dugalich

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0002-5410-0731
avsineeva_nm@rudn.university

Ph. D. (C) Elena Grigoryevna Dmitrieva

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0002-8161-9627
dmitrieva_eg@rudn.university

Ph. D. (C) Zulfiya Akhatovna Usmanova

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0002-0977-1982
usmanova_z@rudn.university

Ph. D. (C) Milana Evgenyevna Kupriyanova

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Russia
ORCID: 0000-0002-0654-205X
kupriyanova_me@rudn.university

Fecha de Recepción: 10 de enero de 2020 – **Fecha Revisión:** 30 de enero de 2020

Fecha de Aceptación: 02 de marzo de 2020 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de abril de 2020

Abstract

The article presents the linguosemiotic approach to the study of phraseological units used by an institutional language personality. It enlists theoretical prerequisites for modeling this type of personality. The explicit meaning of an utterance is regarded as the key element highlighting features of phraseological communication. Other levels are considered during the contrastive description of institutional text and complement the essential parameters conveyed by the structure of ethnocultural code that underlies the construction of statements in national language. The language personality of a politician, in particular Angela Merkel, is considered as an active mechanism for the functioning of institutional discourse. There are certain prospects for analyzing institutional communication with due regard to the extralinguistic factors associated with the communicative competence of a recipient of institutional messages.

Keywords

Phraseology – Linguosemiotics – Institutional discourse – Communication behavior

Para Citar este Artículo:

Sedykh, Arkadiy Petrovich; Dugalich, Natalia Mikhailovna; Dmitrieva, Elena Grigoryevna; Usmanova, Zulfiya Akhatovna y Kupriyanova, Milana Evgenyevna. Phraseology and institutional discourse: Angela Merkel. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 227-239.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported
(CC BY-NC 3.0)

Licencia Internacional



Introduction

Each prominent politician is among the brightest representatives of the language community, to which they belong. Their phraseological word creation reflects the characteristics of national communication. In this regard, we consider institutional discourse as a communication structure determining individual and national features of communication behavior. This position is associated with the cognitive-communicative approach to the interpretation of institutional text.

The traditional concepts of politician, leader, and politician's image bear the imprint of an ethnocultural language personality undifferentiatedly. In our opinion, an institutional language personality can be considered as a "word-creating personality". Interpreting political texts as "meaning-generating structures"¹, we regard this type of discourse as an independent semiotic construction, a carrier of not only individual linguistic characteristics but also national features of language functioning.

The functional interaction between units belonging to different levels of language system and their role in the process of political communication have recently attracted the attention of humanitarians and linguists². Particular interest in inter-level structures is connected with the consideration of constructions larger than a sentence (for example, over-phrasal units and whole texts). In terms of political text, we deal with an additional parameter indicated by the term "ideological connectedness" (*Ideologiegebundenheit*)³. Ideological connectedness means the semantic determinism of a word due to its belonging to the terminological system of a certain ideology or its variation, as well as its role in this system. A. Neubert proposes a different approach to considering relationships between language and ideology. While analyzing this issue, the scholar introduced a new concept of ideologeme, which is defined as a "linguistic invariant with social relevance"⁴.

If an utterance is an elementary speech action, then a coherent text composed of consistent utterances and united by some general thought is a complex speech action. E.A. Referovskaya rightly notes that text is not just a sequence of statements but a complex hierarchically organized system where each statement is subject to a larger speech unit (for example, superphrasal structure or paragraph) and through it to text as a whole⁵.

¹ Yu. M. Lotman, *Vnutri myslyashchikh mirov. Chelovek – tekst – semiosfera – istoriya* (Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kultury, 1999).

² L. I. Grishaeva, *Osobennosti ispolzovaniya yazyka i kulturnaya identichnost kommunikantov* (Voronezh: VGU, 2007); A. P. Sedykh, "Spetsifika rechevogo vozdeistviya Zhaka Shiraka", *Politicheskaya lingvistika*, num 1 Vol: 35 (2011): 24-29; L. V. Tsurikova, *Problema estestvennosti diskursa v mezhkulturnoi kommunikatsii* (Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezh. un-ta, 2002) y A. P. Sedykh; L. M. Buzinova; N. V. Bakirova; N. S. Tsvetova y B. N. Kovalenko, "The sign, linguistic analysis, idioethnic interpretation of communication and linguistic persona", *International Journal of Engineering and Technology (UAE)*, num 7(4.38) (2018): 100-104.

³ W. Schmidt. *Zur Ideologiegebundenheit der politischen Lexik. Zeitschr. für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung*. 1969.

⁴ A. Neubert, *Zu Gegenstand und Grundbegriffen einer marxistisch-leninistischen Soziolinguistik*. In: *Beitrage zur Soziolinguistik*. Halle (Saale). 1974.

⁵ E. A. Referovskaya, *Lingvisticheskie issledovaniya struktury teksta* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1983); L. I. Grishaeva, *Osobennosti ispolzovaniya yazyka i kulturnaya identichnost kommunikantov* (Voronezh: VGU, 2007) y A. P. Sedykh; L. M. Buzinova; N. V. Bakirova; N. S. Tsvetova y B. N. Kovalenko, "The

It is logical to assume that text represents the most comprehensive analysis of linguistic units. At the same time, text can be a separate statement, paragraph and complete written work. An important criterion for analyzing functions of the studied linguistic units is the semiotic characteristics of political text, whose carriers are phraseological units.

Text theory as a complex and generalizing discipline has been formed through the integration of such complementary disciplines as textual study, text linguistics, poetics, rhetoric, pragmatics, and hermeneutics. Despite the abundance of interdisciplinary intersections, text theory has its own epistemological status.

Literature review

The philological decoding of the implicit meaning of some text, including the ethnocultural aspect of its semantics, considers the dual nature of language signs. Having both meaning and formal incarnation, it can be associated with different signs (in their meaning and form) in the same text or other texts and has common substantial structure with other text components. Methods of this interaction can be regarded in the universal and idioethnic aspects.

Substantive textual structures, as well as the author's intentions and attitude to the reported, are traditionally subject to decoding. Political text and any other form of human self-expression consist of conscious, controlled and unconscious, uncontrolled but equally objective processes of perception affecting the addressee of some utterance. The institutional discourse (text) created in some national language is addressed to the representative of a certain linguistic community and is based on the national paradigm of thinking, cultural attitudes, and historical development of each ethnic group.

Every text comprises several layers of organization: from general rules of coherence to implicit semantic (ideological) structures of political text. This type of text can include fragments from other texts, whose associative combinations form an additional meaning (intertext).

B.M. Leikina identifies the most significant levels of text understanding for theoretical linguistics:

1) Linguistic level (primary code) is the literal and explicit meaning of text derived from the meanings of its components (formal linguistic units, both segmental and suprasegmental) on the basis of purely linguistic facts and patterns;

2) Deep and non-linguistic level is the situational meaning of text (secondary code), i.e. the content that the author reveals in a certain text and expresses through linguistic meanings that functions as a form of highlighting situational significance⁶.

sign, linguistic analysis, idioethnic interpretation of communication and linguistic persona", International Journal of Engineering and Technology (UAE), num 7(4.38) (2018): 100-104.

⁶ B. M. Leikina, *K probleme vzaimodeistviya yazykovykh i neyazykovykh znanii pri osmyslenii rechi* (Leningrad: Prosveshchenie, 1974) y A. P. Sedykh y L. M. Buzinova, *Frantsuzskaya yazykovaya lichnost: Akademicheskii i khromaticheskii diskurs* (Moscow: LENAND, 2019).

DR. ARKADIIY PETROVICH SEDYKH / PH. D (C) NATALIA MIKHAILOVNA DUGALICH
PH. D. (C) ELENA GRIGORYEVNA DMITRIEVA PH. D. (C) ZULFIYA AKHATOVNA USMANOVA
XX. MILANA EVGENYEVNA KUPRIYANOVA

Later surveys determine seven levels of text (utterance) comprehension: The first, second, and third levels of text comprehension are based on a formally distinguished structure and contain its description. Thus, these levels refer to instructive pragmatics. Instructive pragmatics is possible only in texts describing already known (at least as a supposed possibility) states of reality. <...> The fourth level of text comprehension is associated with the creative pragmatics of text when its understanding involves the creative recreation of meanings. <...> The fifth level of understanding refers to texts that generate semantics and comprise creative semantics, require the correct recreation of commenting texts, the right disclosure of the author's intention embodied in a particular text. In any case, the addressee chooses an acceptable interpretation. <...> The sixth level of understanding also applies to texts that generate semantics and have creative pragmatics. It is the case when generated commentary texts are incompatible (complementary) in principle. Thus, understanding is determined by the addressee's ability to recreate mutually complementary (inconsistent) texts. <...> The seventh level of understanding arises when all generated texts do not provide the adequate comprehension of what is understood and even the comprehensible meaning⁷). When the recipient understands the phraseology used by politicians, it covers the first three levels of understanding (instructive pragmatist). However, modern politicians are often carried away by phraseological units and consequently the seventh level of understanding should also be studied.

In the course of this research, we consider the dynamic formation of the ethnocultural structure of meanings and pay special attention to additional meanings of utterances and intertextual components that are typical of political speech and are created according to the general laws of semantic formation. At the same time, we focus on determining certain patterns of using phraseological units of some national language with due regard to idiolectal models of communication behavior common to state leaders⁸.

Political text can be represented as an ever-changing semiotic system. According to K.A. Dolinin, we can distinguish between the following levels of organizing the meaning of utterances:

1. The explicit meaning of an utterance is directly expressed by the totality of language signs that form this utterance.
2. The implicit meaning (subtext) is the part of information that is not directly expressed by language signs forming an utterance but somehow derived from it.
3. The actual meaning of an utterance is the part of its content that seems to be the most important, crucial, and dependent on extralinguistic factors.

⁷ N. L. Muskhelishvili y Yu. A. Schreider, "Postizhenie versus ponimanie", *Semiotika: Tr. po znakovym sistemam*, num 23 (1989): 3-17 y A. P. Sedykh; O. N. Ivanishcheva; A. V. Koreneva y I. V. Ryzhkova, "Modern philological knowledge: anthropocentrism and linguistic identity", *International Journal of Engineering and Technology (UAE)*, num 7(4.38) (2018): 447-451 y A. P. Sedykh; O. N. Ivanishcheva; A. V. Koreneva y I. V. Ryzhkova, "Modern philological knowledge: anthropocentrism and linguistic identity", *International Journal of Engineering and Technology (UAE)*, num 7(4.38) (2018): 447-451.

⁸ V. N. Teliya, *Vtorichnaya nominatsiya i ee vidy*. In: *Yazykovaya nominatsiya* (Moscow: Nauka, 1977). 129-222.

4. The global or integral meaning of an utterance is defined as a combination of its meaning and potential subtext⁹.

The study of political text is based on the idea that the state leader's freedom to choose certain language means to realize the semantic structure of any given utterance is preconditioned by the genre of their speech. In this article, we consider the ethnocultural conditionality of selecting particular language means. At the same time, we study the author's organization of text and choice of linguistic material, which can be defined as idiolectal specifics. The latter seems to be vital in the process of cognitive-communicative analysis that contributes to the determination of nuclear signs of the language personality of a political leader.

We cannot but agree with E.V. Paducheva that the description of the specific semantic interpretation of textual structures falls within the tasks of linguistics and text interpretation is based on the identification of its meanings because the above-mentioned text is written in national language¹⁰. In other words, objective linguistic analysis precedes the identification of ethnocentric/individual elements in the structure of the author's discourse.

The actual meaning of an utterance is the most significant level for highlighting typical features of phraseological units. The remaining levels are considered during the contrastive description of the text analyzed and complement the essential parameters conveyed by the ethnocultural code that underlies the construction of utterances in national language.

Phraseological units are mostly connected not with concepts, but with communicative situations. According to E.V. Ganapolskaya, "the syncretism and complexity of phraseological semantics are determined by the fact that phraseological units do not exist outside 1) their inner form associated with the figurative situation of their formation (motivation in case of folk etymology), 2) a set of strictly defined but time-varying contexts (communicative situations), 3) associative nationally-specific meanings of their components acquired in the process of language functioning, etc."¹¹. At the same time, native speakers are not always familiar with all the parameters of phraseology and can miss some associative meanings. In addition, phraseological units encourage the emotional rather than logical perception of an utterance. From the characterological viewpoint, quantitative and qualitative indicators of the *phraseological density* of the politician's speech constitute an empirical basis for the linguistic identification of their personality.

Phraseological units are widely used in political-linguistic culture as a semiotic system. It is known that phraseological nominations have a pronounced national character. Institutional phraseology also has great ethno-connnotative potential; otherwise, the

⁹ K. A. Dolinin, *Interpretatsiya teksta* (Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1985) y A. P. Sedykh, "Spetsifika rechevogo vozdeistviya Zhaka Shiraka", *Politicheskaya lingvistika*, num 1 Vol: 35 (2011): 24-29.

¹⁰ E.V. Paducheva. *Semanticheskie issledovaniya* (Semantika vremeni i vida v russkom yazyke; Semantika narrativa) [Semantic research (The semantics of tense and aspect in the Russian language; the semantics of narrative)]. Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kultury, 1996.

¹¹ E. V. Ganapolskaya, *Svobodnoe slovo ili ezopov yazyk?* (Frazheologiya kak sredstvo sovremennoi politicheskoi kommunikatsii). The collection of scientific articles "Aktualnye problemy teorii kommunikatsii" (Saint Petersburg: Izd-vo SPbGPU, 2004), 111.

pragmatic goal of political speech will not be achieved. Most phraseological units are based on the use of a metaphor. Metaphorical structures are the essence of social categories. They reflect linguistic and cultural phenomena kept in public consciousness and influenced by political, ideological, and socio-economic processes: *reset, at an all-time low, in the G8 format, etc.*

The nominative aspect of a word meaning is its dynamic expansion in the form of nominative relations and the structure of such relations is a way of relating a nomination to a certain meaning and its meaning to denoted reality. In case of direct nomination, new meanings are formed with the same orientation to the world as the main word meanings¹². However, word meanings as means of storing extralinguistic information, i.e. knowledge and data about the world, serve as means of linguistic thinking¹³. Nominative relations enable the possibility of rethinking and forming secondary functions of words since "secondary lexical nomination is the use of the means that are already available in some language in a new function to denote other objects or phenomena"¹⁴.

All secondary nominations in institutional discourse are based on the meaning of words used in a new function, which is expressed by the dependent nominative function of these indirectly derived word meanings and is manifested in the syntagmatic conditionality of their choice and combination while constructing an utterance¹⁵. In this case, the indirect reflection of reality is also influenced by substantive aspects of the reference nomination.

Institutional discourse is characterized by spontaneous processes of secondary nomination, which are not so random in the choice of motivating signs and results. This motivation is manifested in the fact that secondary nominations have inner forms that serve as an intermediary between the new meaning and its relevance to reality. The reinterpreted meaning of some verbal sign not only adapts to the expression of new non-linguistic content but also mediates it in the process of reflection.

We should note that the motive for choosing a linguistic form should not become alienated of the core of an intermediate meaning, which is common to status-oriented discourse. Thus, a certain amount of the significative meaning of a reinterpreted language unit acts as the inner form of a new meaning. The inner form of language units consists of asymmetric features that form the basis of national methods for using and adjusting phraseological units in institutional discourse.

While studying the functioning of a language personality in the institutional discourse, we propose to use the term "phraseological event", which correlates with the category of discourse event defined as "a set of communicatively significant and pragmatically coherent speech acts aimed at achieving a common communicative goal"¹⁶. A phraseological event is the meaningful use of phraseological units in speech aimed at solving the pragmatic task of ideological impact on the audience. This type of event is

¹² V. V. Vinogradov, Osnovnye tipy leksicheskikh znachenii slova. In: Voprosy yazykoznaniya. AN SSSR. 1953.

¹³ V. V. Vinogradov, Osnovnye tipy leksicheskikh znachenii slova... y A. P. Sedykh, "Spetsifika rechevogo vozdeistviya Zhaka Shiraka", Politicheskaya lingvistika, num 1 Vol: 35 (2011): 24-29

¹⁴ V. V. Vinogradov, Osnovnye tipy leksicheskikh znachenii slova... 129.

¹⁵ V. G Gak, K probleme semanticheskoi sintagmatiki (Moscow: Nauka, 1972), 373.

¹⁶ L. V. Tsurikova, Problema estestvennosti diskursa v mezhkulturnoi kommunikatsii (Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezh. un-ta, 2002), 67.

always possible since the recipient of such phraseological material has phraseological "invariants for each type of interaction and knows the principles of their variation. For this reason, the mental representation of the corresponding interactions can be defined as their schemes, i.e. a sequence of actions organized in a certain way and reflecting prototypic phenomena for the corresponding culture"¹⁷.

Individuals as participants to a phraseological event identify themselves with some linguistic culture (group, society, ethnos) and encourage themselves to use an adequate model of a communicative event, thereby positioning themselves as a full-fledged linguistic and cultural subject of communication and discourse. In this regard, "a sign of the communicant's linguocultural identity can be considered the specific use of language conditioned by the cultural-specific linguistic consciousness and communication behavior, which are formed in the process of language acquisition and are being improved throughout one's life together with communication skills in various fields and the mastery of new languages"¹⁸. In other words, linguocultural identity (in relation to the phraseological worldview) is defined as the ability to decode and reproduce phrasal models of a communicative event delivered by some culture and acquired by its subject in the process of socialization.

Methods

Institutional discourse is part of the semiotic field of national linguoculture. Linguoculture acts as the social environment of carriers of national language and culture that induces a certain type of linguistic behavior for all its representatives. In its turn, political linguoculture determines appropriate behavior in the process of status-oriented communication. Status-oriented communication is always institutional in its nature. The positioning function comes to the fore in relation to other communication participants. In this case, the communicant's phraseological toolkit can serve as an "identification signal" for determining their group affiliation (social, ethnocultural, political, or ideological). To achieve mutual understanding, the phraseological and logical toolkit of all communicants should be of the same type.

Political phraseology often dominates the leader's linguistic thinking and imposes certain clichés and euphemisms: "bombing turns into a 'protective reaction', precision bombing becomes a 'surgical strike', a demolished house automatically transforms into a 'military target', and an insignificant house boat sunk in some port is regarded as 'sea transport'¹⁹.

Let us consider the phraseological units used by the Federal Chancellor of Germany, Angela Merkel, in terms of reflecting political features of her language personality and ideological positions of the political party she represents. In the conditions of political struggle, A. Merkel like any other politician of her rank seeks to attract the Germans on the side of her party, represents the party's activities in the positive aspect,

¹⁷ L. I. Grishaeva, *Osobennosti ispolzovaniya yazyka i kulturnaya identichnost kommunikantov* (Voronezh: VGU, 2007), 144.

¹⁸ N. F. German, "Lingvokulturnaya identichnost subekta kommunikatsii", *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filosofiya. Sotsiologiya. Kulturologiya*, num 11 Vol: 149 (2009): 65.

¹⁹ D. Bolinger, *Language – the Loaded Weapon: the Use and Abuse of Language Today* (London and New York: Longman, 1980) y A. Neubert. *Zu Gegenstand und Grundbegriffen einer marxistisch-leninistischen Soziolinguistik*. In: *Beitrage zur Soziolinguistik*. Halle (Saale), 1974.

DR. ARKADY PETROVICH SEDYKH / PH. D (C) NATALIA MIKHAILOVNA DUGALICH

PH. D. (C) ELENA GRIGORYEVNA DMITRIEVA PH. D. (C) ZULFIYA AKHATOVNA USMANOVA

XX. MILANA EVGENYEVNA KUPRIANOVA

and recalls the policy of her mentor Helmut Kohl. The phraseological units used by the Chancellor are an effective means of implementing the ideology of power due to their expressive components. For instance:

"Die Bundesregierung handelt, um die bestehenden Probleme *in den Griff zu bekommen*" (The Federal Government is working hard *to get a grip on* the existing problems);

"In Baden-Württemberg z. B. wurden vor Jahren die Republikaner kurzzeitig stark, weil die CDU damals ihre Idee der Verschärfung des Asylrechts zwar laut verkündete, aber nicht *in Taten umsetzte*" (For example, several years ago the Republicans had strong support in Baden-Württemberg since the Christian Democratic Union then proclaimed the idea of restricting asylum rights (for migrants) but did not *suit the action to the word*);

"Das müssen wir verhindern und das Problem der Überschuldung durch glaubwürdige Konsolidierung *bei der Wurzel packen*" (We must prevent it and eliminate *the root causes* of large debts through credible consolidation).

Let us consider each of the above-mentioned phraseological units:

in den Griff bekommen [*kriegen* colloquial] (literally "to get a grip on something"). The nuclear element of its meaning is the "skill" seme. In everyday use, this phraseological unit means "to master something; to acquire a skill (proficiency); to get the hang of something". In the context of A. Merkel's political discourse presenting the merits of the German government, the expression takes on connotative meanings: "to be in touch with the situation; to take into account all the pros and cons for a more organized and successful resolution of emerging problems". The use of this phraseological unit characterizes the personality of Frau Merkel, emphasizes her working efficiency and ability to control the situation.

(*etw.*) *in die Tat umsetzen* (literally "to transform into action"). The statement actualizes the "implementation" seme. In this case, the phraseological unit is used in a negative meaning, which creates a connotative background of "regret" about conceived but not realized decisions. According to the Chancellor's historian Gerd Langguth, A. Merkel considers every step for a very long time but if she has decided something, she will never back down until she reaches the goal that she believes to be righteous. She is regarded as a purposeful and thorough politician, ready to go all the way in upholding her decisions and putting them into practice.

The set expression *bei der Wurzel packen* (literally "to strike at the root") reveals the nuclear meaning of "prevention". The phrase develops the idea of eliminating any problem at an early stage (upon its emergence), as well as the suppression of any opportunity for its further development and strengthening. The principles of "clarity" and "prudence" are the key categories not only for the Christian Democratic Union but also for the German (historically Teutonic) everyday philosophy.

A. Merkel often meets with members of the public and has been posting a series of video podcasts on a weekly basis since 2006. She is committed to open communication focused on a productive dialogue but she does not forget about cold calculation. Thus, the statements below reveal the ideological principles typical of the Chancellor:

"Wir müssen den Tatsachen *ins Auge sehen*. *English*. We must face the facts". The phraseological unit *j-m, etw. ins Auge sehen* (literally "to look into the eye" – "not to be afraid to look in the face") with the nuclear seme "courage" emphasizes A. Merkel's readiness to act directly. The connotation of this expression in the German linguocultural community is connected with the ideology of "direct action" declared by the Chancellor.

"Ich habe mein ganzes Leben lang noch nie *einen Hehl daraus gemacht*, dass ich für eine längere Laufzeit von Kernkraftwerken bin" (Never in my life have I made secrets like nuclear power plants do throughout all their existence). In this statement, A. Merkel uses the phraseological unit *kein Hehl aus etw. machen* (literally "not to make a secret out of anything" – not to hide, conceal something). The realized seme "openness" emphasizes the frankness and directness of the German leader. Connotative characteristics are represented by the democratic principle of public access to information for each member of society. Such lexemes as *nie (never)* and *mein ganzes Leben lang (throughout my life)* used in the statement prove that this principle is an integral element of A. Merkel's political position.

A. Merkel's discourse often contains the following expression: "Ich habe *dazu auch Stellung genommen*" (I have a definite opinion on this issue). This phrase contains the phraseological unit *zu etw. Stellung nehmen* (literally "to take a position on something" – to have a certain opinion on any issue; to express one's opinion (point of view) on any issue). The semantics of this set expression includes the "independence" seme manifesting a desire to defend one's position, inviolability of views, conservative tendencies in doing business, and unwillingness to succumb to external influence, which is common to the conservative power concept of the Christian Democratic Union.

The Christian Democratic Union is a supraconfessional association originally based on common Christian values. Let us consider the following examples filled with the corresponding semantics:

"Das Zusammenleben ist ein *Geben und Nehmen*" (Living together means to give and take);

"Sie unterstützen nicht nur Bürgerstiftungen *mit Rat und Tat*, wie auch der Förderpreis zeigt, sondern Sie unterstützen alle, die den richtigen Einstieg zum eigenen Mitwirken in Bürgerstiftungen suchen" (As the prices show, you support not only public funds in word and in deed, but also everyone who is taking the right steps to start their work in public funds);

"Wenn wir einmal fragen, was auch geholfen hat, Menschen *Mut zu machen*, was auch geholfen hat, der Freiheit *zum Durchbruch zu verhelfen*, dann waren es natürlich die Medien, dann waren es die Informationen, die plötzlich nicht mehr aufzuhalten waren" (If we ask ourselves what helped cheer up people, what helped us pave the way for freedom, the answer is clear – it was means, it was information that was no longer concealed).

Results and discussion

The semantics of the above-mentioned statements comprising phraseological units defines the cultural and moral guidelines stated in the ideological and values-based party program. The main seme "morality" is expressed at the denotative level and manifests a

desire to consolidate Christian values, as well as to establish interethnic and interfaith harmony in Germany. The following connotative components are implemented: honesty, common interests, fraternity, and tolerance.

The material we have analyzed demonstrates the phraseological manifestation of ideological concepts of the Christian Democratic Union as it is used in A. Merkel's political discourse. Historically, the Germans were always hostile to politics; therefore, the German political leader has to use the entire toolkit of language means to encourage fellow citizens to take an active part in the country's political life. In this regard, phraseological units play crucial roles and help potential voters fix ideological attitudes of the federal chancellor and the party in power in their consciousness.

The meaning of any message essentially depends on the context that is the most important component of implementing phraseological semantics. Obviously, text analysis cannot ignore the contextual functioning of linguistic units. In other words, context historically acts as the research object and can be used as a tool for linguistic analysis in terms of revealing the ethnocultural features of political phraseology as a reflection of the essential parameters of the language personality of a public figure.

References

Thus, the determination of idiolectal and ethnocentric elements is associated with the concept of textual (author's) space that refracts the space-related notions of native speakers fixed in their linguistic worldview and predetermined by the archetypes of national cultures. In addition, text is regarded as part of the socio-psychological space of society, onto which the associative-verbal model of the politician's language personality is projected. Spatial-temporal parameters of reality perception are nationally specific and are revealed in the preferred use of certain linguistic forms and structures.

The politician's language personality acts as an active element in the functioning of institutional discourse. At the same time, institutional discourse is interpreted as a phenomenon of communication. Institutional communication is carried out through political (ideologized) text that is interpreted as a multi-level communicative structure and carrier of not only idiolectal but also national features of communication. Being part of the discrete process of updating the meaning of an utterance, the idiolectal and ethnocultural components are in dialectic interaction; therefore, there is a good reason to use political text as the basis for analyzing the characterological aspect of an utterance. When analyzing political text, it is also necessary to consider the extralinguistic factors associated with the communicative competence of the recipient of an institutional message.

References

Books

Bolinger, D. *Language – the Loaded Weapon: The Use and Abuse of Language Today*. London and New York: Longman. 1980.

Dolinin, K. A. *Interpretatsiya teksta*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie. 1985.

Gak, V. G. K probleme semanticheskoi sintagmatiki. In: Problemy strukturnoi lingvistiki. Moscow: Nauka. 1972. 367-395.

Grishaeva, L. I. Osobennosti ispolzovaniya yazyka i kulturnaya identichnost kommunikantov. Voronezh: VGU. 2007.

Leikina, B. M. K probleme vzaimodeistviya yazykovykh i neyazykovykh znanii pri osmyslenii rechi. Leningrad: Prosveshchenie. 1974.

Lotman, Yu. M. Vnutri myslyashchikh mirov. Chelovek – tekst – semiosfera – istoriya. Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kultury. 1999.

Neubert, A. Zu Gegenstand und Grundbegriffen einer marxistisch-leninistischen Soziolinguistik. In: Beitrage zur Soziolinguistik. Halle (Saale). 1974.

Paducheva, E. V. Semanticheskie issledovaniya (Semantika vremeni i vida v russkom yazyke; Semantika narrativa). Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kultury. 1996.

Referovskaya, E.A. Lingvisticheskie issledovaniya struktury teksta. Leningrad: Nauka. 1983.

Schmidt, W. Zur Ideologiegebundenheit der politischen Lexik. Zeitschr. für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung. 1969.

Sedykh, A. P. y Buzinova, L. M. Frantsuzskaya yazykovaya lichnost: Akademicheskii i khromaticheskii diskurs. Moscow: LENAND. 2019.

Teliya, V.N. Vtorichnaya nominatsiya i ee vidy. In: Yazykovaya nominatsiya. Moscow: Nauka. 1977. 129-222.

Tsurikova, L. V. Problema estestvennosti diskursa v mezhkulturnoi kommunikatsii. Voronezh: Izd-vo Voronezh. un-ta. 2002.

Vinogradov, V. V. Osnovnye tipy leksicheskikh znachenii slova. In: Voprosy yazykoznaniya. AN SSSR. 1953.

Scientific conferences

Ganapolskaya, E. V. Svobodnoe slovo ili ezopov yazyk? (Frazeologiya kak sredstvo sovremennoi politicheskoi kommunikatsii). The collection of scientific articles "Aktualnye problemy teorii kommunikatsii". Saint Petersburg: Izd-vo SPbGPU. 2004. 108-112.

Journal articles

German, N. F. "Lingvokulturnaya identichnost subekta kommunikatsii". Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filosofiya. Sotsiologiya. Kulturologiya, num 11 Vol: 149 (2009): 63-66.

Muskhelishvili, N. L. y Schreider, Yu. A. "Postizhenie versus ponimanie". Semiotika: Tr. po znakovym sistemam, num 23 (1989): 3-17.

Sedykh, A. P. “Spetsifika rechevogo vozdeistviya Zhaka Shiraka”. Politicheskaya lingvistika, num 1 Vol: 35 (2011): 24-29.

Sedykh, A. P.; Buzinova, L. M.; Bakirova, N. V.; Tsvetova, N. S. y Kovalenko, B. N. “The sign, linguistic analysis, idioethnic interpretation of communication and linguistic persona”. International Journal of Engineering and Technology (UAE), num 7(4.38) (2018): 100-104.

Sedykh, A. P.; Ivanishcheva, O. N.; Koreneva, A. V. y Ryzhkova, I. V. “Modern philological knowledge: anthropocentrism and linguistic identity”. International Journal of Engineering and Technology (UAE), num 7(4.38) (2018): 447-451.

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo debe hacerse con permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**.

DR. ARKADIY PETROVICH SEDYKH / PH. D (C) NATALIA MIKHAILOVNA DUGALICH
PH. D. (C) ELENA GRIGORYEVNA DMITRIEVA PH. D. (C) ZULFIYA AKHATOVNA USMANOVA
XX. MILANA EVGENYEVNA KUPRIYANOVA