

SERBIAN PRESIDENTIAL (PRE-)ELECTION SLOGANS: TEXTUAL AND ILLOCUTIONARY ASPECT¹

Abstract: Slogans are a kind of „primitive symbolic action“, defined as sublimated short forms sometimes containing some elements of political ideas/ideologies, but usually containing buzz-words that (are supposed to) attract the attention of an auditorium. Our aim is to analyse five slogans from the 2012 presidential elections slogans from the standpoint of textual linguistics, and to establish if whether there is a connection of these findings with pragmatics, i.e. with an interpretation of the illocutionary point of slogans.

Key words: political slogan, macrostructure and macroproposition, illocutionary force

1. Preliminary facts: communication – political communication (PC) – political slogan

Let me begin this analysis with a broader definition of communication and then proceed to the notion of political communication (PC), finally arriving at the notion of a political slogan and establishing its place in the versatile and branchy contemporary political communication. John Fiske (1990: 1) says that „communication is one of those human activities that everyone recognizes but few can define satisfactorily“, still assuming that:

- all communication involves *signs* and *codes*. Signs are artefacts or acts that refer to something other than themselves; i.e. they are signifying constructs. Codes are the systems into which signs are organized and which determine how signs may be related to each other;
- these signs and codes are *transmitted* or *made available* to others: and that transmitting or receiving signs/codes/communication is the practice of social relationships;
- communication is central to the life of our *culture*: without it, culture of any kind must die (Fiske, 1990: 1□2).

Fiske concludes his inventory of points, which are assumed under the notion of communication, stressing that „underlying these assumptions is a general definition of communication as *social interaction through messages*“ (ibid., 2). Now, if the crucial

¹ This paper is part of an ongoing research project – *Standard Serbian Language: Syntactic, Semantic and Pragmatic Research* (178004) [*Standardni srpski jezik: sintaksička, semantička i pragmatička istraživanja*] – funded by Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Republic of Serbia.

elements of Fiske's „assumed“ points are taken into the account, and these would pertain to: *sign/code*, then to persons involved – *sender/receiver*, or better said, the speaker's intention to convey a message and the listener's reception of what has been said and possible feedback, and finally to *time, place* and the broader cultural *context* of the whole event, then one could end up with the following definition of political communication □ it is human interaction where at least one side of the communication scheme is occupied by *political persona*, and such interaction is *of social*, but more accurately and directly, *political importance, realized through the exchange of information—directly or indirectly via different media* □ *in a spatially and timely determined psycho-social context with instant effects or some political consequences.*

Robert Denton and Gary Woodward (1998: 11), in their book *Political Communication in America*, portray PC as the „ways and intentions of message senders to influence the political environment“. These „ways and intentions“ include public discussion, but also the authority to sanction and make decisions. In their words, „the crucial factor that makes communication ‘political’ is not the source of a message, but its content and purpose“ (ibid.). On the other hand, Dubravko Škiljan (1998), in the book *Javni jezik* [Public Language], makes rather the opposite assumption, stating that precisely the source, or a person's role in society is the determining factor in defining some communication as political. Recognizing the significance of the sociolinguistic dichotomy *public – private*, inter alia, for the determination of the notion of political discourse, Škiljan (1998: 22) devotes a significant part of the analysis to this topic. Seeking criteria on which he would base the delimitation of political discourse from other public discourses, which would tell us more about the real nature of political discourse, Škiljan encounters the problem: neither the form nor the content of utterances taken from political texts possesses distinctive linguistic traits. It is a mistake, claims Škiljan, to think that public language and, for that matter, political language, in terms of the content of message, „refers exclusively to problems that belong to the *general interest* of the community or society, because people can also talk about certain societal topics in a completely private sphere“ (ibid.).² Likewise, although in most cases there are differences in the formal language of the public discourse in comparison with private communication, „nothing prevents participants in private communication to use the standard (formal) language that corresponds to the formal requirements of public communication“ (ibid., 23). Škiljan concludes that although the content of the message and the form of the message, as well as a communication channel, might be very important and have even an essential influence on the character of communication, nevertheless the only thing that differentiates the public from private communication is – the status and the role of the communicator: in public communication, the „status and the role of its participants collectively, explicitly or implicitly, is verified as public [...]“ (ibid., 29). Focusing more on calculated and planned aspects of PC, David Swanson and Dan Nimmo assert (1990: 9) that political communication is „strategic

² All the excerpts and quotations from texts (and speeches) originally written (or delivered) in Serbian (Serbo-Croatian) language were translated into English by the author of this paper.

use of communicative means to influence public knowledge, beliefs, and action on political matters“. They emphasize the strategic nature of political communication, highlighting the role of persuasion in political discourse, but fall short of making it an exclusive characteristic of PC, since strategic nature, maybe most obvious in PC, is certainly not limited only to the political communication. Brian McNair (2003: 24) also provides a similar definition when he writes that political communication is „purposeful communication about politics“.

It can be further postulated that the field of political communication encompasses two main areas: (a) *election campaigns* and (b) *government operations*. I shall concern myself in this paper only with the first area, i.e. with one aspect of election campaigns – *political slogans*. I draw on Slavujević’s definition of a political slogan as a starting point in my analysis: „slogans (i) either express those elements of the identity/individuality of the [...] political candidate – that the candidate wants to make recognizable and accepted the facet of her/his image all the way throughout her/his positioning in the multidimensional space of a political setting –, or (ii) the slogans express elements of political goals that the party/candidate wants to emphasize in order to motivate supporters for certain political engagement and to mobilize them for concrete policy actions“ (Slavujević, 2005: 48).

North Roberts et al. (2012: xxiii) claim that though „political rhetoric is as old as politics, dating at least to the establishment of democracy in Athens [...] [and that] the concise thematic and provocative political phrase is at least as old as Cato’s cry of *Carthago delenda est*, presidential campaign slogans remain an innovation in the grand scheme of things“.

Previous research on slogans was mainly, as far as this author knows, conducted in the field of social sciences, especially political science, at least in our scientific community. Slavujević’s paper is a good example of such an approach. Recently, however, in the study of B. Mišić Ilić and S. Blagojević (2007) Serbian political slogans were for the first time analysed from a linguistic standpoint. The authors wrote about the „seductive language of election campaigns“, thoroughly examining □ lexical, grammatical and pragmatic □ features of political slogans from 2007 parliamentary elections. My paper makes an endeavour to extend this sort of analysis of slogans in this case from 2012 presidential elections predominantly from a text linguistic and pragmatic perspective.

2. Aim of the analysis

In the studies on political communication and especially on political slogans, though relatively scarce on this genre, it can be distinguished between two hypotheses posited concerning the *autonomy* or *identity* of a slogan: according to one opinion, a slogan is, in principle, an *independent textual form*, which may, but need not, stand in conjunction or some sort of relation with other political texts of the respective candidate/party. According to the other opinion, a slogan is a *derivative political text* and, therefore, its autonomy is not complete, and it moreover can be considered

as the derived/condensed content of other text(s), understanding slogans as some kind of *parasitic texts*. Because of their usually monopropositional form,³ slogans seem to be malleable to Austinian (1962) or Searleian (1969) analysis within the frames of Speech Act Theory. What is, however, a particular challenge in this kind of examination, i.e. in determining illocutionary force of slogan(s) is the reductive form, often the extreme ellipsis, multi-constituent omissions, in slogans. Inasmuch the theory of context and relevance proves very significant, for it is only by including these parameters that makes the illocutionary force of slogans determinable. In this paper, the author's attention is dedicated to the examination of (a) the textual and (b) illocutionary status of slogans and (c) to the determination of ties between slogans and pre-election speeches. The author sets out also to determine which of the two hypotheses is supported by the analysed empirical material: (a₁) are examined slogans completely *autonomous/independent textual forms* or (a₂) are they *derivative political texts*.

3. Corpus. Theoretical and methodological frame of the analysis

The central kernel corpus for this study consists of five slogans used in the 2012 presidential elections: *Clearly. Firmly. Resolutely.* [Jasno. Čvrsto. Odlučno.] – Ivica Dačić; *Business. Investments. Safety/Certainty.* [Posao. Investicije. Sigurnost.] – Boris Tadić; *For Serbia. You know why.* [Za Srbiju – znaš zašto] – Vojislav Koštunica; *Truth! [Istina!]* – Čedomir Jovanović; *A fair and successful Serbia.* [Poštena i uspešna Srbija] – Tomislav Nikolić. An additional corpus is composed of five pre-election speeches delivered at the party conventions in 2012 by the five aforementioned presidential candidates.⁴ The analysis consists of comparing slogans with pre-election speeches in order to ascertain if there are any relations between them, and if it happens that these relations exist, how can they be accounted for and, finally, based on these findings, if there is a possibility of determining the illocutionary force of these slogans.

³ Lexeme *slogan* is etymologically derived from sc-gael. *slogorn* (Scottish Gaelic *sluagh-ghairm tanmay=sluagh* „army“, „host“ + *gairm* „cry“). This diachronic aspect vividly depicts the nature of contemporary slogans (or *taglines/straplines*, as they are called in marketing and industrial advertizing) – they represent short, compressed, detailless, and (usually) recognizable phrases, easily memorized and (relatively) potent and motivating.

⁴ These are information concerning dates and places where the speeches were delivered:
Ivica Dačić – final Convention rally of Socialist Party of Serbia, in Beogradska Arena, on the 21st of April, 2012
Boris Tadić – final Convention rally of Democratic Party, in Beogradska Arena, on the 2nd of May, 2012
Vojislav Koštunica – final Convention rally of Democratic Party of Serbia, in Sava Centar, on the 2nd of May, 2012
Čedomir Jovanović – final Convention rally of Liberal Democratic Party, in Sava centar, on the 25th of March, 2012
Tomislav Nikolić – final Convention rally of Serbian Progressive Party, in Sava centar, on the 15th of May, 2012

In order to connect, on the one hand, the pre-election convention speeches which presidential candidates delivered at final party rallies and, on the other hand, the slogans they used throughout the campaign, I shall turn to Teun van Dijk's (1977; 1980) theory of macropropositions and global structures. After the initial enthusiasm and success of text linguistics as a new-born linguistic discipline, it had soon become apparent that still much about text production and text comprehension was not clear and not satisfactorily explained in text grammar methodology. So it came as no surprise that cognitive (mental) concepts found its way into text linguistics, which soon afterwards resulted in various (but still immanently connected) approaches that insisted on the intertwining and interdependence of cognitive and textual (discourse) structures. One of such concepts – devised primarily in the field of psychological theorizing – was the notion of *macropropositions*, and other *macrostructures*, used by Van Dijk (1977; 1980) and Kintsch & Van Dijk (1978) for the analysis of different sorts of texts. Van Dijk maintained that global, or macro, structures are the result of „fundamental cognitive principles operating in the ways we process this kind of highly complex information from the social situation“ (Van Dijk, 1980: 2).⁵ To elaborate it slightly more:

„Instead of saying that we see, interpret, focus upon, etc., a certain object from a certain distance, we may also say that we do all this on various levels, a more specific or particular level, and a more general or abstract level, respectively. In this case the details of the lower, more specific level may be said to be 'ignored' at the higher, more general level. From this particular intuitive distinction between global and local structures we see for the first time that the relation between these structures may take the form of certain cognitive operations, of generalization or abstraction on the one hand and of specification or particularization on the other hand.“ (Van Dijk, 1980: 4).

Actually, this distinction between local and global structures, or more specific and more general units, „can be linked to the notion of relevance, since only what is important for somebody, speaker or hearer, determines the path and degree of generalization/abstraction: the parts or details of the lower, more specific levels are associated with the notion of a lower degree of relevance or importance, whereas the larger parts, the whole, at a more general level are associated with higher degrees of relevance or importance“ (Van Dijk, 1980: 4).

Van Dijk's theory of macrostructures is all-encompassing: he intends to formulate such a theory that would account for macrostructures and macrooperations on three different levels – cognitive, societal and discourse (language). I shall confine this analysis of slogans only to the discourse level, because

„in a *theory of discourse* the notion of macrostructure has a more limited function. It is used to account for the various notions of global meaning, such as topic, theme, or gist. This implies that macrostructures in discourse are semantic objects. According to the principles of explicit semantics, this means that rules of some kind must be

⁵ The meticulous and detailed analysis of macrostructures and macrooperations, their cognitive (psychological) base and application in their model of text comprehension and production Kintsch and Van Dijk explained in the 1978 paper.

formulated to relate meanings of words and sentences (i.e., local structures) to the semantic macrostructures.“ (Van Dijk, 1980: 10).

The task I undertake in this paper, among others, is to determine if there is a connection between slogans (as simple genre) and pre-election speeches (as complex genre). This (rather) naive hypothesis is made more complex further in the text: I am intrigued whether there is enough justification to treat presidential slogans as macropropositions of pre-election presidential speeches. This means that I assume there are much more substantial and significant relations between slogans and political speeches that could be accounted for in terms of Van Dijk's theory: slogans as macropropositions and political speeches as a matrix for micro (or local) propositions.

Macrostructures are, posits Van Dijk (1980: v), „higher-level semantic or conceptual structures that organize the 'local' microstructures of discourse, interaction, and their cognitive processing“. Why is such a postulation of this type of structures psychologically and cognitively sound? The answer seems to be self-evident, but also empirically, through psychological research and experiments, confirmed: when dealing with complex texts which contain a great amount of information and consequently require a lot of processing to gain some effects, only those structures and elements that seem to be most significant, for the recipient of the message, get remembered and stored to be available later for further deployment while the rest gets „deleted“, vacating the place to be loaded with some other relevant new data. Van Dijk (1980: vi) states that macrostructures are „required in the understanding, organization, and reduction of complex information. Without them, the planning and execution of complex interaction sequences and discourses, as well as their comprehension, memory representation, retrieval, and recall, would not be possible“.

The notion of significance/importance of some information for a recipient, underlined in the previous passage, is obviously very difficult, if at all possible, to be measured objectively; it is a subjective notion depending on the recipient's appraisal of what might be relevant for her/him in the present and future time, and this appraisal rests on a broader and narrower social and communicative context as well as on the recipient's knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, wishes (= *cognitive set*) etc.:

„[...] we see first of all that the derivation of macropropositions is very much *socioculturally* determined: Given certain acts and events, it definitely depends on social frames and cultural *norms* and *values* what we consider to be the global event or action now going on. Of course we observe this most clearly as soon as we make inferences about the global personality characteristics of story participants.“ (Van Dijk, 1980: 55).

Since the cognitive set of each language user is unique and different from the cognitive sets of any other individual, it is not surprising that „different readers/hearers, at different moments and for different texts“ reach different interpretations and comprehend texts in non-identical ways; one should remind oneself here of the well-known Barthes' *credo* summarized in the phrase: *the death of the author*. To conclude this theoretical passage, it is the cognitive *schema*, which predetermines what the significant text data are. What we propose to do in this paper, however, is to try to abstract as much as possible from „the many cognitive differences between language users, which may lead to

partially different macrostructures of the same text“ (ibid.), and by applying macrorules to see if there is a stronger link between the slogan and the corresponding speech.

In order to do this, it is important to understand the nature of macrorules. What kind of rules are these? Macrorules are „general rules that link textual propositions with the macropropositions used to define the global topic of a fragment“ (Van Dijk, 1980: 46). These rules rest on semantic derivation or inferencing rules:

„They derive macrostructures from microstructures. [...] the rules are *reductive* in certain respects. Second, the rules also allow certain elements to be combined in new, more complex units of information, so the rules also have a *constructive* nature. Finally, the rules take (sub-) sequences of propositions together by linking them to one macroproposition, which exhibits the *organizational* aspect of the rules.“ (Van Dijk, 1980: 46).

Macrorules can be divided into the following types:

- (a) *Deletion* □ by this macrorule it is possible to delete all those „propositions of the text base which are not relevant for the interpretation of other propositions of the discourse“ (ibid.) or *selection* □ only relevant propositions, which are necessary for the „interpretation conditions (presuppositions) of other propositions in the text base“, are selected.
- (b) *Generalization* □ this rule generalizes and abstracts „from semantic detail in the respective sentences by constructing a proposition that is conceptually more general“, i.e. subsuming several predicates under the one, more abstract and semantically more depleted, which functions as a common denominator, representing „the superset of the property or relation denoted“, (ibid., 47).
- (c) *Construction* □ according to this rule, micropropositions are substituted by a macroproposition that contains a predicate which „takes together“ more or less a stereotypical sequence of events into one complex action.⁶

4. Analysis and discussion

Returning to the first question outlined in the introductory part of the paper □ is slogan an autonomous or „parasitic“, derivative type of text – will be a starting point in my analysis. This question is closely linked with the second question: what is the illocutionary force of slogans. A comparative examination of slogans and pre-election speeches⁷ of five presidential candidates should suffice to answer the questions posed.

⁶ There is actually one more macrorule that is registered in Van Dijk’s (1980: 48□49) list: *zero rule* – this rule leaves „propositions ’intact’ by admitting them directly at the macrolevel“. Van Dijk notices (ibid.) that the application of this rule is especially convenient in dealing with „short discourses (e.g., one-sentence discourses)“, i.e. in those cases „where microstructure and macrostructure simply may coincide“. Since slogans can be understood as „short discourses“, the zero rule might become adequate in this analysis.

⁷ As it will become obvious further in the paper, one step in this sort of Van Dijkian analysis had to be skipped, namely I had to omit all those segments of these long speeches that did not pertain to the central topic of the speech. This means that one (the first) phase of forming macropropositions had already been finished, so that an analysis could start from the second phase. Just for the sake of simplicity (and uniformity) of analysis, quoted segments will be annotated as micropropositions out of which I will derive macropropositions.

(a) The first example is Ivica Dačić's slogan and several segments of his pre-election speech:⁸

(i) Our policy is clear. After all, we are the first and the only major political party that has submitted an electoral list during the day. It is so, because our policy is clear as daylight. All others did it secretly, at night. What are they hiding? They're hiding something from their own people. Our policy is clear on all issues that are important for the state of Serbia. = Clearly

(ii) (...) And, of course, among all my friends and associates and advisers, I especially want to greet Isidora Bjelica, who is here with us. But I'm not going to allow her to speak, because I do not know what she is going to say. And since she told me that she found the slogan „Firm(ly)“ most exciting, I have decided that she will not be allowed to address you. [...] We need economic development, we need a just society, we need a safe and firm hand that will lead our country. [...] And I believe in what I'm saying, and I'm firm in the defense of what I have defined as our national goal. = Firm(ly)

(iii) I want to be a Serb just as Cameron can be English or Orban Hungarian. If they can say NO to the EU, which conditioned them in relation to some internal issues, so can we, when they want to steal and kidnap Kosovo and Metohija from us. Serbia needs a better, more resolute and effective management of the state. Serbia needs a responsible government, which will lead Serbia through the economic crisis without much problem, and which will defend the interests of the Serbian people and try to

⁸ In footnotes I shall give original excerpts from corresponding pre-election speeches. This excerpt is from Ivica Dačić's speech:

Naša politika je *jasna*. Uostalom mi smo prvi i jedini od velikih političkih stranaka podneli našu izbornu listu po danu. Zato što je naša politika *jasna kao dan*. Svi oni su išli krišom, noću. Od čega se kriju? Kriju se od svoga naroda. Naša politika je *jasna* po svim pitanjima koja su važna za državu Srbiju. = *Jasno*

I naravno uz sve ove moje prijatelje i saradnike i savetnike želim da pozdravim Isidoru Bjelicu koja je ovde sa nama. Ali neću da joj dam reč zato što ne znam šta će da kaže. A pošto mi je najavila da bi najviše pričala o tome da je kod žena na najviše oduševljenja naišao ovaj slogan „*Čvrsto*“, onda sam rešio da joj ne dam reč. [...] Treba nam ekonomski razvoj, treba nam pravednije društvo, treba nam sigurna i *čvrsta* ruka koja će da vodi ovu zemlju. [...] jer ja jasno govorim šta ću da radim i *čvrst* sam u odbrani onoga što definišem kao državni i nacionalni cilj. = *Čvrsto*

Ja ne želim da budem manje Srbin nego što je Kameron engleski premijer manje Englez, ili što je Orban manje Mađar. Kad oni mogu da kažu *ne* EU koja ih uslovljava sa nekim unutrašnjim pitanjima, pa valjda možemo i mi kada hoće da nam otmu Kosovo i Metohiju. Srbiji treba bolje rukovođenje državom, *odlučnije* i efikasniji. Treba joj odgovorna vlast koja će što bezbolnije da povede Srbiju kroz ekonomsku krizu. Da odbrani što više srpskih interesa i da pokuša, naravno, da ostvari kompromis sa Evropom. Treba nam *odlučnost*, treba nam da predsednik i Vlada Srbije koja će proisteći iz ove Koalicije sa PUPS i JS da jednostavno donosi odluke, da vodi ovu zemlju, da rešava probleme. = *Odlučno*

Samo onaj koji *jasno* zna šta hoće, samo onaj koji je dovoljno *čvrst* i koji je spreman da *odlučuje* može i zaslužuje da vodi ovu zemlju. = *Jasno. Čvrsto. Odlučno.*

achieve a compromise with Europe. We need resoluteness, we need a president and a government of Serbia who will come out as a result from our coalition with PUPS and JS, and who will non-hesitantly reach decisions and lead this country and solve problems. = Resolutely

 (iv) Only someone who clearly knows what he wants, who is firm enough and who is able to make decisions, deserves to lead this country. = Clearly. Firmly. Decisively.

In three separate segments of Dačić’s speech, a direct correlation with the lexemes used also in Dačić’s presidential slogan can be found: *Clearly. Firmly. Resolutely.* [*Jasno. Čvrsto. Odlučno.*] Within each of these three segments, a specific correlative word has been singled out. Moreover, in the fourth detached segment of the speech, the speaker explicates in a statement all three slogan lexemes, giving a photo-robot picture of an ideal politician.

Revisiting the macrorules and its appliance to the text in question, I am going to examine if the semantic mapping between local and global structures is possible and whether this semantic information reduction can be achieved by application of these rules.

In segment (i) the speaker talks how his party policy is clear. Applying the macrorule of deletion and crossing out those constituents and propositions of the text segment base, which are irrelevant for the interpretation of other propositions of that segment, the following table is reached:

<i>input micropropositions of segment (i)</i>	<i>macrooperations</i>	<i>provisional macropropositions</i>
Our [party] policy is clear.	zero deletion	Our [party] policy is clear.
After all, we are the first and the only major political party that has submitted an electoral list during the day.	strong deletion	-
All others did it secretly, at night.	strong deletion	-
What are they hiding? They're hiding something from their own people.	strong deletion	-
Our policy is clear on all issues that are important for the state of Serbia.	deletion	Our [party] policy is clear.

The same macroproposition is practically repeated, and so the macroproposition of segment (i) can be worded: *Our policy is clear* [=We have a clear agenda of what is to be done], and then, by mere *pars pro toto* substitution of the possessive pronoun (*our*→*my*), it easily becomes an unambiguous indication of what this lexeme in the slogan means: *I* [→*Ivica Dačić*] *have a clear policy/course of action.*

In segment (ii) the speaker explicates how he is *firm in defending the national goal(s)*. Applying the macrooperations on this segment, the following table is construed:



<i>input micropropositions of segment (ii)</i>	<i>macrooperations</i>	<i>provisional macropropositions</i>
[...] And, of course, among all my friends and associates and advisers, I especially want to greet Isidora Bjelica, who is here with us.	strong deletion	-
But I'm not going to allow her to speak...	strong deletion	-
... because I do not know what she is going to say.	strong deletion	-
And since she told me that she found the slogan „ <u>Firm</u> (ly)“ most exciting, I have decided that she will not be allowed to address you.	strong deletion	-
[...] We need economic development, we need a just society, we need a safe and <u>firm</u> hand that will lead our country. [...]	deletion	Serbia needs a safe and <u>firm</u> hand to lead her. M1
And I believe in what I'm saying and I'm <u>firm</u> in the defense of what I have defined as our national goal.	deletion	I'm <u>firm</u> in defending our national goal. M2

From segment (ii), I reduced the semantic information to two macropropositions: M1 and M2. These macropropositions can be further processed and compressed into another macroproposition, but at even more abstract level, M'—*I am a firm leader, precisely for Serbia.*

In segment (iii) the speaker explains how he and his party are resolute—is *firm in defending the national goal(s)*. Applying the macrooperations on this segment, the following table is construed:

<i>input micropropositions of segment (iii)</i>	<i>Macrooperations</i>	<i>provisional macropropositions</i>
I want to be a Serb just as Cameron can be English or Orban Hungarian.	strong deletion	-
If they can say NO to the EU, which conditioned them in relation to some internal issues, so can we, when they want to steal and kidnap Kosovo and Metohija from us.	strong deletion	-
Serbia needs better, more <u>resolute</u> and effective management of the state.	Deletion	Serbia needs resolute management. M1
Serbia needs a responsible government which will lead Serbia through the economic crisis without much problem, and which will defend the interests of the Serbian people and try to achieve a compromise with Europe.	Deletion	Serbia needs a responsible government in times of crisis. M2

<p>We need <u>resoluteness</u>, we need a president and a government of Serbia who will come out as a result from our coalition with PUPS and JS, and who will non-hesitantly reach <u>decisions</u> and lead this country and solve problems.</p>	<p>Deletion</p>	<p>My party and I represent resolute people. M3</p>
--	-----------------	---

From segment (iii), semantic information is reduced to three macropropositions: M1, M2 and M3. These macropropositions can be further processed and compressed into another macroproposition, but at an even more abstract level, M³—*I am a resolute leader, capable of making tough and crucial decisions.*

As a final point, I turn to the last extract: segment (iv) from Dačić’s pre-election speech (iv). In this, though detached, segment of the speech, the speaker enumerates in a single statement all three slogan lexemes □ *Clearly. Firmly. Resolutely.* □ thus giving a photo-robot picture of an ideal politician. And, of course, there is only one politician who satisfies these parameters. From an originally generalized statement, grammatically realized through three non-referential relative clauses, the audience ends up with an unambiguous determination of personal reference □ it’s the speaker himself!

Answering the questions initially posed: what is the relationship of slogans with the genre of political speech, and what is the textual and illocutionary nature of a slogan, it can be concluded that the slogan can be interpreted as a depleted macroproposition of political speech. Confirmation of slogan lexemes in a pre-election speech and their importance in the speech, as a kind of key words, corroborate indubitable association between slogans and political speech. Against the postulates of Van Dijk’s text linguistics theory, more precisely macropropositional theory, a slogan can be interpreted as a macro-proposition, and accordingly as a macroillocution. But even more, pragmatically and socio-semantically speaking, this conclusion simply imposes itself in the example analyzed: the speaker has actually performed auto-portraying/ auto-representation in the most condensed way: he summed it up in a political slogan. And, if I now go back to the slogan perspective from the pre-election speech, I can safely transpose this established macroillocution of speech to the illocution of the slogan, making it thus the illocutionary point of the slogan.

Then, the illocutionary point of this slogan can be interpreted as an assertive statement, assertion, of evaluative type: *My plan/course of actions is clear, and my performance is firm and resolute.*

(b) The second example is Boris Tadić’s slogan: *Business – Investments – Security/Safety*, and the excerpt from his pre-election speech:⁹

⁹ Original excerpt from the speech:

Ogromna većina ljudi biće nadomak auto-puteva i to će otvoriti perspektive za nove *investicije*. [...] Krupan kapital, *investicije*, neće doći u onu zemlju koja nije integrisana. Neće doći u onu zemlju koja nije bezbedna, u kojoj kapital nema garanciju, zakonodavnu i svaku drugu. Danas oni koji žele da se Srbija ne razvija u tom pravcu, prosto ne razumeju, ili ne žele da razumeju vreme u kome žive. A integrisana i standardizovana Srbija donosi nove *investicije*, bez kojih nema novih radnih mesta, bez kojih nema *zapošljavanja*, bez kojih nema boljeg standarda, bez kojih nema boljeg



(i) The vast majority of people will be within reach of motorways. This will open up prospects for new investments. [...] major capital investments will not come to a country that is not well (inter)connected. Capital investments will not come to a country that is not safe or does not provide – legislative or of any other type – guarantees for capital investments. Today, those who do not wish Serbia to continue developing simply do not understand or do not want to understand the time in which they live. An integrated and standardized Serbia attracts new investments, without which there will be no new jobs, there will be no further employment, without investments there is no chance for a better standard, and without a better standard there is no better life in Serbia

(ii) We want also to bring the companies from Russia, from China, from wherever, if they would bring us first-rate investors, because the battle for the workplace is the biggest battle of our time.

(iii) Do they represent people with the moral fiber? People, who will remain tough and firm after they made a choice to, despite the risks, withstand every attack of wind, every thunder of the storm. Do they represent people who can offer security to every child? Would the citizens of Serbia put the fate of their children in the hands of these people? I am convinced that they would not, because the citizens of Serbia want security, they want stability. [...]

In segment (i) the speaker talks about the need for new investments. This can be illustrated in the following table:

<i>input micropropositions of segment (i)</i>	<i>macrooperations</i>	<i>provisional macropropositions</i>
The vast majority of people will be within reach of motorways. This will open up prospects for new investments. [...] major capital investments will not come to a country that is not well (inter)connected.	strong deletion deletion	Serbia needs motorways. M1
Capital investments will not come to a country that is not safe or does not provide – legislative or of any other type – guarantees for capital investments.	deletion	Serbia needs to provide legislative guarantees for investors. M2
Today, those who do not wish Serbia to continue developing simply do not understand or do not want to understand the time in which they live.	strong deletion	-

života u Srbiji...

Želimo da dovedemo i preduzeća iz Rusije, iz Kine, odakle god da dođu dobri investitori, jer borba za *radno mesto* je najveća borba ovoga vremena.

Da li su to oni ljudi koji imaju karakter da izaberu i da ostanu čvrsto, uprkos rizicima, da izdrže svaki udar vetra, svaki udar ledene oluje, da li su to ljudi koji nude *sigurnost* svakom detetu? Da li bi građani Srbije tim ljudima u ruke dali sudbinu svoje dece? Ja sam ubeden da ne bi, zbog toga što građani Srbije žele *sigurnost*, žele stabilnost. Građani Srbije veoma dobro znaju da nema vlade u Srbiji koja se neće suočiti sa problemima i svet je ophrvan problemima većim nego u čitavim sto godina koje su iza nas [...].

An integrated and standardized Serbia attracts new investments [...]	deletion	Serbia must be integrated in order to attract new investments. M3
[...] without which there will be no new jobs, there will be no further employment, without investments there is no chance for a better standard [...]	deletion	Investments mean new jobs and bigger employment. M4
[...] and without a better standard there is no better life in Serbia.	deletion	Bigger employment means better life. M5

From segment (i) I reduced semantic information to five macropropositions: M1-M5. M2. These macropropositions can be further processed and compressed into another macroproposition, but at even more abstract level, M' □ *Serbia needs more investments.*

From the rather short segment (ii), the macroproposition is relatively easy to abstract □ *Serbia needs more jobs/workplaces.*

Finally, in segment (iii) the presidential candidate alludes to one more important, existential issue □ *safety and security.*

<i>input micropropositions of segment (ii)</i>	<i>macrooperations</i>	<i>provisional macropropositions</i>
Do they represent people with the moral fiber? People, who will remain tough and firm after they made a choice to, despite the risks, withstand every attack of wind, every thunder of the storm. Do they represent people who can offer security to every child? Would the citizens of Serbia put the fate of their children in the hands of these people?	strong deletion	-
I am convinced that they would not, because the citizens of Serbia want security, they want stability. [...]	deletion	Serbia needs security and stability.

In the larger part of segment (iii) the speaker makes a rather obvious allusion to the opposition leaders, reproaching them that they are not competent politicians. In the last part of this segment, however, he states what is needed so that Serbia could prosper – security and stability.

It becomes clear that the message of the slogan is: Serbia needs *more workplaces (jobs)* □ due to more *investments* □ and this will bring long awaited *security and stability* to the country. And the implication is that the presidential candidate □ Boris Tadić □ is the right person for this entrepreneurship.

In comparison with example (a), example (b) exhibits somewhat different illocutionary properties, namely, the illocutionary point of the second slogan is not of an assertive, but rather of a commissive type. Furthermore, as far as the content is concerned, while adjectives/adverbs, depending on whether they are interpreted as

nominal or verbal modifiers, *Clear(ly) – Firm(ly) – Decisive(ly)* portray the person, or a mode of action/process, and thus fit into the class of the so called slogan-image type, the latter slogan, *Business. Investments. Safety.*, could be more appropriately described as a theme-slogan: describing what will the candidate, if elected, do. Therefore, I find that this slogan better corresponds to a commissive rather than to an assertive illocutionary force: *We guarantee safety, and that will bring investors/investments, providing new jobs.*

(c) Unlike the previous two, the third slogan *For Serbia – You know why* is not a verb-less type of slogan although there are some omitted sentential constituents in this example as well. Vojislav Koštunica, presidential candidate of the Democratic Party of Serbia, addressed the voters in presidential elections with a slogan containing one (buzz) central word – *Serbia*.

In a contrast with the previous two slogans, this one seems to be far more general. The slogan is centralized around the proper noun *Serbia*, and it does not offer much else, but, unlike the other slogans so far, it does offer an additional utterance as a sort of justification (*You know why*).

If we take a look at Koštunica's pre-election speech, centrality of the proper name *Serbia* is most clearly seen at the beginning of the candidate's speeches:¹⁰

Dear friends, there is a word that is always in our thoughts and in our hearts. With this word you greeted me as I came to podium. With the same word I will now reciprocate to you: *Serbia!* And the other word, inextricably linked with it, is – *Freedom! For Free Serbia!*

This model of slogan formulation is, obviously, very popular with this candidate and his party, because in the presidential elections in 2002, Vojislav Koštunica used a similar slogan: *President. Serbia knows*. Ten years later, a slight modification of the slogan formulation was presented to the voters: initial position being occupied by the accusative PP *For Serbia*, with the semantic role, if the slogan had been developed into a full predicate sentence, of beneficent/recipient.

Attention must be paid to the friendly form used in the second part of the slogan, with the verb in the 2nd pers. sing. *you know* [*znaš*], as if the speaker addresses each citizen individually, reminding him/her of something that is already known. In this case, it looks like as if there is a (pseudo)dialog between the sender of the slogan message (Koštunica) and voter(s). Everything other than that is completely implicit and unclear or vague. Vagueness arises from the use of the prepositional construction *For Serbia*, that is inherently vague, since it is not stated precisely what the sender exactly means.

For the reason of lexeme reductiveness in the slogan, on one hand, and its generality, on the other, different interpretations of illocutionary force of the slogan are possible. Therefore, I have to turn to Koštunica's pre-election speech, and more

¹⁰ Original excerpt from Koštunica's speech:

Dragi prijatelji, ima jedna reč koja nam je svima u mislima i na srcu. S njom ste počeli i njome se obratili. S tom istom reči i ja vama sada uzvraćam: *Srbija!* A druga reč, nerazdvojno povezana s njom je – sloboda. Za slobodnu *Srbiju!*

precisely, to the very beginning of this speech quoted above, in order to obtain a better indication as to what might be the illocutionary point of the speech. The topic of his pre-election speech – after taking into account the political context and the main political goal of Koštunica’s political platform, which is neutral Serbia, neither joining the EU nor the Russian security union and alliance—can be summarized in the macroproposition, derivable from the quoted introductory part of the speech: *My political goal is a free (=independent, neutral) Serbia or I act solely for Serbia*. When this is correlated with the slogan and incorporated into the pattern of the slogan with the necessary complementation and supplementation of the content, then it looks like the speaker, or more precisely, the principal who sent this message, is *verbatim*, saying: *I am ready to work and act in the best interests of Serbia, and you, dear citizen, you know that this is true and you know why it is true, because it’s already well-known from my previous political engagement*.

Since in such an interpretation predominates the candidate’s promise to work in Serbia’s best interest, then according to this analysis, this slogan is a type of commissive speech act.

(d) The fourth example is Čedomir Jovanović’s slogan: *Truth!*

More reduced than all previous ones is the slogan of the Liberal Democratic Party and its presidential candidate Čedomir Jovanović; it actually amounts to just one word: *Truth!*

In a pre-election speech of this presidential candidate, it can be detected following the resemblance:¹¹

We have to be fair to the people, who are entitled to know the truth. Truth can help those who are today apparently wrong. We should be afraid of the impotence of the government that runs this country. [...]

In this program that we offer, in these *ten truths*, there is not a single one [truth] that is dependent on us. [...] almost all the truths, which have remained in life, survived because we selflessly gave our energy to preserve and protect them, to savor them for some other time, when we could take a chance.

In this segment the speaker discusses the cornerstone of his political agenda and policy; the foundation of his policy rests on one but crucial feature – truth. So, it is a job of a politician to tell the truth and then act accordingly. The rationale in his speech can be grasped in the following way:

¹¹ Original excerpt from Jovanović’s speech:

Moramo biti poštteni prema ljudima koji na tu *istinu* imaju pravo. *Istina* može pomoći onima koji danas očigledno greše. Nas treba da plaši nemoć vlasti koja vodi ovu zemlju. [...]

U ovom što mi nudimo, ovih 10 *istina*, nema ni jedne koja zavisi od nas. Ima ih tako puno, gotovo sve *istine* koje su ostale u životu zbog toga što mi njima svoju energiju nesebično dajemo čuvajući ih za neko vreme u kojem ćemo iskoristiti šansu.

<i>input micropropositions of segment (ii)</i>	<i>macrooperations</i>	<i>provisional macropropositions</i>
We have to be fair to the people, who are entitled to know the truth.	deletion	We have to be fair to the people. M1
Truth can help those who are today apparently wrong. We should be afraid of the impotence of the government that runs this country. [...]	deletion	No matter the cost, truth should come out in open. M2
In this program that we offer, in these <i>ten truths</i> , there is not a single one [truth] that is dependent on us. [...]	deletion	We offer truth! M3
[...] almost all the truths, which have remained in life, survived because we selflessly gave our energy to preserve and protect them, to savor them for some other time, when we could take a chance.	deletion	We always fought for the truth. M4

Despite the maximum lexeme reductions in the slogan, its connection with the presidential candidate's political speech is perhaps the most direct one along with Dačić's slogan. From these four macropropositions, a more conceptual macroproposition can easily be derived on the next level of abstraction – *Truth is the major instrument in our political struggle*. Even more, Jovanović's speech, when it was later transcribed and posted on the official party website, was entitled: *The Truth – About the work that awaits us*, and this clearly indicates the crucial character of the word *Truth* both in the speech and, of course, in the slogan.

Finally, from the illocutionary point of view, this exclamative slogan (*Truth!*) though resembles in form expressive speech acts, I would rather classify as assertive, either understood as: *Truth is the major instrument in our political struggle*, which would have evaluative assertive value, or understood as: *This is the truth about the work that awaits us*, which would deictically explicate and also evaluate problems that need to be solved.

(e) The fifth and the last example in our corpus is Tomislav Nikolić's slogan: *A fair and successful Serbia*.

Tomislav Nikolić, presidential candidate of the coalition gathered around the Serbian Progressive Party, used the slogan: *A fair and successful Serbia*. In somewhat smaller font, as a kind of reply, next to this line is also written: *Yes – it is possible*. In addition to this, I shall give several two segments of the candidate's speech:¹²

This one [=Boris Tadić] has ruined Serbia, now it is up to skilled repairmen to fix all the problems. Some other people have to come now: better, more virtuous, more honest people. [...]

¹² Original excerpt from Nikolić's speech:

Ovaj [=Boris Tadić] je upropastio Srbiju, sad moraju da dođu majstori da je poprave. Sad moraju da dođu drugi ljudi, bolji, čestitiji, *pošteniji* na ovim izborima. [...] Hoćemo pravdu, pravičnost. Hoćemo *poštenje*.

[...] We want justice, fairness. We want honesty.

It is necessary, as in previous examples, to contextualize this slogan. In this case, it is important to know that this is a message of the leader of the opposition, and that this form of the slogan, like in example (c), follows the pattern of (pseudo) dialogue; as if a citizen asks: *[Is it finally possible to have] a fair and successful Serbia?*, to which the presidential candidate responds: *Yes – it is possible!* But there is omitted a certainly presupposed utterance in this answer: *But it is feasible only if I come to power.* Thus the second part of the slogan *Yes, it is possible!*¹³ swings, like a pendulum, from an optimistic mood □ in a kind utopian image of the world, if the recipient of the message thinks that this is a description of the current state of affairs = *fair and successful Serbia*, to a negative □ dystopian image, when the message addressee finds out that it was just a question, not a statement, which means that a fair and successful Serbia is not a proper description of the state of affairs, and then, this pendulum is again swayed back in the direction of an optimistic picture of the world, when the message recipient in the end finds out that a fair and successful Serbia is still possible.

The quoted textual segment from Nikolić's pre-election speech strengthens this analysis and induces me to determine this slogan's illocutionary point not as an assertion, but as a commissive speech act, for example: *We promise that Serbia will become an honest and successful country when we come to power.*

5. Conclusions

At the beginning of this paper I asked two questions, or stated two problems: (i) are presidential slogans relatively independent textual forms, or are they derivative political texts—genre types, and (ii) what is the illocutionary force of these slogans. In order to answer both of these questions, I turned to political speeches, as a secondary corpus, and tried to detect correlations and parallels between these two political genres. Applying Van Dijk's methodology, I arrived at the following results and reached these conclusions:

(a) Ad question (i) – slogans in general, or presidential slogans in particular, having distinct form or being instantiations of a separate genre, in political discourse, certainly fulfil some conditions to be treated as autonomous texts, however their content is heavily dependent on the rest of the political discourse characteristic of some candidate. In my analysis, it is blatantly clear that pre-election speeches drastically influenced the creation of slogans, from the addresser's point of view, or that understanding and proper reception/reconstruction of the message of slogans is significantly conditioned by the addressee's awareness of the other candidate's

¹³ Needless to say that political or „slogan intertextuality“ is very vivid here: USA President Barack Obama in 2008 presidential elections used famous and quite catchy slogan: *Yes we can!* Tomislav Nikolić's slogan could be then understood as Serbian version of this model.

political statements. Therefore, one can conclude that a slogan □ as a form □ is an autonomous text type, but that as a message – it is much closer to a derivative type of political text.

(b) Ad question (ii) – reconstructing the broader political cotext and context of slogans enabled me to clarify the illocutionary force point of individual slogans. The outcome is that that slogans had either an assertive or comissive illocutionary point. But reconstructing the broader political cotext and context certainly helped in the process of determining/verifying the illocutionary force of slogans.

(c) Additionally, all this leads to one supplementary conclusion that is more in connection with the domain of political marketing, and, more broadly, political communication: it is obviously very well thought through what would be the slogan because it was the first advertisement that presidential candidates used in their election campaigns, but before that, political speeches were already carefully prepared, or at least designed, so that the nucleus of the speech is unwavering and stable throughout the whole campaign.

References

- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Denton, R., G. Woodward. ([1990/]1998). *Political Communication in America*. New York: Praeger.
- Fiske, J. (1990). *Introduction to Communication Studies* (Studies in culture and communication). London: Routledge.
- McNair, B. (2003). *An Introduction to Political Communication*. London: Routledge.
- Mišić Ilić, B., S. Blagojević. (2007). Zavodljivi jezik izbornih kampanja. In: *Jezik, književnost, politika*, Lopičić, V. et al., ur., 53 □ 66. Niš: Filozofski fakultet.
- North Roberts, R., S. Hammond, V. Sulfaro. (2012). *Presidential Campaigns, Slogans, Issues, and Platforms: The Complete Encyclopedia*. Greenwood: ABC CLIO.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slavujević, Z. (2005). O sloganima političkih stranaka i kandidata. *Sociološki pregled* XXXIX/1, 47 □ 80.
- Swanson, D., D. Nimmo. (1990). *New Directions in Political Communication: A Resource Book*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Škiljan, D. (1998). *Javni jezik*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.
- Van Dijk, T. (1977). *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London / New York: Longman.
- Van Dijk, T. (1980). *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. Hillsdale / New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., Publishers.
- Van Dijk, T., W. Kintsch. (1978). Toward a Model of Text Comprehension and Production. *Psychological Review* vol. 85, No. 5, 363 □ 395.

Strahinja Stepanov

SLOGANI NA PREDSEDNIČKIM IZBORIMA U SRBIJI (2012): TEKSTUALNI I ILOKUCIONI ASPEKT

Rezime

U radu *Slogani na predsedničkim izborima (2012): tekstualni i ilokucionni aspekt* autor proučava slogane na prezidencijalnim izborima 2012. godine s pozicija dveju (relativno) novijih lingvističkih disciplina: lingvistike teksta i pragmalingvistike. Rad je podeljen u pet poglavlja: I. Preliminarne činjenice: komunikacija – politička komunikacija – politički slogan, II. Cilj analize, III. Opis korpusa i teorijsko-metodoloških polazišta, IV. Analiza i diskusija, V. Zaključne primedbe. Imajući u vidu da su slogani nekakva vrsta rudimentalnog, „primitivnog simboličkog delovanja“, autor pokušava utvrditi da li se i kako se može utvrditi ilokucionni potencijal političkog (predsedničkog) slogana. Radi ostvarenja tog cilja autor koristi teorijsku aparaturu lingvistike teksta (Van Dijkove teorije makropropozicija) i kombinuje je sa pragmalingvističkom teorijom govornih činova (Džona Serla).

straxstepanov@yahoo.com

