

Analysis of Social Rap as a Political Discourse of Resistance / *Análisis del rap social como discurso político de resistencia / Análise do rap social como discurso político de resistência*

Leslie Colima*
Diego Cabezas**

ABSTRACT

There has been a growing academic interest in rap and in hip hop culture from Sociolinguistics, Ethnography, Cultural Studies, and Critical Pedagogies. However, research on rap from the perspective of political discourse analysis is not so profuse and in the Chilean context, in particular, is limited. In this line, the present study aimed to identify the linguistic choices in the 2012 rap song *Dónde Empieza*, written and performed by Chilean rappers Portavoz and Subverso, and to relate these choices to the strategic functions of political discourse. To do this, a model of political discourse analysis created by Chilton and Schäffner (2001) was used. The results showed that in this political discourse of resistance, strategies of coercion, legitimization-delegitimization, and resistance, opposition and protest are used and that the function of dissimulation is excluded.

KEYWORDS: Political Discourse; Social Rap; Resistance; Political Discourse Analysis; Strategic Functions

RESUMEN

*Existe un creciente interés académico en el rap y en la Cultura Hip Hop desde la sociolingüística, la etnografía, los estudios culturales y las pedagogías críticas. Sin embargo, la investigación que se ha realizado sobre el rap desde la perspectiva del análisis del discurso político aún no es tan profusa y en el contexto chileno, particularmente, es escasa. En esta línea, el presente estudio tuvo por objetivos identificar las elecciones lingüísticas dentro de la canción de rap *Dónde Empieza*, del año 2012, escrita e interpretada por los raperos chilenos Portavoz y Subverso, y relacionar dichas elecciones con las funciones estratégicas del discurso político. Para ello, se utilizó el modelo de análisis del discurso político creado por Chilton y Schäffner (2001). Los resultados mostraron que en este discurso político de resistencia se emplean las estrategias de coerción, legitimación-deslegitimación y resistencia, oposición y protesta; y que la función de encubrimiento es excluida.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Discurso político; Rap social; Resistencia; Análisis del discurso político; Funciones estratégicas*

* Universidad de Santiago de Chile – USACH, Santiago, Chile; janita.colima@gmail.com

** Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación – UMCE, Santiago, Chile; diego.cabezas.b@gmail.com

RESUMO

*Há um interesse acadêmico crescente ao respeito do rap e da Cultura Hip Hop desde a sociolinguística, a etnografia, os estudos culturais e pedagogias críticas. No entanto, a pesquisa feita a respeito do rap a partir da perspectiva da análise do discurso político não é tão ampla e no contexto chileno, em particular, é escassa. Nessa mesma linha, o presente estudo teve como objetivo identificar as escolhas linguísticas dentro da música rap *Dónde Empieza* do ano 2012, escrita e interpretada pelos rappers chilenos Portavoz e Subverso, e relacionar tais escolhas com as funções estratégicas do discurso político. Para isso, foi utilizado o modelo de análise do discurso político criado por Chilton e Schäffner (2001). Os resultados mostraram que neste discurso político de resistência foram usadas as estratégias de coerção, legitimação-deslegitimação e resistência, oposição e protesto; e que a função de encobrimento é excluída.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Discurso político; Rap social; Resistência; Análise do discurso político; Funções estratégicas

Introduction

Political discourse becomes more relevant in the social and political dimensions, since it is a means that allows the maintenance of the established order, or its rupture. Indeed, various strategies are implemented by those who produce this kind of discourse in order to achieve their goals. While several studies on political discourse have been developed in recent decades (BOLIVAR, 2002, 2007; CHILTON; SCHÄFFNER, 2001, 2002; VAN DIJK, 2004, 2005), and a considerable amount of academic work has been made with respect to hip hop and rap (ALIM, 2006a, 2006b; DIMITRIADIS, 2001, PARDUE, 2004, 2005; PENNYCOOK, 2007a, 2007b; PERRY, 2004; RICHARDSON, 2006), rap, in its right as political discourse of resistance, requires more research attention, especially regarding the Chilean context.

Given this scenario, this research addresses rap from the perspective of political discourse with a qualitative methodological approach and is situated in the descriptive and interpretive levels. As a hypothesis, we assert that the rap song *Dónde Empieza* of 2012, written and performed by Chilean rappers Portavoz and Subverso, as a political discourse of resistance, tends to the dismantling of the established social order. The purpose of this paper is, therefore, to a) identify Portavoz and Subverso's linguistic choices in the rap song

Dónde Empieza, and b) relate their linguistic choices with the strategic functions of political discourse. To do this, we used the political discourse model of analysis created by Chilton and Schäffner (2001), which proposes a linguistic analysis on three levels: pragmatic, semantic and syntactic, directly related to the strategic functions that characterize the political discourse: dissimulation, legitimation and delegitimization, and resistance, opposition and protest.

In the first part of this paper we address essential theoretical issues concerning political discourse, rap and an analysis model. In the second part, we describe the methodology used to obtain the results. In the third part, we analyze a fragment of the rap song *Dónde Empieza* and we present a discussion of the obtained results. Finally, we present our conclusions taken from the results and the projections of this research.

1 Theoretical Framework

1.1. Political discourse

The concept of Political Discourse (PD) has traditionally been defined as the discourse produced from the political arena and, more specifically, by those in power, i.e. the politicians, their groups and institutions (DORNA, 1993; SCORING; MORALES, 1996; VAN DIJK, 2005; BOLIVAR, 2007). Underling this idea it is the fact that PD is a linguistic-ideological instrument used by the authorities to exercise and maintain their dominant position. Consequently, its importance lies essentially in what Bolivar maintains: “many decisions that affect our daily lives in social, economic, moral, and also affect life in the country in which we live depend on political discourse” (2002, p.310; our translation).¹

PD represents “discursive struggle in which certain blows are allowed (manipulation, proselytism, threats, promises) and the challenge of gaining legitimacy

¹ Source text: “del discurso político dependen muchas decisiones que afectan nuestra vida cotidiana en lo social, lo económico, lo moral, y afectan también la vida en el país en el que vivimos”

through the construction of opinions” (MEYENBERG; LUGO, 2011, p.6; our translation).² This discursive struggle, therefore, involves two poles in constant tension disputing power; on the one hand, those who want to perpetuate themselves as dominant, and on the other, those who seek to escape their dominated condition. In Fairclough’s words, “those who exercise power through language must constantly be involved in a struggle with others to defend (or lose) their position” (1989, p.35).

Facing this conceptualization somewhat limited, it is necessary to redefine the concept of PD, considering it is not an exclusive area of the political sphere. In particular, we align with Chilton and Schäffner’s proposal, who set as political all “those actions (linguistic or otherwise) that involve power, or its inverse, resistance” (2001, p.304).³ An even clearer distinction is established by Gutiérrez (2002), who introduces the restrictive versus extensive interpretation of PD. The restrictive approach, on the one hand, is related to the discourse produced from the political and institutional arena, in a traditionalist sense; on the other hand, the extensive conception includes the discourses in which power is at stake and have political intentions without necessarily being emitted from the establishment (GUTIERREZ, 2002). We align ourselves with this broader vision, the extensive conception, so we make a point in the fact that PD refers to both the discourse generated from the political arena, and the one from sectors or groups opposing and resisting the hegemony of the political arena.

1.2 Social Rap

From its origins, that which has characterized rap - and hip hop culture of which it is part - is its condition of marginality, as it arises from an oppressed and segregated social segment that carries strong social stigmata. Therefore, as being embedded within an unequal socio-political framework and fighting against injustices created by that system,

² Source text: “lucha discursiva en la cual se permiten ciertos golpes (manipulación, proselitismo, amenazas, promesas) y el reto de conquistar legitimidad mediante la construcción de opiniones”

³ CHILTON, P. and SCHÄFFNER, C. Discourse and Politics. In: van DIJK, T. (Ed.). *Discourse studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage, 2011, pp.206-230.

rap is a form of resistance oriented to the “(trans)formation of local” and global realities, through “linguistic practices” (ALIM, 2009, p.11).

Among the issues addressed by rap, institutional politics are deeply exposed and criticized given their ideological bias in favor of powerful social groups. The term “politically conscious rap” (ROTH-GORDON, 2009, p.64) comes to define this type of rap: on the one hand, solidary with the dominated and, on the other, confrontational to the structural violence exerted by power groups. Pardue (2005) identifies this form of rap as marginal, in the sense that it comes from socially and politically segregated groups that take a stance to denounce “the institutional causes of violence and suffering in their communities” (ROTH-GORDON, 2009, p.66). In other words, it seeks “to transform reality by opposing the system” (PARDUE, 2004, p.253). We can say that this politically conscious and marginal rap (Social Rap, as it is called by rappers working on it in Chile) is an ideological struggle in the socio-political dimension whose articulation is made possible by language.

Importantly, this ideological struggle about which we talk is not based on a chaotic or poor discourse, as it emerges from the margins; conversely, it corresponds to a sophisticated use of language. One of the most notable features of rap are the patterns of meter and rhyme, which require great skill by their creators to make accurate linguistic choices and organize ideas harmoniously. This quality is evidence of the complexity that the language used in rap acquires. However, at the same time, rap uses language in a clear and direct way, which is possible to be appreciated in the literal meanings of the lyrics (THOMPSON, 2005). These features make rap a singular object of study.

For the purposes of this paper, the approach to social rap requires to consider it as a “complex area of practice” (FAIRCLOUGH, 1995, p.185) that demands seriousness and rigor when being addressed as an object of study. In other words, rap should be treated “as discourse” (ANDROUTSOPOULOS, 2009, p.43) and, at the same time, examined as such. More specifically, social rap, as a sociopolitical discourse of resistance towards practices that represent, constitute, and legitimize inequality, must be addressed as a *political discourse* in the sense proposed by Chilton and Schäffner (2001).

1.3 Political Discourse Analysis

Different theoretical and methodological proposals have been developed in the last three or four decades to analyze political discourse, which is possible to synthesize in the following approaches: French (ALTHUSSER, 1970; FOUCAULT, 1971, GROUPE DE SAINT-CLOUD, 1982, 1995; PECHEUX, 1975, 1990), German (EHRlich, 1989; WODAK; MENZ, 1990; SCHAFFNER; PORSCH, 1993) and Anglo-Saxon (FOWLER et al, 1979; RICHARDSON, 1985; BLOMMAERT; VERSCHUEREN, 1993; CHILTON, 1985, 1990; LAKOFF, 1996), the latter being the most eclectic one, and to which we ascribe to in this study. Specifically, we adopt as a model of analysis the one proposed by Chilton and Schäffner (2001), which corresponds to a form of linguistic analysis in the pragmatic, semantic and syntactic levels in their relationship with the four characteristic strategic functions of PD: coercion; dissimulation; legitimization and delegitimization; resistance, opposition and protest.

Something that should be clear from the beginning of this section is that “political discourse analysis [...] is an activity in which the analyst is engaged” (CHILTON; SCHÄFFNER, 1997, p.307).⁴ This implies that, far from being apolitical, we analysts position ourselves from our reality and our convictions, without reducing the academic rigor in the research process.

1.3.1 Linguistic Levels

Then, the three levels of language, 1) pragmatic; 2) semantic and 3) syntactic, considered in the model of analysis proposed by Chilton and Schäffner (2001) will be briefly described.

The Pragmatic level is directly related to *speech acts*, understood as enunciations that represent or embody actions themselves. Indeed, “the notion of speech acts (...) dissolves the everyday notion that language and action are separate” (CHILTON; SCHÄFFNER, 2001, p.310).⁵ Speech acts that are presented below correspond to the

⁴ For reference, see footnote 3.

⁵ For reference, see footnote 3.

classification previously made by Searle (1969), which can be very useful when carrying out Political Discourse Analysis: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives. However, within this linguistic level not only speech acts play an important role. The language-action dichotomy implies the existence of roles and social relations embedded in all discourse that are demarcated by pronouns, e.g. I, you, we, they, etc., and their possible variations.

The second of these levels corresponds to the semantic level, which studies the meanings of words and the sense relations existing among them. Here it is possible to distinguish the concept of *lexico-semantic field*, referring to words related to a common element or area, which have generally been cognitively stored in such manner previously (RUMELHART, 1980). The particular characteristics of a lexico-semantic field is what allows its differentiation with other networks or groups of words. It is not curious that the lexico-semantic fields are rooted in social and cultural aspects, varying according to these, since the construction of language occurs in community and reflects different human experiences.

Finally, the syntactic level is related to the sentence structure, specifically, thematic roles and topicalization. The thematic roles are linked to various elements within the sentence as, for example, who does what, to whom, where, why, and how. Topicalization basically refers to the introduction of new information and the place in the sentence in which it is presented. Topicalization forms are transitive and intransitive uses, which are related to the use of verbs to express dynamism and temporality, while the nominalization corresponds to the use of nouns that provide the feeling of immobility and timelessness.

However, the importance of the three linguistic levels is their relationship with the different strategic functions of political discourse. That is, the linguistic choices made by those who generate the discourses can be interpreted as resources to produce certain effects on those who receive them.

1.3.2 Strategic Functions

As for the strategic functions, Chilton and Schäffner (2001) mention that they consist of a categorization of four specific strategies used in PD and its analysis: 1)

coercion; 2) dissimulation; 3) legitimization and delegitimization; and 4) resistance, opposition and protest.

The strategic role of coercion is based on a number of actions, for example, in certain speech acts involving sanctions and orders, as well as certain forms of censorship and access restriction to information. The imposition of topics and roles in discourses by who produce them is also a coercive action.

Dissimulation is a strategic function related to the information control produced in discourses. The ultimate intention of those who use this linguistic maneuver is to filter the information in their quality and quantity, providing listeners/readers only with what is suitable for the producer of the discourse. This is accomplished in various ways, such as omission, lie and euphemism.

The function of legitimization and delegitimization aims to generate two specific effects that are always given in connection with each other. First, the legitimization is based on strengthening a social position of power, strengthening the credibility of the speaker or writer. Second, its counterpart, delegitimization, consists of presenting others negatively, for example, through speech acts, such as accusing, blaming, and insulting.

The strategic role of resistance, opposition and protest is used by those opposed to the entities and institutions that enforce power. Those who make use of this feature can certainly use the previously mentioned functions to discursively counterattack the powerful. Political discourse of resistance, unlike the official discourse of politicians or groups of power, can generate infinite forms of marginal expression, rap being one of them.

2 Methodology

The aim of this study was to analyze the political discourse of the rappers Portavoz and Subverso. It specifically analyzed the pragmatic, semantic and syntactic language levels in their relationship with the political discourse strategic functions. Accordingly, this research is within the descriptive and interpretative levels.

2.1 Corpus

The corpus of analysis of this work was constituted by the Social Rap song *Dónde Empieza* (2012), written and performed by Chilean rappers Portavoz and SubVerso, as part of the first and so far only solo album of Portavoz *Escribo Rap con R de Revolución*. The selection of the corpus was mainly due to the fact that both Portavoz and SubVerso are great exponents of social rap (alternative and self-managed) nationwide because of their individual and collective work. Portavoz, apart from being a soloist, is “member of the prominent combative rap group” (GATTI, 2012; our translation)⁶ Salvaje Decibel, with whom he has produced the albums *Poblacional* (2007) and *Radical* (2013). On his behalf, SubVerso has a long history, even, becoming “one of the icons of the student movement” (FAJARDO, 2014; our translation)⁷ of 2011 in our country. Among his works there is the album *¡Apaga la Tele!* (2006), produced by the duo Conspiración, in which he was a member; as soloist, he has so far recorded the album *El amor es Subversivo* (2010). In this sense, the song *Dónde Empieza*, the object of our analysis, is generated to combine forces and talents through an unprecedented joint work carried out by Portavoz and Subverso.

The units of analysis of this corpus corresponded to the written text, specifically the verses. Other musical and performative elements were excluded, because addressing them was not part of our original goals. Furthermore, it is pertinent to mention that although this song is available in an audiovisual format on the Internet, the video is not official, and therefore what is displayed through it is not Portavoz’s and SubVerso’s property or responsibility.

2.2 Procedures

The collection of this corpus was made possible by the availability of the song on the album *Escribo Rap con R de Revolución* (PORTAVOZ, 2012). Once collected the corpus of analysis required, we proceeded to transcribe the song lyrics. Following Gee

⁶ Source text: “miembro del connotado grupo de rap combativo”

⁷ Source text: “uno de los íconos del movimiento estudiantil”

(2008), the corpus was segmented into verses. Then, we carried out the discourse analysis in the three different linguistic levels described in the previous section of this work: pragmatic, semantic and syntactic. In the pragmatic level we analyzed the speech acts and the use of pronouns; in the semantic level we analyzed lexical fields; and in the syntactic level we analyzed thematic roles and nominalizations. Finally, the linguistic choices made in these three levels were linked to the political discourse strategic functions.

3 Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Here is presented and analyzed a representative passage of the most dominant features of this political discourse of resistance.

- [1] No me hablen de violencia / *Do not talk to me about violence*⁸
[2] como si no la conociera / *as if I did not know her*
[3] Autoridades condenan un tipo de violencia / *Authorities condemn a type of violence*
[4] la que atenta contra el sistema de la gran empresa / *the one that attacks against the great corporate system*
[5] contra su propiedad, sus leyes y su policía / *against their property, their laws and their police*
[6] y silencia la violencia inmensa de todos los días./ *and silence the immense every day. violence*
[7] Violenta es la venta de tus derechos y de hecho / *Violence is the sale of your rights and in fact*
[8] es un robo el cobro en educación, salud y techo./ *it is a robbery to charge in education, health and roof.*
[9] Pero eso no sale en la prensa / *But that does not appear in the press*
[10] que trenza mensajes con eficiencia pa vencer la resistencia / *that plaits messages with efficiency to overcome the resistance*
[11] Ven a dormir acá en el ghetto / *Come to sleep here in the ghetto*
[12] y dime si hay faceta de esta realidad concreta / *and tell me if there is a facet of this concrete reality*
[13] que yo no comprendo./ *which I do not understand.*
[14] No les compramos cuando nos dan ese argumento / *We do not buy them when they give us that argument*
[15] que demoniza a los que están luchando por ser tan violentos / *which demonizes those who are struggling to be so violent*

⁸ The translation of the verses is ours.

3.1 Pragmatic Level

In the pragmatic level, it is possible to identify different speech acts and the use of pronouns that indicate relationships and roles within the discourse. These elements, in turn, can be linked to the political discourse strategic functions to achieve a deeper understanding of the ideas and motivations underlying this discourse.

3.1.1 Speech Acts

From the fragment presented, the verses [1], [11] and [12] are directive speech acts, orders, specifically. These orders are given to boost the performance of certain actions, as is the case of [11] *ven/come* and [12] *dime/tell*, or to avoid its performance, exemplified in [1] *no me hablen/do not talk to me*. It is important to note that in all three verses the powerful are invoked, namely, politicians and businessmen who want to maintain the social order. While this questioning is not explicit, given the context of the discourse, all other possible participants are immediately excluded from these mandates, as seen in the analysis of pronouns. Now, these orders are directly related to the function of coercion; i.e., they involve some degree of control over the actions of the person receiving the discourse or to the ones questioned through it.

The assertive speech acts are also present in the fragment and acquire consistency through true propositions expressed in verses [7], [8] and [9], where the first two contain the verbal conjugation *es/is*, assuming the existence of a particular condition, and the third contains the negative *no sale/ does not appear*, which implies the absence of the mentioned condition. Through these true propositions, the discourse producers intend to reassure themselves as having the truth about the obscure operation of the system and assign themselves with the mission of informing the dominated the social injustice they suffer. The latter is even more clear in the specific case of verse [7], where “*tú*”/“you” is directly appealed, referring to anyone who is a passive victim of institutional violence. The strategic function associated with these speech acts is the legitimization-delegitimization because, on the one hand, they legitimize the speaker’s discourse produced from the resistance; and they delegitimize the discourse generated from the political arena conventionally

responsible for producing and reproducing the conditions to perpetuate the status quo, on the other.

Also, numerous expressive speech acts, accusations specifically, can be identified within the fragment. In this sense, verse [3] represents an accusation in itself, further reinforced by verses [4], [5] and [6]. This accusation, expressed through the verbal conjugation *condenan/ condemn*, is part of a delegitimization strategy towards the actions enforced by the powerful in favor of their privileged position in society. As we know, the delegitimization is always given in combination with the legitimization; therefore, the previously mentioned verses also point to legitimize the discourse opposing the social and politically imposed one by those in power. Similarly, [10] and [15] are verses involving an accusation regarding various practices permitted and supported by the system, the purpose of which is the maintenance of inequalities. Verse [10], in particular, refers to the role of the press as truth concealer and as an accomplice of an articulated system working to maintain the establishment, which is expressed in this discourse through the conjugation *trenza/ plaits*. Regarding verse [15], containing the verb *demonize/ demonizes*, they question the powerful people's negative language used to refer to those who struggle for a better society. Again, these verses are strongly linked to the function of legitimization-delegitimization that characterizes political discourse, to validate the resistance discourse and discredit the discourse produced from the political arena and power groups.

3.1.2 Pronouns

Linguistic-sociopolitical relations, which arise among those involved in this particular discourse, are represented by the use of pronouns. This means that pronouns and their different variants are responsible for assigning roles and defining spaces. When we talk about participants, we refer to those who produce the discourse, with whom the producers identify, those who they oppose to, to whom the discourse is directed, etc.

First of all, it is necessary to start with the uses of “yo”/“I” and “nosotros”/“we” that help legitimize the position of the speaker and the social group with whom he identifies. The first person singular is used in verses [1] in its variant *me/me*, [12] in the verbal conjugation *dime/tell me* and [13] with the personal pronoun *yo/I*, which immediately

legitimizes the speaker as the discourse producer. In addition, the first person plural in verse [14] in its variant *nos/us* groups together the speaker and the social group with whom he identifies - in this case, the oppressed, those without power. This self-inclusion implies the legitimization of such group and vindicates its position within the social framework.

To refer to the authorities, the politicians, the entrepreneurs, in brief, to the powerful, the speaker uses “tú”/“you”, “ustedes”/“you” (plural) and “ellos”/“them,” which clearly marks a distance and a different role. Verses [11] and [12] present the second person singular in the implicit imperatives forms *ven/come* and *dime/tell me*, respectively. Here the powerful is questioned, even Sebastián Piñera himself might be referred to as the producer of an initial speech that would have given way to this possible answer. Furthermore, in verse [1] the third person plural is used to refer to the powerful, and in [5] and [14] it is possible to appreciate the use of the possessive *su/their* with the same objective. In short, all uses of pronouns referring to those in power are directly related to the strategic role of delegitimization.

Pronouns “tú”/“you” and “ellos”/“they,” besides being related to the powerful within this discourse, also refer to the dominated as in verse [7] through the possessive *tus/your* and verse [15] when the speaker says *los/those*. These uses, in direct connection with the speech acts previously analyzed for these verses, have the function to delegitimize the discourse of the powerful and legitimize the one produced by the dominated.

As shown, the use of pronouns assigns social roles and relationships that can be associated with the strategic function of legitimization-delegitimization. However, the imposition of such roles within the discourse also involves the function of coercion, since almost arbitrarily, the different actors are placed in certain spaces within the social framework.

3.2 Semantic Level

In this discourse, within the semantic level, the lexico-semantic field of *institutional violence* tends to stand out. Given its particular presentation, we can glimpse a mental-emotional pattern of violence linked to the structural or institutional ground, that is, this

fragment indicates that violence is equivalent to the inequality produced, reproduced and legitimized by power groups. This does not mean that Portavoz and Subverso handle only this specific conceptualization of violence, but within the broad category of violence, they have incorporated institutional violence as one of the many ways that it can occur and that becomes important because of its impact on a social level.

The semantic field to which we refer can be seen in verses [1] and [2], in which the speaker begins legitimizing his particular vision of *violence*, without delving into it. Verses [3], [4] and [5], meanwhile, delegitimize violence as it is understood and presented by the powerful, that is to say, the violence of a subjected social group attempting to brake a system of oppression and segregation. Relevant lexico-semantic elements in [3], [4] and [5] are, therefore, *autoridades/authorities*, *gran empresa/great corporation*, *propiedad/property*, *leyes/laws* and *policía/police*, allowing to visualize more clearly the sophisticated articulation of a system that supports the fact that just a few protect their interests at the expense of the majority. Verse [6], which ends the stanza, emphasizes the invisibility of institutional violence and, therefore, it has been resorted to the strategic function of legitimization-delegitimization once again. Together, in verses [7] and [8] the speaker delegitimizes institutional violence present in the prevailing socioeconomic model, which allows people's basic needs *cobro/charge*, or rather, *lucro/profit* and which, consequently, restricts access to those who lack economic resources.

The words we have highlighted in italics in this section correspond to a semantic network in close relation to the institutional violence that mobilizes the content and argument of this discourse. Clearly, these linguistic choices show a social order established and maintained by the powerful benefiting themselves, their groups and institutions, which is heavily criticized by the producers of this resistance political discourse.

3.3 Syntactic Level

As it regards to syntax, it is necessary to analyze verses [7] and [8], because they contain an obvious alteration in sentence order. In both cases, subject and predicate have suffered an inversion.

In [7], when expressing *violenta es/violence is*, violence stands out from the moment it is positioned as the first element, but this sentence structure also transmits a contrast, so the idea of violence contained in this verse is legitimized, and anyone else's conceptualization is delegitimized. So far, we know what happens, *la venta/the sale*, and who is affected, *tus derechos/your rights* (you, dominated individual). However, the verse does not give explicit account of the one who performs the action; in fact, *la venta/the sale* corresponds to a nominalization providing a static and timeless feeling. In [8] something very similar happens, because by saying *es un robo/ it is a robbery* the speaker highlights the theft over the rest of the elements in the sentence, and it is also possible to distinguish a "what," which corresponds to *el cobro en salud, educación y techo/ charge in education, health and roof*. However, from the point of view of topicalization, the verb "rob" has been nominalized, and from the point of view of thematic roles, the one who carries out the action and who receives it has been omitted.

While these linguistic choices (immobilizing the action, omitting who carries it out and who receives it) could be related to the strategic function of dissimulation, we reject this possibility for the two following reasons. First, it is necessary to restate that throughout this discourse, the powerful are directly questioned through the use of pronouns and speech acts, as analyzed in the pragmatic level, and *autoridades/authorities* are even openly mentioned in [3]. Also, the dominated ones are clearly identified and legitimized, so this specific omission does not constitute a form of dissimulation. A second argument has to do with the fact that rap, as revised in our theoretical framework, is governed by patterns of rhyme and meter that provide permission to play with language and use various resources that in other contexts would be interpreted differently; however, here we have addressed a political discourse, which is essentially rap and maintains its particular musical and linguistic features.

In sum, a possible interpretation would be that the reason to generate these grammatical constructions is the production of rhymes, which, unintentionally, leads to intervene the logical order of the sentence. In other words, the technique used by Portavoz and Subverso in [7] and [8] would be distant from dissimulation as a strategic function used by the powerful to manipulate information and mislead their readers / listeners.

3.4 Strategic Functions

The strategic functions implemented in this discourse and identified by the linguistic analysis are legitimization-delegitimization and coercion. In the background, it is also possible to recognize the function of resistance, opposition and protest, which is expressed throughout all the linguistic resources, in the sense that is embedded in the production and content of the discourse itself as a political discourse of resistance against power groups. As we discussed in the section concerning the model of analysis proposed by Chilton and Schäffner, the strategic functions of PD are four, of which three are present within the discourse studied, and therefore the function of dissimulation is not part of the repertoire of strategies used by rappers Portavoz and SubVerso. This would be originated in the fact that dissimulation is an opaque use of language that is used by the powerful to legitimize their negative practices and maintain the status quo. Quite the opposite, social rap, as a political discourse of resistance, uses direct clear language, and thus avoids dissimulation. In other words, *Dónde Empieza*, which has been our object of analysis, acts as an explicit denunciation discourse, which does not hide, omit or dissimulate, but brutally reveals the facts of an unjust social reality and points to the final breakdown of the social order.

Conclusions

This research aimed to identify Portavoz's and Subverso's linguistic choices in the Social Rap song *Dónde Empieza* and relate these choices with the political discourse strategic functions.

The results show that Portavoz and Subverso make different linguistic choices in this discourse. In the pragmatic level they use directive, assertive and expressive speech acts, and at the same time, they use pronouns such as *yo/I*, *tú/you*, *nosotros/we* and *ustedes/you* (plural); in the semantic level they make use of the lexico-semantic field of institutional violence, and in the syntactic level they employ inversion of subject and

predicate and nominalization. These linguistic choices are related to three of the four political discourse strategic functions: legitimization-delegitimization, coercion, and resistance, opposition and protest. Therefore, dissimulation is not a function used by the producers of *Dónde Empieza*.

These results indicate that the use of the functions of legitimization-delegitimization, coercion and resistance, opposition and protest, together with the exclusion of the dissimulation strategy and the consequent use of clear language in this resistance political discourse, point to the dismantling of the established social order. Indeed, Portavoz and Subverso present themselves as potential political actors that highlight the inequities of the current socio-political-economic system, promoting the dominated critical consciousness by a direct-transforming political discourse which implies a defiant stance towards the status quo that the powerful arduously and untiringly try to keep.

It would be particularly interesting to enhance the scope of this work through the study of a larger corpus, perhaps adding some quantitative data that offered a panoramic view of the phenomenon of social rap as a political discourse of resistance. At the moment, this research makes a small contribution to the area of political discourse analysis in its broadest sense and may be useful for those interested in discourse analysis, in political discourse, in hip hop and rap, or in expressions of the marginal type.

REFERENCES

ALIM, H. S. *Roc the Mic Right: The Language of Hip Hop Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2006a.

_____. The Natti Ain't no Punk City: Emic Views of Hip Hop cultures. *Callaloo*, n.29 (3), pp.969-990, 2006b.

_____. Introducción: Straight Outta Compton, Straight aus München: Global Linguistic Flows, Identities, and the Politics of Language in a Global Hip Hop Nation. En: ALIM, H.S., IBRAHIM, A. y PENNYCOOK, A. (Eds.). *Global linguistic flows*. New York: Routledge, 2009, p.1-22.

ALTHUSSER, L. *Essays on Ideology*. Londres: Verso, 1970.

ANDROUTSOPOULOS, J. Language and the Three Spheres of Hip Hop. En: H.S.ALIM, H.S., IBRAHIM, A. y PENNYCOOK, A. (Eds.), *Global Linguistic Flows*. New York: Routledge, 2009, pp.43-62.

BLOMMAERT, J. e VERSCHUEREN, J. The Rhetoric of Tolerance or, What Police Officers Are Taught about Migrants. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, n.14 (1), pp.49-63, 1993.

BOLÍVAR, A. La lectura del discurso político. Em *Lingüística y Interdisciplinariedad: Desafíos del nuevo milenio*. Valparaíso: Ediciones Universitarias de Valparaíso de la UCV. p.309-333, 2002.

_____. Dialogue and Confrontation in Venezuelan Political Interaction. Em: van DIJK, T.A. (Ed.), *Discourse studies vol.1* London: Sage Publications Ltd., 2007, pp.262-274.

CHILTON, P. Words, Discourse and Metaphors: the Meanings of Deter, Deterrent and Deterrence. Em: CHILTON, P. (Comp.), *Language and the Nuclear Arms*. Debate. Londres: Pinter, 1985, pp.103-127.

_____. Politeness and Politics. *Discourse and Society*, n.1 (2), pp.201-224, 1990.

CHILTON, P. e SCHÄFFNER, C. Discurso y Política. Em: VAN DIJK, T.A. (Ed.), *El discurso como interacción social* Barcelona: Gedisa, 2001, pp.279-329.

_____. Introduction: Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse. In: CHILTON, P. and SCHÄFFNER, C. (Eds.). *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002, pp.1-41.

CONSPIRAZIÓN. *Apaga la tele!* [CD]. Santiago, 2006.

DIMITRIADIS, G. *Performing Identity/Performing Culture: Hip-Hop as Text, Pedagogy, and Lived Practice*. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.

DORNA, A. Estudios sobre el discurso político: El papel persuasivo de las figuras retóricas y de la gestualidad. *Psicología Política* n.6, p.117-128, 1993.

EHLICH, K. *Sprache im faschismus*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1989.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. *Language and Power*. London: Longman, 1989.

_____. *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold, 1995.

FAJARDO, G. Subverso: El narrador urbano más implacable de la cultura no oficial. *El Mostrador*, Santiago. 2014. Disponível em: [<http://www.elmostrador.cl/cultura/2014/11/14/subverso-el-narrador-urbano-mas-implacable-de-la-cultura-no-oficial/>] Acesso en: 03 Julio 2016.

FOUCAULT, M. *L'Ordre du discours*. París: Gallimard, 1971.

FOWLER, R., HODGER, B., KRESS, G. e TREW, T. *Language and Control*. Londres: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

GATTI, E. Entrevista a Portavoz, um MC que escreve Rap com R de Revolução. *Solidaridad*, Santiago. 2012. Disponível em: [<http://periodico->

solidaridad.blogspot.cl/2012/07/entrevista-portavoz-un-mc-que-escribe.html] Acceso en: 03 Julio 2016.

GEE, J.P. *Social Linguistics and Literacies*. Ideology in Discourses. Londres: Routledge, 2008.

GROUPE DE SAINT-CLOUD. *La parole syndicale: étude du vocabulaire confédérale des centrales ouvrières françaises (1971-1976)*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982.

_____. *Présidentielle: regards sur les discours télévisés*. Paris: INA-Nathan, 1995.

GUTIÉRREZ, S. Discurso político y argumentación. En: *Tercer Coloquio Latinoamericano de Estudios del Discurso*, 3, 1999, Santiago. *Discurso para el cambio*. Santiago: Universidade do Chile e Pontificia Universidade Católica do Chile, 2002, p.1-11.

LAKOFF, G. *Moral Politics: What Conservatives Know that Liberals Don't*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996.

MEYENBERG, Y. y LUGO, J.A. *Palabra y poder*. Manual del discurso político. México: Grijalbo, 2011.

PARDUE, D. Putting *Mano* to Music: the Mediation of Race in Brazilian Rap. *Ethnomusicology Forum*, n.13 (2), pp.253-286, 2004.

_____. Brazilian Hip-Hop Material and Ideology: A Case of Cultural Design. *Image & Narrative*, n.5 (2), 2005.

PÊCHEUX, M. *Les Vérités de la Palice: linguistique, sémantique, philosophie*. Paris: Maspéro, 1975.

_____. *L'Inquiétude du discours: textes choisis et présentés par Denise Maldidier*. Paris: Editions des Cendres, 1990.

PENNYCOOK, A. *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: Routledge, 2007a.

_____. Language, Localization, and the Real: Hip-Hop and the Global Spread of Authenticity. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, n.6 (2), pp.101-115, 2007b.

PERRY, I. *Prophets of the Hood: Politics and Poetics in Hip Hop*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.

PORTAVOZ. *Escribo rap con r de revolución* [CD]. Santiago: Texas Studio, 2012.

PORTAVOZ e SUBVERSO. *Dónde empieza*, En: PORTAVOZ. *Escribo rap con r de revolución* [CD]. Santiago: Texas Studio, 2012.

PUNTAJE, D. y MORALES, E. Discurso político en la actual democracia española. *Discurso* n.21, p.39 -75, 1996.

RICHARDSON, K. Pragmatics of Speeches Against the Peace Movement in Britain: A Case Study. En: CHILTON, P. (Comp.), *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate: Nukespeak Today*. Londres: Pinter, 1985, pp.23-44.

RICHARDSON, E. *Hiphop Literacies*. London: Routledge, 2006.

ROTH-GORDON, J. Conversational Sampling, Race Trafficking, and the Invocation of the Gueto in Brazilian Hip Hop. En: ALIM, H.S., IBRAHIM, A. y PENNYCOOK, A. (Eds.). *Global Linguistic Flows*. New York: Routledge, 2009, pp.63-78.

RUMELHART, D. Schemata: The Building Blocks of Cognition. In: SPIRO, R., BRUCE, B. y BREWER, W. (Eds.). *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1980, pp.33-58.

SALVAJE DECIBEL. *Poblacional* [CD]. Santiago, 2007.

_____. *Radical* [CD]. Santiago: Texas Studio, 2013.

SCHÄFFNER, C. y PORSCH, P. Meeting the Challenge on the Path to Democracy: Discursive Strategies in Governmental Declarations. *Discourse and Society*, n.4 (1), pp.33-55, 1993.

SEARLE, J. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

SUBVERSO. *El amor es subversivo* [CD]. Santiago, 2010.

THOMPSON, S. L. Knowwhatumsayin'? How Hip-Hop Lyrics Mean. In: DARBY, D. and SHELBY, T. (Eds.). *Hip-Hop and Philosophy*. Chicago: Open Court, 2005, pp.119-132).

VAN DIJK, T.A. Politics, Ideology and Discourse. In: WODAK, R. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2004, pp.728-740.

_____. *Racism and Discourse in Spain and Latin America*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2005.

WODAK, R. ; MENZ, F. (Comps.) *Sprache in der politik – politik in der sprache: analysen zum öffentlichen sprachgebrauch*. Klagenfurt: Drava, 1990.

Translated by the authors

Received April 16,2016

Accepted March 20,2017