

2. Мюллер-Фольмер Курт. перекладати - куди? До проблеми формування дискурсу у фрау фон Шталь та в американському трансценденталізмі. В кн.: Переклад як культурний процес: рецепція, проєкція та конструювання іноземного. Берлін: Е. Шмідт, 1998. С. 11 – 31.
3. Фесенко Т.О. Концептуальний переклад у структурі взаємовідносини «дійсність – мислення – свідомість – мова». Питання когнітивної лінгвістики. №1. Т.: ТГУ, 2014. С. 112 – 122.
4. Фефілов А.І. Методологічні засади транслатології. Київський. ун- т., 2003. 243 с.

Николин Вікторія

Науковий керівник – доц. Ладика Ольга

PERSUASIVE STRATEGIES IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Language plays a pivotal role in constructing identity and ideology, therefore, political leaders use language i.e., political discourse, to persuade others. Through language, persuasive strategies are used across the globe by well-known political leaders. Political discourse as a specific area of communication, its structure and features has become the subject of detailed linguistic analysis relatively recently. Particular attention is paid to the linguistic means of influencing the politician on the addressee in order to manipulate his consciousness, as political discourse is the most influential phenomenon in modern political communication.

The objective of the article is to study and differentiate the main means of the category of persuasion in political discourse, which plays a dominant role in modern political and media world due to its rational argumentation and numerous strategies employed by a political leader to propagate his ideology using language.

Discourse is defined, as “a stretch of language in use, of any length and in any mode, which achieves meaning and coherence for those involved” [1, p.191]. Moreover, political discourse is one of the types of institutional discourse along with diplomatic, administrative, legal, military, pedagogical, religious, mystical, medical, business, advertising, sports, scientific, stage and media [4, p. 23-25].

In this investigation we treat political discourse as a coherent, cohesive text of political communication combined with pragmatic, sociological, psychological and other factors carry out a systematic objectification of what people mostly unconsciously and symbolically do in their everyday life. That is, discourse analysis is concerned with patterns of language use and the circumstances with which such patterning is associated in any instance of communication.

Discourse is composed of two levels:

a) Microstructural discourse level which is concerned with issues of cohesion; that is, the integration of discourse elements into a unified text;

b) Macrostructural discourse level which deals with the knowledge of organizational features that are characteristic of genres which are conventionalized categories and types of discourse and interactional strategies [4, p.29].

In modern linguistics, some researchers (V. Chudinov; M. Lazar, etc.) use the term political discourse as given a priori; others (A. Baranov, E. Sheigal, T. Van Dijk; R. Wodak, etc.) use it as synonymous for political communication, political language, language of politics; and still others (P. Parshin, Yu. Stepanov, etc.) refuse to recognize its solely linguistic meaning. The semantic

structure of the lexeme “politics” consists of the following components: political events, views and beliefs; principles of behaviour; political course [2, p. 230].

Political speeches are considered to be a separate type of discourse. Characteristic features of the political speech are: ideology (each speech has its purpose), conflict (a politician represents a certain political party, respectively – the conflict of ideas with opponents) and solemn style (sublimity of political speech). The structure of any political speech includes three basic components: the introduction, the main part and the final part.

The primary purpose of political discourse is to win and deduct power, with political and social participation [2, p.231]. The power of an immediate manipulative impact on the minds of the public is achieved through certain political discourse representation tactics and strategies. Speech strategies are unique in this respect: arguments technique, propagation strategy, manipulative strategy, the strategy of self-defence.

Analysing the speeches of Boris Johnson 2019 – 2021, we conclude that many speeches by this Prime Minister can be attributed to ideological discourse, where ideology is a system of ideas and beliefs relevant to a particular social group or community that represents socio-cultural norms and values of this group. Our analysis suggests that Boris Johnson's persuasive strategies, techniques, and means of speech vary according to the period and topic of the speech. That is, before the pandemic period, the dominance of strategies of theatricality, evaluation, increase and decrease is observed, but in speeches related to the situation with the coronavirus, the strategy of intensification prevails.

It is appropriate to consider an example of a theatrical strategy. A large percentage of examples of strategy expression belong to the tactics of promise: My job is to make your streets safer...; My job is to make sure you don't have to wait 3 weeks to see your GP [3, p.253].

The main component of the universal persuasive strategy of political discourse is the strategy of evaluation. With this tactic, the politician implicitly creates a positive image for himself and his party, emphasizing that “service to the good of this country” is the main goal of his political activity: you will see it is we Conservatives that have had the best insights, I think, into human nature, and the best insights in how to manage the jostling sets of instincts in the human heart [3, p.253].

Prominent is the influence strategy, expressed by such tactics as, for example, the tactics of implicit self-presentation: The doubters, the doomsters, the gloomsters - they are going to get it wrong again [3, p. 255]. It is clearly distinguished in speech due to the parallel construction, namely the climax.

The conflict resolution strategy is expressed by the tactics of impersonal accusation in the first speech of Boris Johnson as Prime Minister: ...that this country has become a prisoner to the old arguments of 2016 and that in this home of democracy we are incapable of honouring a basic democratic mandate [3, p.253], tactics expressed by the metaphor of prisoner to the old arguments.

The strategy of intensification is implemented in the speeches of politicians on coronavirus infection through a number of lexical means: semantic intensifiers (emergency committee; global pandemic; no escaping the reality), repetitions and gradations.

Applying the strategy of subjugation in these speeches, B. Johnson uses the tactics of contrast and persuasion. And lastly of course even if things seem tough now, // just to remember, that we will get through this, this country will get through this epidemic. ... And it's clear that coronavirus, COVID-19, continues and will continue to spread across the world and our country over the next few months [1, p.199].

In the publication under consideration, we want to direct attention to the main points of Linguistic means of expression of persuasion in the speeches of Boris Johnson. Frequent are the use of epithets, which are artistic figurative meaning that emphasizes the characteristic feature, the use of adjectives in the comparative and superlative degrees of comparison, Metaphors, a pun, the antithesis (opposition), the enumeration figure, syntactic repetition, rhetorical question.

In our opinion, the above stated points of political discourse in B. Johnson's speeches are characterized by frequent use of figurative vocabulary and a combination of several means of expression in one segment of speech.

To sum up, the stylistic and expressive means used by Boris Johnson characterize him as an original, competent politician who has authority in the world community, and at the same time make his speech original and convincing.

REFERENCES

1. Aazam F., Baig F. Z., Baig T., Khaliq S., Azam A., Shamshad S., Aslam M. Z. A Critical Discourse Analysis of 'Fire and Fury: Inside the Trump White House' by Michael Wolff. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9 (4), 2019. P. 192–199. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n4p192> (дата звернення: 15.03.2022).
2. Baig F. Z., Aslam M. Z., Yaseen T., Ahmad H. S., Murtaza M., Abbas M. J. Practicing Language Therapy for Effective Simultaneous Bilingualism: Case Studies. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10 (1), 2020. P. 230–240. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n1p230> (дата звернення: 15.03.2022).
3. Baig F. Z., Yousaf W., Aazam F., Shamshad S., Fida I., Aslam M. Z. Power, Ideology and Identity in Digital Literacy: A Sociolinguistic Study. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9 (2), 2019. P. 252–264. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n4p252> (дата звернення: 15.03.2022).
4. Bayram F. Ideology and Political Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Erdogan's Political Speech. *ARECLS*. Vol. 7., 2010. P. 23-40.