

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології імені професора
Г.Г. Почепцова

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра
з лінгвістики на тему:
**«СУБ'ЄКТИВНА МОДАЛЬНІСТЬ В АНГЛОМОВНОМУ
ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ»**

Студентки групи Мла 60-19
факультету германської філології
освітньо-професійної програми
Сучасні філологічні
студії(англійська мова):
лінгвістика та перекладознавство
спеціальності 035 Філологія
Мова і література (англійська)
Різванли Назарії Сергіївни

Допущена до захисту
« ____ » _____ 2020 р.

Науковий керівник
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент Шнуровська Л.В.

Завідувач кафедри

(підпис) Шутова М.О.
(ПІБ)

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів: _____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ - 2020

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY

Professor G.G. Pocheptsov Chair Of Germanic And Finno-Ugrian Philology

Master's Qualification Paper:

SUBJECTIVE MODALITY IN THE ENGLISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Rizvanli Nazariia

Group MLa 60-19

Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser:

Assoc. Prof.

Shnurovska Lyubov

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv – 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL BASIS OF SUBJECTIVE MODALITY IN THE ENGLISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	6
1.1 Political discourse in discourse studies and classifications	6
1.2 The notion of political discourse.....	9
1.2.1 Main characteristics of political discourse.....	13
1.2.2 Syntactic structure of the English political discourse	19
1.2.3 Idiosyncratic features of English political discourse.....	23
1.2.4 The categories of evaluation and expressiveness as basic features of English political discourse.....	26
1.3 Subjective modality as a semantic category, its types and means in the political discourse.....	40
CONCLUSION TO CHAPTER ONE.....	46
CHAPTER TWO. LINGUISTIC MEANS OF SUBJECTIVE MODALITY IN THE SPEECHES OF ENGLISH AND AMERICAN POLITICIANS.....	48
2.1 Lexical means of subjective modality.....	48
2.2 Grammatical means the subjective modality.....	51
2.3 Specific modal means of subjective modality in the English political discourse.....	55
CONCLUSION TO CHAPTER TWO.....	63
CONCLUSIONS	65
REFERENCES.....	68

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays the political discourse became an essential tool for all political circles. Political texts are socially conditioned. The special language used in writing political texts requires a constant investigation and description in order to develop a kind of model of a political text. The language of political texts, the language of linguistic acts is one of the “steps” for the study of communicative political technologies.

A political text consisting of linguistic acts is an actualization of political discourse. In addition to political texts, political discourse includes intertextual connections, context, and participants in the situation, their knowledge of the world. Political discourse is a set of “all linguistic acts used in political discussions, as well as the rules of public policy, sanctified by tradition and tested by experience” [1, p. 6]. This definition represents a broad approach to the meaning of “political discourse”. This discourse is a linguistic image which task is to attract attention, interest addressee and motivate him to take an appropriate action.

In the mid-1990s, a number of notorious works appeared in this sphere, the most important are works of A.G. Altunyan, E.I. Sheigal [2, 3]. These works have determined the development of a relatively young science of political linguistics for the next decade.

The researchers investigated one more important notion, namely modality and its types in the English political discourse. Traditionally, the linguistic term “modality” (from the Latin *modus* - measure, method) means a functional-semantic category that expresses different types of attitudes towards reality, as well as different types of subjective qualification of the reported message; moreover, it is a linguistic universal, and it is differentiated into objective and subjective modalities [4]. The notion of subjective modality comprises of evaluation, qualification of reported messages, including various kinds of emotional responses. Subjective modality expresses speaker’s attitude to the expression content from the point of level of acknowledgement of what is being reported (epistemic modality),

correspondence of information content to individual or public stereotypes (axiological modality), the level of necessity or volition of making real connections between predicate or responsible actants of propositions (volitional modality). So, subjective modality is not a component of certain expression content, that gives linguists an opportunity to denote, it as an “external modal framework” (V.B.Kasevich, V.S.Khrakovsky, V.Z. Panfilov and some others) [5, 6].

The novelty of the research consists in considering of the subjective modality as a systemic determinant in the nature and structure of the political discourse.

The aim of the research is to study the linguistic means of the subjective modality in the political discourse. In our research, the following **tasks** are to be resolved:

- To outline the main characteristics of political discourse;
- To describe the syntactic structure and idiosyncratic features of English political discourse;
- To view the categories of evaluation and expressiveness as basic features of English political discourse;
- To analyze the subjective modality as a semantic category, its types and means in the political discourse.

The object of the investigation is the means of expressing subjective modality in the American and British political speeches, while **the subject** of the category of subjective modality and its realization in the political discourse.

The **material** of the study is the American and British political speeches of Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton, Barak Obama, and some others.

The theoretical value consists in the contribution to the development of the notion ‘subjective modality’ in the political discourse; introduction of various features of political discourse; implementation of different means of expressing modality in the English political speeches.

The practical value is proved by the possibility to the use findings of the paper in teaching courses of theoretical grammar, optional courses ‘the text linguistics’, ‘the text stylistics’, ‘the text grammar’, ‘the text modality’, ‘contrastive

linguistics' in the methodology of teaching native and foreign languages during the teaching of reading and interpretation of different texts with respect to the realization of subjective modality.

The following **methods** have been applied during the investigation: the comparative, text and discourse analysis, the elements of structural analysis, the method of vocabulary definitions, and also the general scientific methods of intendance, generalization and description.

The approbation of the paper.

According to the paper results, the thesis on the topic 'Linguo-stylistic peculiarities of political speeches (on the example of Donald Trump's speech)' were reported on the scientific conference 'Philological studies: the history, contemporary state and prospects of investigation' (Lviv, 18-19 September 2020) and published in the academic journal 'Molodiy vchenyi' (Lviv, 18-19 September 2020) [7].

The paper consists of the introduction, two chapters and appendix. It contains 67 pages and 8 pages of references. *Chapter One* focuses on defining the concept of political discourse and its features, to outline the main characteristics of political discourse; the syntactic structure and idiosyncratic features of English political discourse; the categories of evaluation and expressiveness as basic features of English political discourse; as well as analyzes the subjective modality as a semantic category, its types and means in the political discourse. *Chapter Two* deals with close consideration of means of expressing subjective modality on the examples of the British and American political speeches.

CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL BASIS OF SUBJECTIVE MODALITY IN THE ENGLISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE

1.1 Political discourse in discourse studies and classifications

The topic of our investigation involves the consideration of such basic concepts as ‘text’, ‘discourse’, ‘political discourse’ and their relationship. The term “discourse” is widely used not only in linguistics, but also in other modern sciences and is characterized by extreme ambiguity. In this regard, we should note the work ‘Paradoxes of Discourse’ written by N.N. Belozeroва, in which the linguist analyzes the etymology and transformation of the meaning of the word ‘discourse’ from the Middle Ages up to nowadays. Firstly, in the Latin language, this word meant ‘*course deviation*’ and ‘*to run away*’. Systematically, ‘the word’s conversion into a term occurred when it used by a limited number of people’ [8, p. 102].

The transformation of the word ‘discourse’ into a term was determined by the special area of its application. N.N. Belozeroва gives a classification of disciplines which make use of the word ‘*discourse*’, among them are the theory of psychoanalysis, the theory of translation, didactic disciplines and computer sciences.

The word ‘discourse’ that derives from the French language, had the original meaning ‘*dialogical speech*’. In the 19th century, this word became polysemantic and had a variety of meanings: 1) dialogue or conversation; 2) speech or lecture. Notably, the word ‘discourse’ often takes place in the modern Western linguistic studies (oral discourse, free indirect discourse) in the meaning ‘speech’. During the formation of text linguistics, the notion ‘discourse’ was considered as its subject: “Discourse is a multi-valued term of text linguistics, used by a number of authors that use homonymous terms. The most important of them: 1) a coherent text; 2) an oral-spoken form of text; 3) a dialogue 4) statements related to each other within the meaning; 5) a speech written or oral” Nikolaeva 1978, p. 467].

As we can see from the definition, the discourse is directly related to the concept ‘*text*’. It should be noted, that later the definition ‘discourse’ went beyond

the text and began to include various circumstances for the text realization. In such a way, the most reputable definition for the linguistic study belongs to T. van Dijk: '... *discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that includes extralinguistic factors such as knowledge of the world, opinions, attitudes, goals of the addressee that are necessary for understanding the text*' [9, p. 10].

The linguists assure that the most explicit definition for discourse is given in the Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary: 'Discourse ... – is a coherent text along with extralinguistic (pragmatic, sociocultural) and other factors; the text taken as the eventful aspect; the speech that is considered as a targeted social action, as a component that involved in people's and their mechanisms of consciousness (cognitive processes). The discourse includes the extralinguistic assistance of speech, namely facial expressions and gestures and is studied together with the relating 'life forms' (reporting, briefing, small talk, etc.)' [11].

Based on the definition, given above, we can conclude that the text is a nuclear element of discourse and its study involves the study of the text. At the same time, discourse is related to the concept 'speech', which indicates its dynamic nature. E.S., Kubryakova and O.V. Aleksandrova distinguishes between the notions '*discourse*' and '*text*'. The first implies cognitive process, which is associated with speech production, while the second means the final result of the process of speech activity (fixed form) [12].

However, it is impossible to make a clear distinction between these two terms in indigenous and foreign linguistics. Obviously, the process of delimiting of these two concepts in the modern linguistics has not been completed yet, that's why there a great variety of existing approaches to their definition. The term 'discourse' is more often applied to oral speech works, while 'text' is associated with written speech.

N.N. Mironova in her work '*The discourse analysis of the evaluative semantics*' gives the following classification of discourses' types of discourses that exist in the specialized literature [13]:

- pedagogical discourse, which defines the social norms of behavior of the children and the youth [14];
- political discourse, in which social consciousness is actualized [15];
- ethical discourse in which highlights the concepts ‘good’ and ‘evil’ [16];
- military discourse, in which there is interpretation of conflicts and wars [14];
- pragmatic discourses, to which all issues above are related, because certain communicative strategies are actualized in them [9, 16].

As it was mentioned above, the text is a nucleus element of the discourse and its studying implies the study of the text. The most notable definition of the text is given by the professor I.R. Galperin: “Text...is a realization of speech process, possessing completeness, objectivized in the form of written document, literally processed, according to the document’s type and having title and a number of special units united by lexical, grammatical, logical and stylistic connections, that have certain aim and pragmatic attitude.” [17]

Nevertheless, more and more investigators tend to speak about types of discourse without impacting by criteria of national identity. They lay emphasis on practical types of discourse, that are widely used in cultural, ideological and communicational situations and can be taught in terms of general communication theory, such as political, pedagogical, scientific, critical etc. D.A. Alkebayeva asserts that ‘discourse is a main form of communication. It is the right to have connection between addresser and discourse addressee, that gives birth to new sphere, called pragma-linguistics. Discourse deals with 2 aspects of communication: spoken – discourse and written – text. Discourse looks on verbal and non-verbal language means, psychological problems, communicants’ aims and communication tools [18].

Here we see that discourse is considered as oral form of communication as well as pragmatics, that has a definite intention in order to influence addressee using different methods. V. I. Karasik offers the basis of discourse classification namely the orientation criterion. He distinguishes between 2 types of discourse. The first is personal or personal-oriented, in which the speaker acts as the individual in all his

richness of inner world. The second is institutional or status-oriented, in which the speaker acts as the representative of certain social status [19].

T.V. Matveeva offers her own criterion of discourse classification. She explains it in such a way: the classification is based on notions of addresser and addressee. The first type of discourse means conversation in the form of monologue and the wish to be closer with the other speaker. The second type is conversation in terms of status and role relationship, namely speech interaction of representatives of social groups [20].

The institutional discourse means conversation in the frames of status and role relationship. In relation to modern society, the following types of institutional discourse are identified: political, religious, medical, sports, scenic, pedagogical etc. V.I. Karasik accents that this list is not strictly fixed, as the public institutes differ from each other and cannot be viewed as homogenous phenomena [19]. They are historically changeable; they emerge with each other and may be arise as versions of this or that type.

1.2 The notion of political discourse

In the modern society the importance of political communication continues to grow, as it has an enormous impact on citizens' consciousness and formation of their political views. Besides, the solving of many political problems depends on how they will be interpreted correctly. The analysis of language's role in politics is in a deep attention of philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, linguists and social activists.

The study of political discourse dates back to Plato. Politics is an inalienable aspect of civic existence. Politics being the 'art of the possibility', the 'art of management' is usually associated with the influence and competition between individuals and groups about distribution of benefits and welfare within society. Therefore, political discourse is incredibly newsworthy for investigation, as it applies to the whole society.

Political discourse is a phenomenon, which we face with every day. The struggle for power is an important topic and a driving force for this sphere of communication. As this competition is realized through language, which is the intermediate between external world and people, the existence of linguistic investigations in a political science becomes inevitably.

Taking into account the definitions of political discourse given by various authors, such as A.N. Baranov and E.G. Kazakevich [21], V.Z. Demyankov[22], P.B. Parshin, [23], G.G. Pocheptsov [24], A.P. Chudinov. [25], V.I. Shahovskiy [26], we define **political discourse** as a collection of all speech acts, consisting of public law, tradition and experience, which is determined and expressed in the form of verbal formations, content, subject and the addressee of which belongs to the sphere of politics.

Classifying political discourse to the type of institutional communication, we, first of all, suggest to consider the specifics of its discursive content. Specifics of institutional discourse is displayed in in the type of public institution, which is identified by a special name in the collective consciousness of the language and generalized in the key concepts of this institution, in particular, functioning of political discourse as a power [27].

Consequently, the political discourse is not just a communication; it brings together its clear goals and specific participants. The purpose and a choice of participants depend on the particular type of a discourse, so in this case the purpose of political discourse is the conquest and deduction of power; and its participants are politicians and society.

In the linguistic work *'The linguistic analysis of the political discourse'* by M.B. Gavrilova the author points out that 'political discourse is presented as a multidimensional and multifaceted phenomenon, as a complex of elements forming a single whole' [28, p. 43]. Some researcher's theses are considered to be noteworthy about the study of language function in the political discourse. M.Gavrilova considers that in this issue two problems are inevitably arisen – the language of power and the power of language.

They differ in the following: *the language of power* is what is said, what linguistic means and techniques are used by the current power, and this is the subject of the study of “pure” linguistics. And *the power of language* is – how these linguistic means and techniques influence the mass consciousness and which must be explored by political linguistics [28, p. 45]. In the thesis *‘The political text as a culture phenomenon(linguo-cultural analysis)’* by A.E. Falileev the researcher states that political discourse allows us to synchronize over time the life of society as a single organism, which carries with various situations [29, p. 21].

The scientist A. Volkov in his work *‘The political text and liberty of speech’* emphasizes that using the help of political text it is possible to regulate the space of social actions of an individual in different ways. The social freedom arises when the political text creates the conditions for self-realization of the people and limits antisocial actions [30, p. 97].

According to A.M. Baranov and his work *‘The linguistic argumentation theory (cognitive approach)’*, political discourse can be defined as a combination of all speech acts in political discussions, rules of public policy, which formed according to traditions and experience [31, p. 76].

In the linguistic monography *‘The semiotics of political discourse’* by E.I. Sheigal, there is a wide and narrow definition about political discourse. If we take a wide meaning, political discourse consists of texts, subject or addressee of which refer to the political sphere [32].

Another definition given by A.M. Baranov in the work *‘The parliament debates: traditions and innovations’* relies in that it is a combination of discursive practices, that identify the members of political communication or form an accurate subject matter of political communication [21].

Some researches, such as R. Vodak, A.D. Stuart., D.G. Winter., view political discourse as an integral part of public sphere. In *‘Politically speaking: a worldwide examination of language used in the public sphere’* there is a hypothesis that a political function is typical for all public speeches [33, p. 78-81]. Thus, a political

discourse is an up-to date using of language in a social-political sphere and communication in public sphere.

A Dutch linguist T. van Dijk keeps for narrow definition of political discourse in his academic work *'What is political discourse analysis?'* he asserts that political discourse is a group of genres, which is restricted by social sphere, including policy. Such genres like government discussions, parliament debates, politicians' speeches, party programs belong to political sphere.

The scientist says that a political discourse may be referred to an institutional one. It means that politicians' discourse appears in such an institutional environment, like government session and parliament session. The speech must be performed by a politician and in this very institutional environment. Thus, a discourse can be called political, when it accompanies a political act in political encirclement [34].

In all kinds of political discourse there is always a struggle of ideas, which are protected by contestants and the victory is the main aim for them. From this we can make a conclusion that in a political communication language (or speech) is a countermeasure vehicle.

Thus, the general meanings of notion 'political discourse' are based on the theoretical ground of the key word 'discourse', namely – political discourse is a combination of speech structure in an exact linguistic context, i.e. the context of political activity, views and principles. Therefore, political discourse is any speech organization, used by subject of political sphere [35, p.23].

The political discourse can be interpreted as a combination of all speech acts in political discussions, rules of public policy, which were formed according to traditions and experience.

In their collective monography named 'The discursive analysis and modern language studies' *Lviv linguistic school* under political discourse implies a logically build text that is expressed by verbal and non-verbal means, which arise from political communication and situations along with pragmatic, psychological and sociocultural factors [36, p. 159-160].

The political discourse is actually related to system of values in the society. The value categories are often regarded as semantic and cognitive constructions. The political discourse is comprised of newspaper and journalistic texts, oratory speeches in politics, official texts on a political sphere, political science articles [37].

E.I. Sheigal presents a number of genres, the initial components of which intersect with the discourse of the media, and the final ones relate directly to the political: pamphlet, feuilleton – a problematic analytical article written by a journalist – column of the correspondent – editorial – report (from a congress) – information note – interview with a politician – polemic – political document (presidential decree, law texts, communiqué) – problematic analytical article (written by a politician) – public speech of the politician [32].

In the linguo-pragmatic investigations of this political notion the essential significance lies on using of specific vocabulary, which is taken advantage of achievement of political tasks. The influential function can be achieved by emotional and expressive means, which are widely used in the English political discourse.

1.2.1 Main characteristics of political discourse

In this chapter, we consider the characteristic features and signs of political discourse. Political discourse has set of all essential features that are important to mention. Presenting a comprehensive and accurate system of distinctive features is rather complicated, as they form a very fragile frame. Taking into account the classification of various authors, including M.V. Alekseeva [38], V.I. Konkov, [39], Yu.A. Hlevova [40], here the most common and indefeasible features of the political discourse:

1) **The image of the author.** This category is important in characterizing both personal-oriented and status-oriented discourse. Depending on a communication situation the image of the author consists of the following components. The first is the author's abstraction when his personal features and psychological states have no communicative priority. The second is the author's personification when personal

characteristics of the interlocutor and his psychological state considerably influence on communication process.

The next component is para-textual components, such as photo of the author, a brief information about author, the image of the author, e.g. Barack Obama's prediction for the Future: *'I believe that the single most important job of any President is to protect the American people. And I am equally convinced that doing that job effectively in the 21st century will require a new vision of American leadership and a new conception of our national security – a vision that draws from the lessons of the past, but is not bound by outdated thinking'* (Barack Obama, 2008) [41].

2) addressee ability or factor of addressee The structure of a political discourse presupposes existence of two roles: the speaker's and the addressee's, that's why when we analyze discourse, we can recreate a mental world of communicants, details and assessment of reality from two points of view. Therefore, the ability of addressee as the discourse category is in the first priority. The text creating presupposes removing some abstractive models of addressee, that have complex of functions that help to perceive message adequately. It is naturally that a person conducting the construction of discourse, has a privileged position that is widely used to draw listeners over. This circumstance plays an important role, especially in political sphere and also connects this category with other concepts:

a) communicative leadership that means in the conversation there is a leader is who regulates the communicative process directing it for the achievement of communicative aims.

b) communicative equality is possible only if in the conversation leader's highlighting is formal or absent.

In the political discourse we can find both types of addressee ability depending on genre of political discourse. In genres such as political interview or political documents we define the type of communicative leadership, while in polemic genres (TV debates, discussions) the type of communicative equality is present. It is worthy of note that genre of campaign trail is necessary to take out separately connecting

both of these concepts of the category of addressee ability depending on the one who the addressee is for the speaker at the moment - directly the opponent, i.e. the equal rival or the audience (live and TV viewers), i.e. the third party. According to their opinion there is a requirement to have impact.

3) Informational content. This category more or less characterizes any act of communication, but nevertheless directly depends on communicative aims of discourse. The purport of political discourse and its social mission is the suggestion of the perforce to present politically correct actions to the addressees.

4. Conventionality. Some authors, such as V.V. Karasik call this category interpretability [42] and E.N. Komarov denotes it as a perceptual ability [43]. This category is manifested in 3 forms:

a) **cliché** is characterized by transparence and accurateness of information, logicity and simplicity of statement. Cliché is often used in political discourse in order to cause existing stereotypes in audience's consciousness and make information more briefly and easier to understand, e.g. *to proceed from the assumption that, to sum up the above-said, to bear in mind.*

b) **terminology**, i.e. the presence of terminological apparatus, that has all requirements: accuracy, briefness, linguistic correctness. Using terminology helps to create more difficult terms and fulfill them with new connotations, e.g. *to corroborate a statement, proponents, a vision, heterogeneous, soft power* – soft influence, i.e. influence through culture, ideology and propaganda; *Europhobia* – dismay of European integration; *Eurosceptic* – the assailant of European integration; *Europhilia* – a followership to European integration and a positive attitude towards the European Union. Politicians make a great contribution in creating new political terms, e.g. *dark horse* – politician who is unknown to be a candidate, but suddenly receives a nomination. This term goes back to horse-racing lexicon for denoting a horse, that is not popular, but wins the first place [44]; *axis off evil* – the term suggested by David Frum to George Bush in his State of the Union address. With the help of this word Bush called governments who supported terrorists and weapons of mass destruction: *'In my state of the Union address, I had outlined the threats*

posed by Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. The media seized on the phrase 'axis of evil'. They took the line to mean that the three countries had formed an alliance. That missed the point. The axis I referred to was the link between the governments that pursued WMD and terrorists who could use those weapons/ There was a larger point in the speech that no one could miss: I was serious about dealing with Iraq' [44]; window of vulnerability – the term coined by Ronald Reagan when he spoke about Soviet Union's possibility to wipe out U.S. nuclear weapons capabilities in the first strike attack; Obamacare – a term of derogation for Barack Obama's Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which was proposed by the democratic leadership and became law in March 2010 [44].

c) **rituality**, i.e. the stereotype of behaviour, e.g. *None of us – black, white, Latino, or Asian is immune to the stereotypes that our culture continues to feed us, especially stereotypes about black criminality, black intelligence, or the black work ethic. In general, members of every minority group continue to be measured largely by the degree of our assimilation – how closely speech patterns, dress, or demeanor conform to the dominant white culture – and the more that a minority strays from these external markers, the more he or she is subject to negative assumptions [44].*

5. Intentionality. This discourse category that means communicative purposes of the speaker. Any oral work is said by the author with that or this aim. This category in relation to political discourse is in direct dependence on discourse purports that dictates rules of verbal behavior to addressee.

6. Emotiveness. The basis of this category is made of miscellaneous combinations of syntactical elements that add not only integrity and connectivity to definite discourses and texts but also additional expression. According to A.Yu. Mazaev, political discourse is always brightly coloured with emotional character, as the aim of public speeches is to convince listeners [45]. The presence of emotivity in political discourse varies from genre to genre. For example, it is difficult to imagine emotional peculiarities in law texts, decrees, analytical reports, while in public political speech, polemics, interview, emotiveness is an indisputable

component. The percentage of emotiveness in political discourse depends not only of genre, but also specific discursive events. If we take parliament speeches, we may see that the category of informational content will be higher than the category of emotiveness, e.g. Speech of Barack Obama, President of the USA: *'We need not look to the past for greatness, because it is before our very eyes. This generation of soldiers ...have served tour after tour of duty in distant, different and difficult places. They have stood watch in blinding deserts and on snowy mountains ...They are man and woman; white, black, and brown; of all faiths and stations – all Americans, serving together to protect our people, while giving others half a world away the chance to lead a better life'* [46].

6. Modality. Under this category we understand the attitude towards reality in the speaker's representation. The speaker's evaluation in the content of expressions in terms of reality/unreality, possibility, necessity, the degree of certainty – all these we can find in discourse and discourse participants in general. The expressions of need and desirability are realized in modality components, that can be described as prescriptive. In another aspect, modality presupposes a certain degree of confidence that will demonstrate the level of knowledge, from which the seriousness of impression produced by political performance will be depend on, e.g. *'America is the country that helped liberate a continent from the march of a madman. We are the country that told the brave people of a divided city that we were Berliners too. We sent generations of young people to serve as ambassadors for peace in countries all over the world. And we're the country that rushed aid throughout Asia for the victims of a devastated tsunami. Now it's our moment to lead – our generation's time to tell another great American story. So some day we can tell our children that this was the time when we helped forge peace in the Middle East. That this was the time when we confronted climate change and secured the weapons that could destroy the human race. This was the time when we brought opportunity to those forgotten corners of the world. And this was the time when we renewed the America that has led generations of weary travelers from all over the world to find opportunity, and liberty, and hope on our doorstep'* [47]. Here the use

of we/our adds to the speech of Baraka Obama flamboyancy and makes his speech stylistically rich and touches people's mind.

7. Socio-cultural context. This category represents ability to activate and induct the complex of socio-cultural contexts of recipients [48]. Understanding of political oral and written text depends on the ability of the readers to identify the subject instantly and immense allusions that are necessary for understanding context. All above-mentioned semantic-pragmatic categories which are present in text are a typical text identifiers within a political discourse. Thus, when analyzing political discourse, linguists should bear in mind both extralinguistic factors (the circumstances accompanying events in the text, background, that explains these events and evaluation of event participants) and linguistic factors (the phonetic system of the text, grammatical and lexical peculiarities of text). Having mentioned the main semantic and situational feature of political discourse, it is necessary to denote its communicative and functional characteristics, namely:

8. Means of communications. The last category is presented by two components: verbal/ nonverbal, the forms of communication are represented by four types:

- depending on method information transfer: oral-written;
- depending on number of participants: polylogue-monologue.

Thus, poly-logicality is characterized by universality and poly-orientation of composition [38]. Political discourse is characterized by polylogical form of communication, i.e. the special multisided form of speech communication and structurally-compositional address to several interlocutors.

9. Estimation. The task of political discourse is not only describing reality objectively, but also highlighting certain peculiarities of this phenomenon, in order to perceive recipients by forcing them to certain actions. Consequently, the formation takes place in certain society to political event and this estimation is necessary for this subject.

This category requires more detailed consideration and the chapter is dedicated to it.

1.2.2 Syntactic structure of the English political discourse

The political discourse is characterized by a miscellaneous area of study. From the point of view of modern linguistics, one of the most important aspect in studying English political discourse is investigation of different sides of this notion.

Thus, I.S. Shevchenko analyzed interdiscursivity of political discourse [49]. O.V. Gorina inquired into cognitive-communicative characteristics of political discourse [50]. I.V. Loseva made a study of linguo-stylistic peculiarities of political polemics [51]. M.B. Thir made research in linguo-cognitive and communicative-cognitive aspects of image-formation of the President [52]. Moreover, A.A. Prokopenko researched into cognitive-communicative aspects of Barak Obama's presidential discourse [53]. A.Yu. Ponikaryova treated argumentative-suggestive potential of complex syntactic structures [54]. What is more, M.L. Ilchenko examined into tactics of speaking initiation in the electoral discourse [55] and G.L. Ryabokon enquired semantic and pragmalinguistic peculiarities of the British Parliament discourse on the Internet [56].

The speech of statesman should realize by certain communicative strategies. Although, the success of such realization depends on using of stylistic means of expression. In this chapter we are to investigate a syntactic structure of the English political speeches, in several texts of political debates between Donald Trump and Hilary Clinton.

Speaking about Ukrainian linguists, they also worked at syntax of political discourse. Among them O.V. Gorina [50], M.B. Thir [52] and others. In particular, in the investigation M.B.Thir highlighted means of stylistic expression along with communicative strategies and tactics [57].

Under stylistic device we understand unusual combinations and parts of structure both in one sentence and the whole text fragment [58, p.299]

The change in sentence structure can be viewed as source of syntactic expression. Here we understand such processes as reduction of syntactic structure

(RSS), expansion of syntactic structure (ESS) and transformation of structure or sentence type (TSST).

To the means of RSS belong deliberate or undeliberate omission. The examples of this item are typical for both candidates:

H. Clinton: *When it comes to the wall that Donald talks about building, he went to Mexico, he had a meeting with the Mexican president. **Didn't even raise it.***

In this sentence there is a deliberate omission of personal pronoun he, that is contingent on communicative fullness, as we can understand from the context that she is talking about Trump.

D. Trump: *First of all, I had a very good meeting with the president of Mexico. **Very nice man.*** With the help of this omission Trump prunes away his speech in order to make it closer to his electorate.

Undeliberate omission is significant only for Donald Trump: *Our country is so, so – it's just so imperative that we have the right justices.*

According to some investigators, these omissions take place in Trump's speech, as he doesn't articulate his thoughts. As a result, some of his statements are incomplete and he begins a new sentence.

To the means of expansion of syntactic structure, we refer various kinds of repetitions and introductory constructions. Having analyzed repetitions in third presidential debates between H. Clinton and D. Trump, we can offer a distribution by 3 characteristics: place in the utterance, degree of tautology and aim of using.

To the first group we refer anaphoric and epichoric repetitions, that are used at the beginning and in the end of utterance. For example:

D. Trump: ***They will** have a conservative bent. **They will** be protecting the Second Amendment. **They are** great scholars in all cases, and they're people of tremendous respect. **They will** interpret the Constitution the way the founders wanted it interpreted.* In this example Trump even uses 2 parallel anaphoric constructions within 4 sentences. Instead, H. Clinton uses epichoric repetitions: *For me, that means that we need a Supreme Court that will **stand up** on behalf of women's rights, on behalf of the rights of the LGBT community, that **will stand up***

and say no to Citizens United, a decision that has undermined the election system in our country because of the way it permits dark, unaccountable money to come into our electoral system.

To the second group we include tautological repetitions. And as examples here we have the following fragments:

*CLINTON: Well, that's because he'd rather have a **puppet** as president of the United States.*

*TRUMP: **No puppet. No puppet.***

CLINTON: And it's pretty clear...

*TRUMP: **You're the puppet!***

CLINTON: It's pretty clear you won't admit...

*TRUMP: No, **you're the puppet.** In the excerpt above D. Trump repeats both his own and his opponent's words. Besides, for the Trump's manner is peculiar to use simple contact repetitions: *Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some **very, very** inappropriate statements toward me and toward a tremendous number of people, **many, many** millions of people that I represent.**

Apart from simple tautology, both candidates tend to use synonymic lexical and syntactic constructions in order to avoid simple tautology: H. Clinton: *Of course we're going **to protect and defend** the Second Amendment.*

To the third group we put down repetitions, which serve for coherence of expressed thoughts and which are used for integrality of logically related utterances:

*H. Clinton: **But I feel that at this point in our country's history, it is important that we not reverse marriage equality, that we not reverse Roe v. Wade, that we stand up against Citizens United, we stand up for the rights of people in the workplace, that we stand up and basically say: The Supreme Court should represent all of us. That's how I see the court, and the kind of people that I would be looking to nominate to the court would be in the great tradition of standing up to the powerful, standing up on behalf of our rights as Americans.***

In this example along with using of repetitions for conveying coherence, H. Clinton uses the other grammatical construction for avoidance of tautology.

To the second group of means of ESS we trace parenthetical clauses which serve as sources of additional information about a definite part of sentence.

D. Trump: *I believe if my opponent should win this race, **which I truly don't think will happen**, we will have a Second Amendment which will be a very, very small replica of what it is right now.*

H. Clinton: *Well, I would like to say to everyone watching tonight that I'm reaching out to all Americans – **Democrats, Republicans, and independents** – because we need everybody to help make our country what it should be, to grow the economy, to make it fairer, to make it work for everyone.*

In both examples, with the help of parenthetical clauses, the orators try to add information, which relate to semantic units at the beginning or in the middle of the sentence, as later thoughts will be lost.

To the group of transformation structure or sentence type we add emphatic constructions and rhetorical questions. Emphatic constructions are intensifiers of lexical-grammatical meaning of one of the elements of syntactic structure. This property has great opportunities of expression, as with its help we can highlight and emphasize certain parts of sentences [58, p.310]

H. Clinton: ***And what I was saying that you referenced**, Chris, was that I disagreed with the way the court applied the Second Amendment in that case, because what the District of Columbia was trying to do was to protect toddlers from guns and so they wanted people with guns to safely store them.*

One of the means for achieving emphatic effect is inversion, which is meant to be used by presidential candidates: D. Trump: *And she was forced to apologize. **And apologize she did.***

Rhetorical questions differ from simple ones, that they mainly are statements, and according to form they are questions. Thus, this very change of sentence type conger us the possibility to relate such questions to this group of stylistic means:

D. Trump: *Saudi Arabia, nothing but money. We protect Saudi Arabia. **Why aren't they paying?***

On the next exemplum we can assure that speaker asking a rhetorical question, doesn't need an answer, because he already knows and presents it to his target listeners:

H. Clinton: *That is a plan that has been analyzed by independent experts which said that it could produce 10 million new jobs. By contrast, Donald's plan has been analyzed to conclude it might lose 3.5 million jobs. **Why? Because** his whole plan is to cut taxes, to give the biggest tax breaks ever to the wealthy and to corporations, adding \$20 trillion to our debt, and causing the kind of dislocation that we have seen before, because it truly will be trickle-down economics on steroids.*

It is important to note that in one chain of logically related utterances, leaders can use different syntactic structures simultaneously:

H. Clinton: *You know, I think when we talk about the Supreme Court, it really raises the central issue in this election, namely, **what kind of country** are we going to be? **What kind of opportunities** will we provide for our citizens? **What kind of rights** will Americans have?* (three anaphoric repetitions and rhetorical questions)

D. Trump: *I feel that **the justices that I am going to appoint – and I've named 20 of them – the justices that I'm going to appoint** will be pro-life. **They will** have a conservative bent. **They will** be protecting the Second Amendment. They are great scholars in all cases, and they're people of tremendous respect. **They will** interpret the Constitution the way the founders wanted it interpreted. And I believe that's **very, very important*** (multifarious kinds of repetitions and parenthetical clause) [59].

1.2.3 Idiosyncratic features of English political discourse

It is necessary to mention individual or specific peculiarities that are inherited only for this type of discourse. Thus, the particular features of political discourse are the following: a) agonistic capability; b) aggressiveness; c) ideological character; d) theatricality. Each feature requires a particularized contemplation

1. Agonistic capability, i.e. competitiveness. The basis of political discourse consists of continuous speech battle between party in the power and opposition,

where rivals attack each other from time to time, hold the fort, reflect blows and take the offensive. Taking these above-mentioned elements into account, we may conclude that there is an alikeness of political discourse with sports discourse, namely presence of sport elements in political sphere: presence of opponents, fight of opponents, ethics of fight, right regulations and norms, strategy and tactics of fight, wins, defeat, triumph of winner. The competitiveness is greatly manifested in parliamentary debates and pre-election campaigns.

2. Aggressiveness. One of the most important components of political speech is aggressiveness. In the English explanatory dictionaries, the word ‘aggression’ is defined as ‘violent or hostile feelings, behavior or attitude’ [60]. Thesaurus of this word is the most numerous: hostility, onslaught, warlike attitude, debredation, animosity, incursion, prevarication, raid, pugnaciousness etc. [61].

Aggression in the political discourse is closely related to notions hierarchy and predominance. The word ‘hierarchy’ comes from the Greek language (*hieros* – sacred and *ache* – power). The word ‘domination’ derives from the Latin language (*dominantis*) and denotes supremacy and prevalence. Aggression is viewed as the basis of masterdom, which in turn is a consequence of aggression and denotes hierarchical order in personal relationship. The reason of hierarchy is competition connected with struggle for power, social status and notoriety, strengthening of territorial positions or positions in group etc. If we consider speech aggression in the terms of political communications, it is necessary to point out that here a political aggressiveness is directed to a certain political representative, that is not presented in speech situation, i.e. the critic of political rival ‘for eyes’ in speaking with third party or large group of people in the public speeches, interview or political discussions.

A verbal aggression is presented by definite speech acts. Making accent in speech acts of aggression, it should be noted that all of them are demonstration of political muscle and they are directed to downgrade the status of the addressee. Standard speech acts of aggression in the political discourse are embossed:

- expressive wills with the semantic of exile (will act);

- categorical requirements and commands;
- speech acts of perdition (in slogan genres);
- speech acts of threat [62].

3. Ideological character. This notion presents the system of social representations, group knowledge, statements and thoughts that are based on group values, norms and interests. This peculiarity of political discourse resembles military. As we know, the war is a continuation of politics with using of other methods. Here belong such genres as military doctrine, military-political agreement, peace negotiations, i.e. genres that provide ideology and course of the war from the point of view of warring parties.

4. Theatricality. This category approaches political discourse with scenic and advertising discourse. The theatricality of political discourse is that people (who are the one of the participants of communication) carries out not the role of direct addressee, but the role of addressee-observer, who takes current political events as a play with amazing plot and vagarious end. Politicians who are in constant connection with journalists, always remember about ‘spectators’ and intentionally ‘play to the gallery’ trying to make impression and ‘raise a cheer’. The political ‘theatre’ is based on politicians’ images. If a plot-role component of political discourse is mainly used in a figurative meaning, and its ‘stage director’ component is displayed in a chain of political events, in which the element of performance (screenplay, pre-written texts, casting, rehearsals) is indispensable, e.g.

‘If fate had put Gore and Bush in the other’s place on election night, the drama of the next five weeks would have had everybody playing the opposite role. This election is not an award for past performance, Congressional Digest, October 2000’.

‘We celebrate the peaceful transition of power in a democracy; and then we sit back and judge how the players perform – how graceful the losers, how gracious the winners, a fierce pageant of patriotism and pride and prejudice all tightly staged on the Capitol, Time. Hearings serve as a kind of overture to the First act of a new

President, a preview of all the themes and characters that will share the stage and shape the combat for the next four years, Time.’

We should mention that the genre of political advertisement is absolutely dramatizing. A political type of advertisement is directed on formulation of a definite ‘image’ of political activist and motivation to a certain line of action. These both are used in political advertisement and realized in genres of political propaganda (posters, presentations, public performances, debates etc.) and agitations (banners, leaflets, meeting speeches etc.). Secondly, these ritual events are in nature of mass event, such as the inauguration and events dedicated to the national holidays.

Besides ritual actions that take place independently on mass media world and are reported in media sources, there are also co-called ‘pseudo-events’ that include specially planned events with object of an immediate displaying or information transfer about them. To the pseudo-events belong interview, press-conferences, TV debates, TV conversations etc. All these discursive methods are the communicative events which dramatic art is set up by news outlet.

1.2.4 The categories of evaluation and expressiveness as basic features of the English political discourse

One of the most prominent features of the political discourse is the category of evaluation. It is considered to be one of the most essential side of person’s cognitive activity, that forms the image of the world. The evaluation structure includes explicit and implicit elements such as the subject, object, evaluation reason, evaluation stereotype and schedule. This notion relates with the categories of impact and expressiveness; thus it is worth considering.

V.V. Nagel defines evaluation in such words: ‘it is a universal category that expresses positive or negative attitude of speaker to the speech context and is realized in parts of speech, exclamations, modal particles, notional lexemes, phrases in speech acts and axiological categories’ [63, p. 55]. M.N. Kojina contemplates evaluation as a phenomenon of functional system of linguistic means of some

degrees, that take place in texts of any functional styles in one role and thus, coincides with each other (in a certain area of communication), based on the equal communicative tasks. Besides, these means are divided according to the principle 'nucleus-periphery' [64].

The pragmatic approach means that we have to interpret the notional particularity through communicative aims of speech acts. E.M. Volf suggest their own interpretation of evaluation. They say it is a functional-semantic category and learn the multilevel system of language means, that perform evaluative function [65, p. 5; 66, p.10].

The scientists look upon such factors as the author's aim and prediction of probable effect by using evaluative means.

Some scientists observe rational and emotive value depending on presence or absence of emotive component.

The main goal of the rational evaluation is to indicate that the object responses to the subject's thoughts about norms and samples. The notion of emotive evaluation is the subject's attitude to the object of speech and his emotive impression from the object.

Its worthy of note that there is a correlation between notion 'evaluation' and 'subjective modality'. In this work points of view are represented by the famous linguists such as I.V. Arnold [66], N.D. Arutuynova [67], E.M. Volf [65] and others. These scientists denote several approaches to this concept. Thus, the evaluation is considered as a constituent part of word's meaning. R. hear sets apart lexical meanings into descriptive, e.g. *This apple is tasty, big, red* and evaluative ones, e.g. *This apple is good, this apple is worth eating*. The descriptive meaning reflects the qualities of apple, while in the evaluative meaning the apple is assessed by the speaker from the point of view of general norms. The most research workers highlight in lexical meaning of the word several macro- components, among which there is connotative macro-component, that denotes the producent's attitude to the object in the form of emotion or denotata evaluation.

According to V.N. Telia, the main function of connotation is the function of reaction, that associated with speech pragmatics. In such a way, we can conclude that there is a connection between connotation and evaluativity. Connotation is said to be a subcategory of evaluative modality [68].

The evaluation is based on the formula 'A g B', where A is the subject of the evaluation, B is the object of the evaluation, and g is the estimated ratio, which has meaning 'good-bad'. Thus, the evaluation has the following modal framework: subject, object, predicate. The predicate possesses the following characteristics- 'emotiveness' or 'appraisal', attitude according to good/bad/emotiveness/rationality features and effectiveness. The modal evaluation framework includes a rating scale and stereotypes that exist in a given society. These elements of the modal framework of the evaluation correspond to the components of the assessment in the logic – the subject, object and basis of evaluation.

E.M. Volf states that the most important feature of evaluation is that it always possesses subjective factor, interacting with objective one [65]. The subjective component bears positive or negative attitude of the subject of the evaluation to its object, e.g. like/dislike, appreciate/unappreciate, approve/disapprove, etc. The objective component of the evaluation is based on its own properties of objects or phenomena, e.g. the water is cold/warm – here the water's features and object's feelings are implied.

According to E.M. Volf [65], the elements of evaluative modal structure comprises elements of three types: 1) explicit (the object of the evaluation); 2) implicit (scale of evaluation, evaluative stereotype, the evaluative aspect); 3) explicit-implicit (the object of evaluation, axiological predicates and evaluative motivations). The structure of evaluative scale has objective and subjective sides. From the one hand, on the scale the subject's attitude to the evaluative object is taken into account, e.g. *I like, I don't like, I can't bear, I hate something* etc. From the other hand, the object's properties are born in mind, e.g. *the apples are tasteful, very tasteful* etc.

Among evaluative meanings the researchers define generally evaluated and partly evaluated. The first type is realized through adjectives ‘good’ or ‘bad’ and their synonyms with different expressive shades, e.g. marvelous, gorgeous, etc. The second type is more numerous, it contains meanings, that give evaluation to one of the aspect from the certain point of view.

N.D. Arutyunova [67] breaks down all partly evaluated into following categories:

- sensory-gustatory or hedonistic, e.g. pleasant/unpleasant, tasty/tasteless;
- psychological evaluations: a) intellectual evaluations, e.g. interesting/uninteresting, fascinating, boring; b) emotional evaluation, e.g. funny/sad;
- aesthetic evaluations (combine sensory-gustatory and psychological evaluations): e.g. beautiful – ugly;
- ethical evaluations, e.g. moral/immoral, good – evil;
- utilitarian evaluations, e.g. useful – harmful;
- normative evaluations, e.g. correct – incorrect, standard – non-standard;
- teleological evaluations, e.g. effective – ineffective [67].

From all partly evaluated meanings mentioned above, sensory and psychological evaluations usually are not motivated, as evaluation there is the result of human sensations and feelings. That’s why the author classifies them into one group. The second group, containing aesthetic and ethical evaluations, forms the nucleus of the inwardness of man. The last three meanings are rational evaluations. Their main criteria are physical or mental benefit that focus on achieving a specific goal and performing various functions. The main difference between general and partial meanings is that general evaluations can be both in the function of the model operator and in the predicate function. As for private assessments, they perform mainly the second function. For example, one can say *‘Its good(bad) that it is winter’*. But we can’t say *‘It is beautiful that it is winter’*. Or *‘It is immoral of you to do in such a way.’* But it is impossible to say: *‘It’s a shame to do this.’*

The evaluation is appropriate to lexical level of the language. For this very statement we can take a concept by G.Y. Solganik, who subdivided an evaluative

lexicon into positive evaluative, negative evaluative and modal evaluative. The first is characterized by expression of affirmative evaluation (peaceful, grateful etc.) The second subdivision performs nefarious function (defaulter, deplorable etc.). The third group of words imply words with two-sided direction of the semantic structure, that is, words that appear in different contexts, acquire positive and negative connotations (*drama, tragedy, fetters etc.*) [69].

On the lexical level, M.N. Epstein defined 3 classes of words that differ by their mode of evaluative use. To the first class he refers words with meaning that doesn't predesignate speakers' attitude to the signified phenomenon, e.g. *horse, cat, to see, yellow etc.* To the second class, academic specialist refers words with an evaluative meaning, but it is not denoted to which exactly, e.g. *nice, gloomy, profitable, harmful etc.* In the third group of words the objective and evaluative meaning are fiercely connected with each other. They not only denote phenomenon, but also informs us about it. For example, the word 'to badmouth' means 'to expose to public dishonour', and at the same time expresses negative evaluation of this action, implying that somebody was named through the mud wrongly. M.N. Epstein worked with words that combining objectification and evaluativity and called them *pragmema* [70].

B.I. Karasik ('*The language circle: personality, concert, discourse*') claims that the evaluative orientation can be observed in all kinds of discourse, regardless the type of conversation. According to his words, the political discourse is full of value signs, and the political lexicon shows more measurable labiability depending on those who use responsible words. As the example, the linguist takes a word '*patriot*' that in gentry takes a negative connotation '*nationalist*' [27, p.33].

In the political discourse, the evaluation can be expressed implicitly and explicitly by using different means and being the signal of value information. This term can help to provide pragmatic effect of the message and influence. According to the discursive norms, the evaluative concept can be evaluative proper, evaluative-descriptive or descriptive proper. This concept is always necessarily component of cognitive pattern, because it forms evaluative viewpoint of the public. As the

example we can take the speech of Barak Obama which took place in Paris during the attacks. In his declaration he makes accent on values which are of great importance for the audience.

‘Good evening, everybody. I just want to make a few brief comments about the attacks across Paris tonight. Once again, we’ve seen an outrageous attempt to terrorize innocent civilians. This is an attack not just on Paris, it’s an attack not just on the people of France, but this is an attack on all of humanity and the universal values that we share.

Paris itself represents the timeless values of human progress. Those who think that they can terrorize the people of France or the values that they stand for are wrong. The American people draw strength from the French people’s commitment to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness. We are reminded in this of tragedy that the bonds of liberte and egalite and fraternite are not only values that the French people care so deeply about, but they are values that we share. And those values are going to endure for beyond any act of terrorism or the hateful vision of those who perpetrated the crimes this evening’ [41].

As we can see, the explicit lexical unit ‘values’ is repeated six times and serves as a vehicle for emotional wringer of the speaking. Furthermore, the emotivity is raised by using nouns and French words, which contain a positive evaluation: *life, happiness, liberte, egalite, fraternite*.

If we take the statement of David Cameron, made after the problems in Paris for the consideration, we will see the using of nouns that represent general values: *‘And they were killed and injured by brutal, callous murders who want to destroy everything our two countries stand for. **Peace. Tolerance. Liberty.**’*

The evaluative representation of the political discourse depends on extralinguistic features of political context. Among them you can notice the specificity of communication sphere, communicative aim and addressee factors.

One of the most major text characteristics of political speeches is the invocation to the authority through the citations of the famous and noble politicians, writers or citations from Bible. The citations are related with the speech content and

the level of the auditorium for whom the politician is going to declare. The quotation bears at the same time information and evaluative functional weight. It can be seen in the inauguration speech of Barak Obama:

*'We remain a young nation, but in the words of Scripture, **the time has come to set aside childish things. The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit; to choose our better history; to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea, passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that we are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness**'.*

Another example is the second inauguration speech of George Bush: *'The rulers of outlaw regimes can know that we still believe as Abraham Lincoln did: **"Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under the rule of a just God, cannot long retain it"*** [41].

According to O.M. Volf's perspective, the evaluation can be restricted by elements that are smaller than the word, but also can characterizes the word groups and the whole utterance [66, p. 6].

The investigators assume that the adjectives are the principal stronghold of lexis that can express evaluation. In the frame of the political discourse, we can observe the function of evaluation quality that is expressed by the adjectives.

The linguist mentioned above thinks that the connection between descriptive and evaluative (emotive) contest in the word meanings brightly manifests in the system of adjectives. Among this part of speech, the researcher offers differentiate between descriptive words and evaluative proper ones. The descriptive words have no evaluation in their nature (e.g. *Turkish, silver, evening*). The evaluative proper words denote only assessment with '+' sign ('good') or '-' ('bad') with different degree of intensification or affectivity, e.g. *nice, brilliant, disgusting, abominable etc.* [65, p. 29]. At the same time, the researchers make remarks that it is inherent of the relative adjectives to take qualitative features. Let's analyze the use of the superlative degree of the adjective 'large' in the phrase taken from Barak Obama's performance in Parisian summit.

*'I've come here personally, as the leader of the world's **largest** economy and the second-**largest** emitter, to say that the United States of America not only recognize our role in creating this problem, we embrace our responsibility to do something about it.'* [41].

As we see from the example, the lexeme '*largest*' is repeated twice. In the first case it is used for positive evaluation of his country – *the world's largest economy*, and in the second case it denotes a negative characterization – *the second-largest emitter*. This contrast helps to achieve the highest level of emotivity.

The expressiveness of attitudinal meaning can be expressed in its intensification, thus the heightening of evaluative content level. Therefore, the degree of comparison of the adjectives is an effective manner of expression negative and positive emotions. Feeling sorry for the victims of terrorist attack in Paris, Barak Obama uses an adjective 'deep' in the superlative degree: *'We have been in contact with French officials to communicate **our deepest condolences** to the families of those who have been killed, to offer our prayers and thoughts to those who have been wounded.'* [41].

The positive emotive connotation also can be observed in the President's attitude to the activity of running mate: *'I want to thank my friend and partner of the last four years, America's happy warrior, **the best vice-president anybody could ever hope for, Joe Biden.*** 'And also he comments his own presidential activity: *'As President and Commander in Chief, **my highest priority** is the security of the American people.'* [41].

Barak Obama often applies the adjectives with positive connotation when he talks about his country: *'We believe in a **generous** America, in a **compassionate** America, in a **tolerant** America.'* [41].

The same positive emotive connotation is typical for evaluation of American people and intelligence agency's actions during the struggle with terrorism: *'So anyone trying to harm Americans need to know- they need to know that we are **strong** and that we're **resilient**, that we will not be terrorized.'*

It is worth considering the lexeme ‘extraordinary’. It is met almost in all Obama’s phrases aiming to demonstrate the expression’s emotivity: *‘They served there with **extraordinary skill and valor**, and it is worth remembering especially the more than 2,200 American patriots who made the ultimate sacrifice in Afghanistan’*. And the other example is: *‘Since 9/11, we’ve taken **extraordinary measures** to strengthen our homeland security.’* [41].

It should be noted that the tragedy in Paris is of immediate interest in the political discourse. When the politician comments events, he directly attributes zones with positive and negative evaluations. The terrorists’ actions are denoted with the adjective with emotive-intellectual component of the negative evaluation: *‘Once again, we’ve seen **an outrageous attempt** to terrorize innocent civilians.’*;

*‘**The terrible events** in Paris were a terrible and sickening setback.’*

*‘What happened in Paris is **truly horrific**.’*

The adjectives with the same negative connotations are used to characterize terrorist enterprise activity: *‘Muslims around the world-including millions of patriotic Muslim Americans who reject **their hateful ideology**.’*

*‘Tragically, Paris is not alone. We’ve seen **outrageous attacks** by ISIL in Beirut, last month in Ankara, routinely in Iraq.’*

Simultaneously, the condolences and support of the French people is denoted by the word-phrases with emotive-intellectual component of the positive evaluation: *‘These were **innocent victims**, enjoying a Friday night out with friends and family, no doubt at the end of a hard week.’*

*‘This is a **heartbreaking situation**. And obviously those of us here in the United states know what it’s like.’* [41].

Thus, looking at the examples given above, we can come to conclusion that it is natural for political discourse texts to advert both for emotio and ratio of the addressee. The evaluation in the political text plays the key role in the expression of the author’s position, and also helps to attract attention, fulfills text with flamboyant images and influences on associative thinking.

The study of the notion 'evaluation' in the political discourse have shown that evaluative meaning is a remarkable element of the content and an integrant part of communicative-pragmatic aim of the influence. It bears mentioning that evaluation in political discourse shows the ability to realize with the help of multilevel language and speech means. Among them word-forming (expressive prefixes and adjectives' degrees of comparison), lexical-grammatical (adjectives, nouns), pragmatic (precedential utterances and names). The most productive lexical-grammatical word classes that expresses evaluation in political discourse texts are adjectives.

Besides lexical means, the evaluation category can be signified by stylistic and syntactic means, that will be perspective of the further research.

It is a well-known fact, that expressiveness, being a linguistic category of expressing explicitness and feelings and a feature of intensification of words meaning, acquires a special value in the frame of political discourse, precisely because it helps to identificate essential aims and functions of political speech, attract attention, activate cognitive processes, strengthen emotive tension of the auditorium [71, p. 3]

The notion of expressivity in political discourse lies on function of impact and its relation with a communitive aim of expression. The category of expressivity makes dependent on speaker's intention and situation of communication. The main role of expressivity is providing of dialogical interference with addressee through explication of speaker's subjective attitude to expression context and its speech activity.

Expressivity, mainly in political texts, is obliged to combine two context plans: informational and subjective. The first aims in conveying the sense of real or unreal, modern or archaic facts and events, while the second combines subjective and individual outlook by politician, and the desire to have influence on listener: inspire, meet somebody's demands, impress, displease, make laugh of etc.

Besides, in the linguistics there are a lot of definitions concerning expressivity, but in its basis there is an understanding of this category as accentuation of text context with the help of various linguistic means and devices to make greater

effect on addressee's personality and his emotional state. In other words, expressivity is the ability of linguistic units to strengthen impact in the communication act. If speak about emotivity and expressivity, it is important to note that expression of emotions is always expressive in the language, while expressivity in the language is not always emotional [72, p. 75]

One of the integral components of political speech is emotional-expressive nomination, which can be reached by using the whole line of linguistic means, such as emphatic pronouns, auxiliary verb 'do' in an emphatic function, inverted word order, emphatic lexical units-nouns, verbs, adjectives, particles, including linguistic items of quantitative semantics, e.g. *gazillion; bazillion; plethora; myriad; many; so many; an awesome amount; a whole bunch of; tsunami of activity; as many as; as much as; aslong as mouyo, remarkably; extreme(ly); overwhelming(ly); definite(ly), entirely; considerably; significant(ly); particular(ly) noteworthy etc.*

One of the communicative-pragmatic strategies in political speeches is the strategy of identification, that is apprising of speechmaker as a political player to the electorate [73, p. 37]. From the one side, candidates tend to persuade the voting public in personal exclusiveness during proclamation of political speeches, but on the other side, to look like ordinary people. It is recognized that people believe those politicians, that are similar to common men, that's why orators try to create an image of 'fellowmen', convicting that statesman is on the same page with peoplehood. In other words, the principal aim of addressant is formation of trust of auditorium and closeness with electorate.

This category embraces tactics of creating collective image and tactics of reference on personal experience. They are realized with the help of linguistic units of different levels.

The tactics of creating a collective image, that is identification of statesman with public is manifested in lexical level by using elements of colloquial language, and sometimes inappropriate words: *kind of people, the kind of man ..., you know, friends, I believe, Labor's mess (David Cameron); You know, Michelle and I..., I am*

sorry to say that..., gamble your retirement..., I was pretty independent then...(Gordon Brown) [74].

The other mode of realization of collective image is using of personal pronoun 'we' in nominative and objective cases. So, in the extract of speech *'But my arguments tonight are also the latest chapter in what has been a long conversation between us, because many of you here attended the regular events for faith groups and NGOs that I convened throughout my years at the Treasury and many of us are veterans together of those long-shared endeavours to secure for the poorest of the world debt cancellation and increased aid and fairer trade'*, David Cameron identifies himself with public, using lexemes *'together, many of us'*, and tries to give understanding, that he and his party are like-minded people, and only they can protect country and restore fair trade.

In the extract of speech by David Cameron: *'The role we play, the organizations we belong to... and yes – the fact our defence budget remains the 4th largest in the world... all this is not about national vanity – it's about our national interest'*, [74] there is use of personal pronoun 'we' and possessive pronoun 'our' as means of identification with people.

The orator tends to hit it over the fence that the country's budget is one of the greatest in the world is the mutual merit of ordinary British along with politicians. In his speeches, country's leader often uses lexemes, such as *'team, friends,'* in order to show respect and equal rightness to his own voter base: *'... We in this room are a team'*, *'... And friends, you know what someone said about us recently?'*

On the syntactical level, the mentioned tactics is realized through using rhetorical questions. Its use provides function of contact making and personification. With the help of this speech figure, the political leader makes accent of weighty problems, demonstrates his own attitude to these questions, that is reproaching himself to the auditorium.

As the example we take an excerpt of David Cameron's speech, which he pronounced at party convention: *'Apparently some Russian official said: Britain is just a small island that no-one pays any attention to'. Really? Let me just get this*

off my chest. When the world wanted rights, who wrote Magna Carta? When they wanted representation, who built the first Parliament? When they looked for compassion, who led the abolition of slavery? When they searched for equality, who gave women the vote? When their freedom was in peril, who offered blood, toil, tears and sweat? And today – whose music do they dance to? Whose universities do they flock to? Whose football league do they watch? [74].

This part of speech is characterized by using 7 rhetorical questions in a row for making closer contact with locutionary target and persuasion of British, that Britain is not only a small island, but a democratic state. In order to bear out his opinion, David Cameron uses identical structure of creating every question-‘when...who?’, in which after interrogative word ‘when’ is presented a well-known fact, that became a problem of global scale, and after interrogative pronoun ‘who’, which intensifies importance of Britain’s participation on this process, is presented its solution. In such a way, rhetorical questions *...who wrote Magna Carta? ...who built the first Parliament? ...who led the abolition of slavery? ...who gave women the vote?* are evident proof of remarkable contribution of Great Britain in the development of world democracy.

Introducing the strategies of intensification, political leaders widely use repetitions. These figures increase a general expressivity, creating a special rhythm of phrase or the whole fragment. Meanwhile, these figures are the modes of accentuation of the most notorious and sensual elements of speech.

Thus, in his speech, David Cameron in Birmingham repeats a syntagma ‘Britain is on the rise’: *‘Today I’m going to set out a serious argument to this country about how we do that. How we compete and thrive in this world... how we can make sure in this century, like the ones before. Britain is on the rise. Nothing matters more. Every battle we fight, every plan we make, every decision we take is to achieve that end...Britain on the rise’* [74], which along with repetition of personal pronoun ‘we’, creates a logical causative-consecutive relation between conservative party and way of country’s prosperity.

The tactics of reference to personal experience is chosen for identification of statesman as a candidate from ‘the public’, who works for the improvement of life. The effective device of using these tactics is mention of family members, friends, or people who helped to reach success or stories that became examples of fighting with social and economical disadvantages. First of all, the mention of personal experience appellates to emotional side and have a ponderable psychological input on the audience.

As the example we have fragment from Gordon Brown’s speech: *‘And I say this too; these are my values – the values I grew up with in an ordinary family in an ordinary town. Like most families on middle and modest incomes we believed in making the most of our talents. But we knew that no matter how hard we worked free education was our only pathway to being the best we could be’* [74]. Here there is an illustration of orator’s intention to show his closeness with fellowmen in consequence of story about origin from an ordinary British family (*an ordinary family, like most families on middle and modest incomes*), which became a place of birth of life values of future leader.

In his speeches, David Cameron more often invokes to personal experience, mentioning members of his family: *‘...I’ll never forget how after my son Ivan was born, a social worker sat patiently in our kitchen and told us about the sort of help we might need’*, and ordinary nationals, who call him for help : *‘...I’ll never forget watching Samantha do just that – winning her first customer, sorting out the cash flow, that magic moment when she got her first business cards printed. I was incredibly proud of her then – and I am incredibly proud of her now’*, *‘... I met a couple on Sunday – Emily and James’*, *‘... I’ll never forget sitting in the classroom at Perry Beeches III in Birmingham, on the first day of term this year. I met a mum there who said to me – this is what I’ve dreamed of for my child...’* [74].

Every time Cameron shares his own experience in his speeches, he uses phrase ‘I’ll never forget’. This phrase is emotionally weighty, because it demonstrates to his voting people personal involvement to people’s problems, and also witnesses about his humanness both as politician and family man.

1.3 Subjective modality as a semantic category, its types and means in the political discourse

Any linguistic phenomenon in the modern linguistic area acquires special features which are worth considering in order to convey everything that is present in an original text of any author.

Modality considers to be a functional-semantic category, a language universality that is manifested in general language categories. This linguistic category is an important element of communication, expressing attitude of the speaker to the utterance. Moreover, it is an integral part of any text consisting of author's attitude to the reality, fundamental feature of pragmatic component of the text, one of the most basal peculiarities of psycho and ability to oppose 'I – not I' in the expression frame.

With the help of modality, we may express thoughts fluently and emotively, as we can't convey all necessary information without demonstrating our attitude to what we are talking about. Thus, modality plays a key role in any texts of every genre and style.

The notion 'modality' is quite multiplicate and multi-faceted. According to Ya.I. Retsker, 'in the English language there is no other lexical-grammatical category with so many difficulties in the translation, but category of modality' [75, p.80].

Thus, modality is a battle-ground in linguistics, that's why it is an 'eternal' question of linguistic studies, because still we can't find an exclusive point of view concerning this category.

Due to V.H. Yartseva, 'modality is a functional-semantic category, that express various types of attitudes to the reality and different types of subjective qualification of what is being reported' [11].

O.O. Selivanova points the category of modality as a representation of different emotive-evaluative signals that are formed by author's consciousness,

reality/irreality of imitative reference, that plays a notional role in actualization of context-continuous text organization. [76, p. 74-80]

A French linguist Charles Ballie [77, p. 100] gives his own interpretation of modality. He explains that ‘modality is a personal form of the verb, verbal phrases or modal adverb with the help of which speaker expresses his points of view to quality of action or state, modified by predicate’. From the other side, Charles Ballie says that ‘modality is a soul of the sentence. There are no expressions without modality’.

The famous academicians O. A. Bun and V.V. Vinogradov’ hold the same opinion. [78, p. 141-148; 79, p. 53-87].

Concluding the reported above, modality is both negative and positive attitude of the author to the environment.

The main feature of modality is speaker’s attitude to what is being said or written. Although it can be expressed by different means (grammatical, lexical, phraseological, syntactical, intonational, syntactical), modality is a category that is inherent in speech, and that is the very notion of communicative process. However, modern English linguists do not give definition to this category at all, concerning it as a given and consider its variations: conditional, indicative, alethic, deontic and epistemic.

As O.P. Vorobyova states, ‘investigation of category of modality is perplexed by ambiguity or even homonymy of the term.’ [80, p. 22-30].

Modality is a multifaceted phenomenon, and that is why in linguistic literature there are many ideas concerning this concept. Although, V.V. Kozlovsky points that miscellaneous definitions of modality does not exclude each other, but complement one another, displaying difficulty and multifarious of very notion ‘modality’ [81].

As we know, the traditional distinction of modality consists of two types: objective and subjective. The first type is understood as an attitude of expression, that is formed grammatically, to the extralinguistic reality, while the second one is understood as an expression of speaker’s attitude to what he is talking about. The scientists assert [66,67] that objective modality is a necessary thing for any

expressions, while subjective one is facultative. Moreover, these two definitions differ mostly, that they are worth rationally differentiating it.

The investigators [66,67] think that linguistic category of modality expresses two types of logical-grammatical connections: the relation to the sentence content according to the objective reality and speaker's attitude to the sentence content (utterance). In the first case, V.V. Kozlovsky uses the term 'objective modality', while in the second case they discover the form of speech – 'subjective modality'. [81, p. 48-53]. Thus, linguistic modality includes the aspect of objective modality- relation of reportability to the reality and the aspect of subjective modality- speaker's evaluative relation to expression content.

According to definition of V.N. Yartseva, objective modality 'is an obligated feature of any expression, one of the categories that forms predicative unit, namely sentence'. It expresses attitude of what is being reported to the reality in the frames of reality/irreality [11].

O.P. Vorobyova makes accent that objective and subjective modalities are two sides of the whole [80, p. 28]. It means that we can't dismiss expression content from the speaker, namely to consider objective modality as an independent category and vice versa.

Subjective modality expresses speaker's attitude to what is reported. It is based on evaluation in a wide meaning of the word, including not only logical qualification, but also multiple kinds of emotive reactions. Introduction of sub-modal meaning to the general category of modality is a 'bridge' from sentence to expression and text and creates prerequisites to its distinction into phrasal and textual [80, p. 76-82].

In contrast to objective modality, subjective modality is a facultative feature of text. The context basis of subjective modality creates a notion of evaluation in a wide sense, including not only logical and intellectual qualification of what is reported but also different kinds of emotional (or irrational) reaction.

Many scholars [76, 77, 79, 80 etc.] highlight segmental modality, that according to their definition, characterizes the process of text conclusion on its

certain stages. We should bear in mind not only about possibility of modal energy's fixation on its 'certain stages', but expression of author's presence. The author in this way performs as commentator of his own text and his relation to it. As these authors understand that, the author modality is an author position and attitude to the message, that's why such an attitude find its expression in such text manifestations as titles, key words, personal names, remarks.

At the same time they mention that author modality 'is attitude of speaker to what is reported, thoughts and positions that are formed for the sake of message to the readers.

There is also a logical modality, which is understood as a determined veracity of thoughts due to variety of judgements.'

According to V.V. Kozlovsky, subjective modality – is a personal relation of speaker to the sentence content, which is expressed by the system of grammatical, lexico-grammatical means and intonation [81].

N.M. Safonova proposes her own sub-aspects of subjective modality. She mentions epistemic subjective modality, that is the speaker's attitude to the expression content from the degree of enquiry of what is spoken about. Further, the research talks about axiological subjective modality, that is the concordance of expression content to the individual or social stereotypes. And the second type is volitional subjective modality, that the degree of necessity or volitivity of real connections between the predicate and the actant of proposal [82, p. 76].

V.V. Kozlovsky offers that the main criteria of subjective modality are evaluation, which was mentioned in sub-chapter 1.2.4.; implicitness/ explicitness; direct/indirect (using of description and indirect speech) and agential/unagential, that flows from the language situation [81, p. 12].

According to L.R. Bezugla, in the sentence there are explicit and implicit subjective modality [83].

To confirm the first case, we can use the words of George Bush from his speech: '*Our Iran policy is a complete failure right now...*'. For the second case, let's take the words of Barak Obama: '*We are a nation of Christians and Muslims,*

Jews and Hindus- and non-believers.’ In the first sentence the speaker clearly expresses his negative evaluation, that is the Americans can’t struggle with Iran properly, while in the second case the politician asserts that America is a country for all people, independently from race and beliefs.

The researchers also differentiate between direct and indirect subjective modality. The direct subjective modality points out that the speaker is a subject of the very subjective modality as in example of George Bush’s declaration: *‘I’m running for President to change course, not to continue George Bush’s course.’*, while the indirect subjective modality appears in the sentence, where the speaker doesn’t combine with the subject of subjective modality.

The SM can also be divided into agential and non-agential [84].

The agential SM is present in the sentences with a brightly expressed subject of the action. As the example can be George Bush’s words: *‘The terrorists and Saddamists continue to sow violence and terror, and they will continue fighting freedom’s progress with all the hateful determination they can muster.’* And correspondently, nonagential modality is present in the sentences without the subject of SM, as in Barak Obama’s words: *‘...And that’s certainly true with the budget.’*

There are a lot of classifications of means in expressing modality which are dependent on linguists’ implement to linguistic studios. I.V. Korynets remarks that ‘modality, being an extralinguistic category, expresses speaker’s attitude to the reality and has general means of realization, such as phonetic means (accent and intonation), lexical-grammatical means (modal verbs), lexical means (modal words and phrases), grammatical means expressing grammatical modality [85].

Such classification supports Ya.I. Retzker, who thinks that ‘in the theory and practice of translation the main task is conveying subjective modality’, using the means mentioned above [86].

Having deal with translation of English political texts, V.I. Karaban underlines that such texts are translated by lexical-grammatical means of expressing modality with the help of *complex modal predicates* with ‘must, have to, should, may, might, can, could, will, would, need, ought to, to be to’ [87].

The linguist O.M. Ilchenko makes accent on *epistemic modality* [88]. It is a component of subjective modality, oriented on expressing probability, faithfulness, degree of fullness and knowledge of speaker about message. According to his classification, modality can be expressed during translation using modal verbs and its equivalents (may, might, etc.), adjectives (possible, probable), nouns (feeling, guess etc.) [88].

Epistemic modality expresses the degree of probability including the logical possibility, necessity, hypothetical meaning, beliefs and predictability. Epistemic modality is concerned with matters of knowledge or belief on which basis speakers express their judgments about states of affairs, events or actions [89]. In other words, it concerns the speaker's attitude to the factuality of past or present time situations [90]. Thus, in the modalized proposition something may, or might, must, could be, the speaker communicates his or her subjective attitude to the proposition and so s/he modifies the illocutionary force of the utterance. It is often claimed in the linguistics literature that epistemic modality, unlike other kinds of modality, does not contribute to the truth conditions of the utterance. Relatedly, several authors argue that epistemic modality expresses a comment on the proposition expressed by the rest of the utterance.

All ways of expressing modal means (modality) can be split into two classes: universal and non-universal. The first are typical for all kinds of expressions, that is intonation. The second are present only in some expressions. The main task of means in expressing modality is to discover forms of its expressions. Non-universal means of expressing modality are used in order to create conditions for any forms of expressing modality. To these means we refer disyllabic construction with direct word order, monosyllabic construction and construction of complex proposition.

To conclude, modality is a category that characterizes verb mood or relation to the action. Modality is a functional-semantic category that expresses attitude of speaker to expression context and reality. Modality can be of different types, but the classification into subjective and objective is more general.

CONCLUSION TO CHAPTER ONE

The consideration of the theoretical study of subjective modality in the English political discourse gives us an opportunity to conclude the following:

1. Taking into account the definitions of political discourse given by various authors, we offer the following definition of this concept: political discourse is a collection of all speech acts, consisting of the public law, tradition and experience, which is determined and expressed in the form of verbal formations, content, subject and the addressee of which belongs to the sphere of politics.

2. During the investigation, we found out that the English political discourse has the following characteristic parameters: the image of the author, addressee ability, informational content, conventionality (manifesting in three forms: cliches, terminology, rituality), emotiveness, intentionality, modality, social content, estimation.

3. Among general characteristics of the English political discourse, we can define idiosyncratic features, which are typical only for English political discourse. Namely here belongs agonistic capability, aggressiveness, ideological character and theatricality.

4. One of the most prominent feature of the English political discourse is the category of evaluation, which stands in one line with categories of impact and expressiveness. Having considered many definitions by different scholars (I.V. Arnold, N.D. Arutuynova, E.I. Solganik), we have some to conclusion, that there is a strong correlation between notions 'evaluation' and 'subjective modality', namely: 'evaluation' and 'subjective modality' are equivalent concepts and can be defined both as 'the speaker's attitude to what is reported'. The following concept which is worthy considering is concept 'expressiveness'. The notion of expressivity in political discourse lies on function of impact and its relation with a communicative aim of expression. The category of expressivity makes dependent on speaker's intention and situation of communication. The main role of expressivity is providing of dialogical interference with addressee through explication of speaker's subjective

attitude to expression context and its speech activity. Expressivity, is obliged to combine two context plans: informational and subjective. The first aims in conveying the sense of real or unreal, modern or archaic facts and events, while the second combines subjective and individual outlook by politician, and the desire to have influence on listener: to inspire, meet somebody's demands, impress, displease, make laugh of etc.

5. Based on approaches of many linguists, we have defined that modality is a functional-semantic category, a language universality that is manifested in general language categories. This linguistic category is an important element of communication, expressing both positive and negative attitude of the speaker to the utterance. During the investigation, we bear in mind that traditionally modality is divided into subjective and objective. The first type is understood as an attitude of expression, that is formed grammatically, to the extralinguistic reality, while the second one is understood as an expression of speaker's attitude to what he is talking about. The scientists assert that objective modality is a necessary for any expressions, while subjective one is facultative. Some researchers highlight segmental and logical modality, and moreover they denote sub-aspects of subjective modality, such as epistemic subjective modality, (that is the speaker's attitude to the expression content from the degree of enquiry of what is spoken about). Further, the research define axiological subjective modality, (the concordance of expression content to the individual or social stereotypes). And finally, volitional subjective modality, (the degree of necessity or volitivity of real connections between the predicate and the actant of proposal). Drawing on the classification of means of expressing modality, we take the view of I.V. Korynets, who remarks that subjective modality, being an extralinguistic category, expresses speaker's attitude to the reality and has general means of realization, such as phonetic means (accent and intonation), lexical-grammatical means (modal verbs), lexical means (modal words and phrases), grammatical means expressing grammatical modality.

CHAPTER II. LINGUISTIC MEANS OF SUBJECTIVE MODALITY IN ENGLISH AND AMERICAN POLITICAL SPEECHES

2.1 Lexical means of subjective modality

The most prominent means of expressing modality is modal verbs and modal modifiers. Modal words are lexical-grammatical category that embraces lexical and lexical-phraseological units that are characterized by grammatical independence and express subjective-modal meaning. Modal words have both semantic and syntactic features.

The syntactic feature of modal words characterizes by subjective relationship to expressing according to authenticity, probability or desire. Modal words distinguish mainly from notional parts of speech, having nominative function.

Modal words usually perform function of linking words, and it can be seen in political speeches, e.g. David Cameron used modal word *perhaps*:

‘(70) I can say something today that perhaps no Prime Minister has ever really been able to say before [91].

Or modal word actually in Theresa May’s speech:

(97) Third, there are those who argue that grammars don’t actually select on ability because wealthy families can pay tutors to help their children get through the tests [92].

Modal words differ from notional ones with what they are related by origin and absence of nominative function. Modal words don’t mention subjects, features or processes that are marketed by notional words; They are denuded grammatical connection with words, that make up sentences.

According to their meaning, modal words can be divided depending on their subjective attitude to the facts of reality on. Here there are:

- 1) Words expressing statements;
- 2) Words expressing assumptions;
- 3) Words expressing a subjective assessment of the content of the statement

in terms of its desirability or undesirability.

It is well-known fact that English lexical means of expression modality include the author's attitude to his expression, denoting confidence, doubts, assumptions, positive or negative evaluation of what is expressed in sentence. In the political speeches we can find simple (sure, perhaps), derived (surely, naturally, really), and compound (maybe, to be sure) modal words.

For example, simple modal words can be found in David Cameron's speech:

(12) Medical care, of course, is merely one component of our overall health... Sure, most of that money doesn't pass through your hands now [91].

(70) I can say something today that perhaps no Prime Minister has ever really been able to say before [91].

Politicians use derived modal words in their speeches:

(67) We can talk all we want about opportunity, but it's meaningless unless people are really judged equally [91].

(74) Induced abortion is maybe the most contentious issue within reproductive health [93].

In political speeches the most used lexical means are:

1. Modal words that express uncertainty, assumption, uncertainty in facts that are reported: maybe, perhaps, possibly, probably. These words can perform function of synonyms, thus creating synonymic groups. For example, words maybe and perhaps express doubt, but sometimes can express shades of hopes, probability:

(7) Perhaps someday in the future there will be a magical moment when the countries of the world will get together to eliminate their nuclear weapons [92].

(37) It's like one of these law school hypotheticals that now has maybe becoming real [91].

2. There are some other modal words that express approval or disapproval, fortunately, happily, unhappily, that uses David Cameron in his speech:

(81) I will supply what evidence we have, what reports we have honestly, and then happily leave it or unhappily leave it to the Council [91].

(77) *The first lesson of politics is that many memories are short - but, fortunately, not yet too many* [91].

3. Modal words that express intensification:

(96) *For the best way of resisting protectionism is to ensure that this century is defined by open markets that really deliver for all our people* [94].

(32) *But which of those two weapons is really more effective in the world of today?* [94].

4. Modal words that express certainty, authenticity of what is reported (of course, sure, no doubt):

(68) *But we must also deliver a radical increase in the capacity of the school system so that these families can be sure of their children getting good school places* [92].

(78) *Of course, there must be strict and properly enforced rules to ensure that every new faith school operates in a way that supports British values* [92].

37 (1) *We will have to keep that resolve because there is no doubt that we will be tested again and I can assure you that in that test the resolve of the British government and people will be unflinching* [94].

(21) *Languages are no doubt an expression of civilization* [91].

Modal words express the speaker's subjective attitude to the expressed thought in the sentences. They are not parts of the sentence, as giving an assessment to the whole situations that are in a sentence, modal words are as if outside the sentence.

Performing the function of the inserted member of the sentence, the modal word can be placed at the beginning of the sentence, in the middle and sometimes at the end of the sentence.

Most modal words are derived from adverbs and coincide in form with adverbs of the mode of action and have the suffix *-ly*. Modal words differ from the adverb in meaning and syntactic function. The meaning and syntactic function of the adverb consists of the fact that it gives an objective description of the action, properties, signs or indicates the circumstances under which the action is carried out, and refers to one member of the sentence. The modal word, in turn, usually refers to

the whole sentence as a whole and expresses the subjective attitude of the speaker, to expressed opinion.

Therefore, summarizing the above, we can conclude that modal words are a common linguistic phenomenon in political speeches. The largest amount of their use can be traced in the speeches of David Cameron and Theresa May.

2.2 Grammatical means of subjective modality

With the help of moods of verbs, we can express modality in the English political discourse. Thus, Indicative mood displays the fact of actual action in the present, past and future tenses. In the English it is possible to distinguish four groups of tenses:

- Indefinite Tenses
- Continuous Tenses
- Perfect Tenses
- Perfect Continuous Tenses

As mentioned above, the indicative mood in English has active and passive voices. The Active Voice expresses the action being performed by a person or object as a subject, and the Passive Voice is used if the subject does not perform the action, but feels the influence producing from the predicate.

That is, Imperative Mood – expresses a request, order, advice, invitation, prohibition, etc. while Subjunctive Mood - expresses assumptions about what could happen, would happen, and what would we like to happen.

We can monitor all these phenomena in examples of English-language political discourse.

Indicative Mood is used to state, assert or deny the real reality in the present, past or future tense. Modality of indicative mood is that the content of the predicate, and through it everything the sentence is presented or evaluated by the speaker as authentic and in speech of Boris Thomson we see a following method: (5) *The water*

was contaminated with industrial waste [91] or Theresa May: (16) *But none of this will mean anything if the war does not stop* [92].

The Indicative mood conveys the action, which is considered by the speaker as real fact, hence the need to correlate it with one or another temporal form, as no action can occur outside the temporal framework:

(4) *You will definitely be punished if you do this again* [92].

(15) *But let me also declare that, if war is thrust upon us, we will exercise our right to self-defense fully and very effectively* [91].

Often, all the events and words in the speeches of represented by politicians are real, which is why this way of implementing objective modality is the most common in political discourse and accounts for 91.3% of all analyzed examples and forms the basis of all these political speeches.

The other two moods of the verb do not imply a clear relationship with a certain time sphere. The imperative mood expresses the urge to act and implicitly thus implies an action not yet committed, but an action to take place in the future; but precisely because it expresses only a desire, an incentive to performing an action, this form is not a form of the future tense.

The Imperative Mood expresses not an action, but a motivation, a request, and order to make it. In connection with the above in political discourse for the imperative mood is not inherent forms of tenses and temporal relativity. Because the imperative mood does not express an action, but only a motivation for it, it has no experienced category of numbers and persons, although usually addressed to another person. However, a person can be specified, but in this case it is not the subject:

(9) *Help me to find the right way, please* [94].

The Imperative mood is characterized by a special intonation, without which the verb form loses the meaning of the imperative mood and becomes infinitive form. For example, in the speech of Boris Thomson it is possible to follow a specific intonation to emphasize the importance of what is said:

(10) *Most of my colleagues said; “Don’t do it!” – but I am here and stay in front of you today* [94].

A specific intonation refers the imperative mood also to exclamations, because the latter can directly express the will.

In order to strengthen person's negative attitude and express clearly dissatisfaction Boris Thomson used an appeal to the second person through the pronoun 'you':

(56) *Do not you forget my words!* [94].

To sum up, the Imperative mood used in the political discourse is used to add a strong emotional shading to a political speech.

The Subjunctive Mood used in the political discourse causes some questions among linguists, that is Subjective mood is a kind of verb mood, where a semantic verb expresses possible a predictable and desirable, but not an actual state or action as well as the subjective attitude of the speaker to such action or state. So, in his speech Boris Thomson used a Subjective mood, for example:

(14) *God save the Queen!* [94].

The Subjective mood used in politicians' speeches forms Subjunctive I and Subjunctive II. As a well-known fact, Subjunctive I is a synthetic form of the subjective mood formed by means of special forms of semantic verb.

For example, Boris Thomson mostly used in his speeches the form of the present tense (Present Subjunctive):

(2) *It is essential that people be well-educated* [94].

(17) *We suggest that the meeting be postponed* [91].

Earlier, we have reported that the Subjective mood of the past tense (Past Subjunctive) has only one form for the verb to be - the form 'were' for all plural and singular persons. The Past Subjunctive is used more often in political by Theresa May:

(11) *I wished he were less remote* [92].

(18) *He could have covered his tracks if he were guilty* [91].

Political discourse also embraces the use of the Conditional that bears an unrealistic action due to the lack of certain conditions for its implementation. For

example, Donald Trump used a zero conditional to demonstrate a well-known real fact:

(33) *If you abuse that power, people get hurt* [93].

(31) *When unemployment and the budget deficit soar, people suffer* [92].

Or, for example, the first type of conditional sentence was used in situations when it is necessary to announce future facts:

(30) *If this does not work, then we will have to have consultations* [91].

As you can see, in the subordinate clause and the main sentence we are talking about future. That is, there are prerequisites under which this condition can be met. However, in this case in Theresa May's speech, there is uncertainty about the result of condition, as this very condition hasn't yet come, although it is real one.

One more bright example in Donald Trump's speech, where we can see a conditional sentence of the first type, where in subordinate part of the sentence instead of using a conjunction 'If', there is 'unless' and verb in an affirmative form:

(35) *You don't have to do this unless you want* [91].

Donald Trump also used second type of conditional sentence: (65) *Ten years ago, I stood on stage just like this one and said if we changed our party we could change our country* [91].

In this sentence there is a statement about future, although the condition for its result seems to be unreal. Another example of second type of conditional sentence is present in Donald Trump's speech in order to give advice: (66) *If I were in a tricky situation, I would take this opportunity* [91].

The third type is called 'unreal'. In the political discourse speeches' this type is a rare item, but it can be met in Barak Obama's speeches: (71) *If I had been more diligent, I would have been promoted long time ago* [93].

The all notion of this sentence can be explained in a few words, that is a regret about the past. In the other case we can notice a brilliant event that took place in the past and had a positive impact on present situation, as in Theresa May's sentence: (59) *If I had not taken the wrong way, I would not get into politics* [92].

In the sentence, the verb mood expresses speaker's attitude about state of existence of what it is spoken about. It is defined as a set of distinctive verb forms that express modality. Modality is a grammatical expression of subjective and objective attitude of a speaker, including possibility, probability, necessity, obligation, ability, willing and unpredictability.

In such a way, the mood of verb is a main grammatical means of conveying subjective and objective modality. The indicative mood demonstrates that a speaker refers action as a real fact in the present, past and future. The imperative mood serves to give commands, requests etc. The subjective mood shows that a speaker considers action as a predictable and desirable, but not as a real fact. In the modern English there are little forms of subjective mood and they have their own peculiarities in the use.

2.3. Specific modal means of subjective modality in the English political discourse

The modern linguistics places emphasis on the means of expressing subjective modality. These are personal pronouns, modal verbs, introductory words, phrases and sentences, repetitions, word order, intonation, special syntactic constructions, etc.

These modalities of expression promote the author's identity, his word image, emotional mood, as well as perform the communicative function of influencing the consciousness of the addressee. The subjective modality has means of expression at all levels of text organization.

At the lexical-grammatical level, the most common means of expressing subjective modality are modal verbs. Modal verbs in English, by their nature, express the possibility or impossibility of action, probability or improbability, obligation, necessity, desirability, doubt, etc. The primary function of modal verbs is precisely to verbalize, mark the speaker's psychological emotional state, relate to

the communicative situation and its components, and soften the categoricity of functional verbs [16].

The modal verbs are thought to be additional means of expressiveness of speaker's attitude to the action in the sentence, as they demonstrate real/unreal, imposable, doubtful etc. actions. Its naturally, that modal verbs are quite popular in political declarations.

As mentioned [37], political activists use modal verbs and their equivalents to express different shadows of obligation and necessity. The verbalizers of this modal meaning in the English language are verbs *must*, *have to*, *be to*, *should*, *ought to*, *need*.

Modal verb 'must'. The first modal verb we are to consider is '*must*'. With the infinitive of the notional verb, '*must*' expresses necessity, obligation, imminence of action doing and also command, as in example: '*Still I **must** take complete responsibility for all my actions, both public and private.*' [95]. Bill Klinton acknowledges his obligations before the American people to take all the responsibility for his actions. The primary task and the highest priority that was set by Klinton's administration are promoting the best education, broadening the educational borders and the opportunity to acquire new knowledge and skills: '*...to have the best schools, we **must** have the best teachers; we **must** do more to help all our children read; we **must** teach our children to be good citizens; we **must** continue to promote order and discipline; we **must** open the doors of college to all Americans; we **must** bring the power of the information age into all our schools; in the 21st century, we **must** expand the frontiers of learning across a lifetime. All our people, of whatever age, **must** have the chance to learn new skills.*' [95].

Addressing to his fellow countryman, the President Bill Klinton emphasizes on a convincing truth – every American must play his key role in renewing the system of education, both the President and people need each other and they must take care about themselves:

*'My fellow Americans, you, too, **must** play your part in our renewal... We recognize a simple but powerful truth: We need each other, and we **must** care for one another.'* [95].

The modal verb '*must*' along with the passive form of the notional verb and the previous context shows us that the President lies obligation on all the people, namely: *'In reaffirming the greatness of our nation, we understand that greatness is never a given. **It must be earned.**'* [95].

As we can see from the examples given above, with the help of the modal verb '*must*' the obligation or necessity of actions' doing can deal with the subject of expression itself (in the sentences with personal singular pronoun '*I*'), the subject of expression together with other persons (in the sentences with personal plural pronoun '*we*') and the other subjects or phenomena (in the sentences with other pronouns and nouns), that express subject's thoughts about the necessity of it.

Modal verb 'have to'. The verb '*have to*' in its modal meaning expresses the necessity of actions' doing due to certain circumstances. Having analyzed this verb in the discourse of political speeches, we came to the conclusion that the subjects of necessity can be the subject of expression itself, the subject of expression along with other persons and other ones that have a certain necessity, for example:

*'**I have to say** that I find Winston Churchill's perception a good deal more convincing, and more encouraging for the interests of our nation.'* [96].

In this case, the member of the British Parliament Jeffry How is both the subject of necessity and the subject of expression.

In '*The first issue that **we have to confront** is violent extremism in all of its forms'*, the subject of necessity is the American president Barak Obama and the political leaders of Egypt, to whom he is addressing during the meeting in the University of Cairo.

According to B. Obama, the subject of necessity is the Americans, who are aware of their duties: *'They know **they have to** work hard to get ahead, and they want to'* [95].

Modal verbs ‘to be’, ‘should’, ‘ought to’ and ‘need’. The verb ‘to be’ along with the infinitive of the notional verb expresses indispensability, which arises from agreement or plans, as in example taken from the words of Tony Bler: *‘But government’s role is going to be organize provision-like new stakeholder pensions not fund it all through ever -higher taxes.’* [96].

Here the prime-minister of England talks about all necessary measures that must be taken for the improvement of pension reforms and makes accent on the exceptional role of the government.

There are few expressions with such a shade of necessity in political discourse, and all of them deals with other subjects and events, which are obliged to something. In such a case, the subject of expression in the political speech avoids talks about his duties by plan or arrangement.

With the help of modal verbs ‘should’ and ‘ought to’ politicians can express necessity, that arises from moral imperatives and advice, for example:

‘Here is what that woman said I should say to you today, - here Bill Klinton speaks about the advice, that he was given by the American women;

She said, *‘We should all plant a tree in memory of the children,* - the advice mentions about moral duty of the subject of expression and all citizens of the USA.

One more example is: *‘If anybody thinks Americans have lost the capacity for love and caring and courage, they ought to come to Oklahoma’.* By saying these words, Bill Klinton wants to make change mind of those, who doubt in Americans’ aptness to love, aftercare and bravery.

‘I should also say a final word of thanks to the Tory Party. Let’s be honest, we’d never have done so well without them’- Tony Bler talks about his moral obligation to thank to the Tory Party and adds that he wouldn’t have done anything without them.

Nik Clegg, the British politician, the Liberal Democrats leader, the vice-prime minister expresses his own points of view and the general thought of the British people concerning the state budget: *‘We believe ministers should spend money as carefully as if they’d borrowed it from a friend.’*

Having analyzed the examples above, we can say that advice and moral obligation in the political speeches can refer both to the subject 'I' and object of utterance along with other persons 'we'.

The modal verb 'need' expresses the necessity of doing something, as in example: *Nor **need** we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today [95]; "No one **need** be afraid" the North Carolina ratification convention "No one **need** be afraid that officers who commit oppression will pass with immunity" [95].*

Exploring such utterances in the political speeches, we found that there are few of them (table 1.) and the expressed necessity refers only the subject of utterance with other persons.

Modal verbs 'can', 'may', 'will' and 'would'. The next function of the modal verbs that is worth considering is action's possibility/impossibility. The key role in this case plays the modal verb 'can', that is along with the infinitive of the notional verb expresses physical ability and skills or the opportunity of doing something, for example George Bush's speech, where he dwells about war ending in the Persian Gulf: *As Commander in Chief, I can report to you our armed forces fought with honor and valor. And as President, I can report to the Nation aggression is defeated. The war is over [95].*

Another exemplum is Nick Clegg's words, where he states that the government will be able to spend money rationally: *Making these savings will mean we can afford to spend money on things that really matter [96]*

In the sample: *And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country [95]*, George Kennedy accents on possibility of the USA to do something for its citizens and vice versa.

The examples mentioned above also demonstrate that the modal verb 'can' can refer to the politicians and their encirclement.

The other meaning that is typical of the English modal verbs is assumption, uncertainty and presumption. Intending can stand with subject of utterance (with the personal pronoun 'I') mutual activity of subject of utterance and other persons (with the personal pronoun 'we'), and other persons in general with different nouns and pronouns.

Basically, this meaning is inherent of modal verb ‘may’, that is often present in political speeches, as in Tony Bler’s guessing: *I may have been wrong [96]*, where he highlights his mistake.

Harry Trumen delineates the thread for peace and welfare, if the government will be undetermined: *If we falter in our leadership we may endanger the peace of the world and we shall surely endanger the welfare of the nation [95]*.

Barak Obama in his inauguration makes assumption that the country will face with new problems and will struggle with them using new methods, but all those values- hard work, honesty, love to the motherland and allegiance will be untouchable: *Our challenges may be new. The instruments with which we meet them may be new. But those values upon which our success depends – hard work and honesty, courage and fair play, tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism – these things are old [95]*.

I would like to pay tribute to the outgoing prime minister for his long record of dedicated public service [96].

But this I believe passionately: we will not win until we shake ourselves free of the wretched capitulation to the propaganda of the enemy, that somehow we are the ones responsible [96].

The modal meaning of wish, that is verbalized by modal verbs ‘will’ and ‘would’ is not in a frequent use, 2.07% and 1.70% in American political discourse, and 1.47% and 0.98% in British political discourse respectively. The frequency of use modal verbs and their structure expressing subjective modality in both American and British political discourse can be viewed in the table 1.

Table 1.

Analysis of structure of relative using of modal verbs

Modal verb	American political discourse		British political discourse	
	quantity	frequency of use, %	quantity	frequency of use, %
1	2	3	4	5
Must	191	35.97	65	15.89
Have to	14	2.64	32	7.82

Continuation of table 1.

1	2	3	4	5
Should/ought to	41	7.72	78	19.07
Need	12	2.26	6	1.47
Be to	15	2.82	8	1.96
Can	202	38.04	192	46.94
May	36	6.78	18	4.40
Will	11	2.07	6	1.47
Would	9	1.70	4	0.98
Total	531	100	409	100

The results have shown that in the American political discourse there is a greater amount of modal verbs that express necessity of doing something, as there are 273 utterances of American presidents' speeches, that is 51.41 % of general amount in modal verbs using, and 189 utterances in the British prime-ministers' speeches, that is 46.21%.

It is worthy of note that there are some differences in direction of necessity and its means of expression. In such a way, obligation caused by advice and moral duty predominates in the British political discourse. In this way modal verbs 'should/ought to' comprises 19.07%. Alternatively, in the American political discourse necessity driven by duty, impudence or command comprises 35.97%. In this case there is a frequent use of modal verb 'must'. Besides, in the British discourse there are three times larger utterances that express necessity of doing something due to certain circumstances. Here we use modal verb 'have to'. Although, in both discourses there is a small amount of utterances, that points out necessity due to prearrangement (modal verb 'be to') or general agreement (modal verb 'need').

The given analysis speaks to the fact that British politicians intends to talk about obligation due to circumstances, moral duty and advice, while American statesmen speaks about necessity due to obligation. Such divergence in verbal preferences can witness about differences in American and British mentality.

Traditionally, British people respect demureness and etiquettical impossibility of verbal force. Alternatively, the Americans operate notion 'public duty' that must be in every citizen's heart.

The main characteristics of British speeches is a great prodigality of assumption (can, could, may, might), while in American speeches there is a few number of assumption, that directs to the subject of utterance itself. American statesmen prefer addressing their assumptions to the other persons. The modal verbs that verbalize certainty and desire are in a rare use- 2.07 % and 1.70 % in the American political discourse and 1.47% and 0.98% in the British political discourse respectively. This fact may be interpreted as implied orientation to the public. Such target listeners must conceive speechmaker's plea as their 'own' wishes, but not fulfill a wish as an order.

Summing up, we may say that depending on a great amount of promises and slogans that are present in political oratorical speeches, the use of modal verbs is quite consistent. They point out psychological emotivity, make emotional contact with public, express content's subjective direction, perform as a logical connection between real condition and desired image for the speaker, attract listeners' attention, strengthen expressivity and help to avoid negative reaction, that is manipulation with public's cognitivity.

CONCLUSION TO CHAPTER TWO

Having analyzed the practical part of our investigation, we have drawn the following conclusions:

1. There are lexical and grammatical means of expressing modality. The lexical means of expressing modality include modal words; lexical means of expression modality include the author's attitude to his expression, denoting confidence, doubts, assumptions, positive or negative evaluation of what is expressed in sentence. In the political speeches we can find simple (sure, perhaps, etc.), derived (surely, naturally, really, etc.), and compound (maybe, to be sure, etc.) modal words.

2. At the lexical-grammatical level, the most common means of expressing subjective modality are modal verbs. Modal verbs in English, by their nature, express the possibility or impossibility of action, probability or improbability, obligation, necessity, desirability, doubt, etc. In our work we depicted how these modal categories are conveyed in the English political discourse by means of the modal verbs must, should, ought to, need, to be, can, may, will, would, have to.

3. Having analyzed political speeches of American and British statesmen, we can sum up that the main characteristics of British speeches is a great prodigality of assumption conveyed mainly by *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, while in American speeches there is a few numbers of assumption directing to the subject of utterance itself. American statesmen tend to address their assumptions to the other persons that can implies orientation to the public. Along with this, politicians' speeches are characterized by psychological emotivity, emotional contact with public, subjective direction, logical connection between real condition and desired image for the speaker, attracting of listeners' attention, strengthened expressivity aiming to avoid negative reaction, manipulation with public's cognitivity, etc. It is worthy of note that there are some differences in direction of necessity and its means of expression. In such a way, obligation caused by advice and moral duty predominates in the British political discourse. Alternatively, in

American political discourse necessity driven by duty, impence or command. In this case there is a frequent use of modal verb 'must'. Besides, in British discourse there are three times larger utterances that express necessity of doing something due to certain circumstances. Here we use modal verb 'have to'. Although, in both discourses there is a small amount of utterances, that points out necessity due to prearrangement (modal verb 'be to') or general agreement (modal verb 'need'). The given analysis speaks to the fact that British politicians intends to talk about obligation due to circumstances, moral duty and advice, while American statesmen speaks about necessity due to obligation. Such divergence in verbal preferences can witness about differences in American and British mentality

CONCLUSIONS

In the modern society the importance of political communication continues to grow, as it has an enormous impact on citizens' consciousness and formation of their political views. Political discourse is a phenomenon, which we face with every day. The struggle for power is an important topic and a driving force for this sphere of communication. As this competition is realized through language, which is the intermediate between external world and people, the existence of linguistic investigations in a political science becomes inevitable.

The political discourse is a collection of all speech acts, consisting of the public law, tradition and experience, which is determined and expressed in the form of verbal formations, content, subject and the addressee of which belongs to the sphere of politics.

The English political discourse has the following characteristic features: the image of the author, addressee ability, informational content, conventionality (manifesting in 3 forms: cliches, terminology, rituality), emotiveness, intentionality, modality, social content, estimation.

Among general characteristics of the English political discourse, we can define idiosyncratic features, which are typical only for English political discourse. Among them are agonistic capability, aggressiveness, ideological character and theatricality.

One of the most prominent features of the English political discourse is the category of evaluation, which stands in one line with categories of impact and expressiveness. There is a strong correlation between notions 'evaluation' and 'subjective modality', namely: 'evaluation' and 'subjective modality' are equivalent concepts and can be defined both as 'the speaker's attitude to what is reported'. The notion of expressivity in political discourse lies on function of impact and its relation with a communitive aim of expression. The category of expressivity makes dependent on speaker's intention and situation of communication. The main role of expressivity is providing of dialogue interaction with addressee through explication

of speaker's subjective attitude to expression context and its speech activity. Expressivity, combines two context plans: informational and subjective. The first aims in conveying the sense of real or unreal, modern or archaic facts and events, while the second marks subjective and individual outlook by politician, and the desire to have influence on listener: to inspire, meet somebody's demands, impress, displease, make laugh of etc.

The notion 'modality' is a functional-semantic category, a language universality that is manifested in general language categories. Traditionally, modality is divided into subjective and objective. The first type is understood as an attitude of expression, that is formed grammatically, to the extralinguistic reality, while the second – as an expression of speaker's attitude to what he is talking about. The scientists assert that objective modality is a necessary for any expressions, while subjective one is facultative. Some researchers highlight segmental and logical modality.

Subjective modality expresses speaker's attitude to what is reported. It is based on evaluation in a wide meaning of the word, including not only logical qualification, but also multiple kinds of emotive reactions. Introduction of sub-modal meaning to the general category of modality is a 'bridge' from sentence to expression and text and creates prerequisites to its distinction into phrasal and textual [80, p. 76-82].

In contrast to objective modality, subjective modality is a facultative feature of text. The context basis of subjective modality creates a notion of evaluation in a wide sense, including not only logical and intellectual qualification of what is reported but also different kinds of emotional (or irrational) reaction.

Many scholars also define segmental modality, that according to their definition, characterizes the process of text conclusion on its certain stages. We should bear in mind not only about possibility of modal energy's fixation on its 'certain stages', but expression of author's presence. The author in this way performs as commentator of his own text and his relation to it.

At the same time they mention the author modality, that is attitude of speaker to what is reported, thoughts and positions that are formed for the sake of message to the readers. There is also a logical modality, which is understood as a determined veracity of thoughts due to variety of judgements.

In the English political discourse there are lexical means of expressing modality which include modal words. English politicians use lexical means of modality to convey attitude, assumptions, positive or negative evaluation of the utterance. Grammatical means of modality in the English political discourse are manifested in 3 moods: Indicative, Imperative and Subjective. Indicative Mood is used to state, assert or deny the real reality in the present, past or future tense. The Imperative Mood expresses not an action, but a motivation, a request, and order to make it. In connection with the above in political discourse for the imperative mood is not inherent forms of tenses and temporal relativity. Because the imperative mood does not express an action, but only a motivation for it, it has no experienced category of numbers and persons, although usually addressed to another person. The Subjunctive Mood used in the political discourse causes some questions among linguists, that is Subjective mood is a kind of verb mood, where a semantic verb expresses possible a predictable and desirable, but not an actual state or action as well as the subjective attitude of the speaker to such action or state.

At the lexical-grammatical level, the most common means of expressing subjective modality are modal verbs. Modal verbs in English, by their nature, express the possibility or impossibility of action, probability or improbability, obligation, necessity, desirability, doubt, etc. During the analysis of the English political discourse, we mentioned the following modal verbs: must, should, ought to, need, to be, can, may, will, would, have to.

REFERENCES

1. Баранов А.Н. Политическая метафорика публицистического текста: Возможности лингвистического мониторинга // Язык массовой информации как объект междисциплинарного исследования. - М., 2001.
2. Алтунян А.Г. От Булгарина до Жириновского. Идеино стилистический анализ политических текстов. М.: Российск. гос. гуманит. ун-т, 1999. – 263 с.
3. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса: [монография]/ Е.И. Шейгал - М.; Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. – 367 с. URL:
4. Языкознание. Большой энциклопедический словарь / Гл. ред. Н.В. Ярцева. – 2-е изд. – М.: Большая Российская энциклопедия, 2000. – 688 с.
5. Касевич В.Б. Семантика. Синтаксис. Морфология. – М.: Наука, 1988. – 311 с.
6. Панфилов В.З. Категория модальности и её роль в конструировании структуры предложения // Вопросы языкознания. – 1977. – № 4. – С. 37-48.
7. Різванли Н. С. Linguo-stylistic peculiarities of political speeches (on the example of Donald Trump's public speeches) [Текст] / Н. С. Різванли // «Філологічні науки: історія, сучасний стан та перспективи досліджень» (м. Львів, 18-19 вересня 2020 р.). — Херсон : Видавничий дім "Гельветика", 2020. URL: <http://molodyvcheny.in.ua/files/conf/fil/38sept2020/9.pdf>
8. Белозерова Н.Н., Чуфистова Л.Е. Когнитивные модели дискурса. - Учебное пособие. — 2-е изд. — Тюмень: Издательство Тюменского государственного университета, 2013. — 256 с. URL: <https://docplayer.ru/26326609-Kognitivnye-modeli-diskursa.html>
9. Dijk T.A. van. Discourse analysis as a New Cross - Discipline // Handbook of Discourse analysis, - London, 1985.
10. Petrov, Karaulov 1989
11. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. Гл. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. - М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1990. — 685 с.

12. Кубрякова Е.С., Александрова О.В. Виды пространств текста и дискурса // Категоризация мира: пространство и время. Материалы науч. конференции. — М., 1997.
13. Миронова Н.Н. Дискурс-анализ оценочной семантики. - М.: «НВИ»-«Тезаурус», 1997. - 158 с.
14. Ильин И.П. Дискурс / Дискурсивные практики // Современное зарубежное литературоведение (страны Западной Европы и США): Концепции, школы, термины / Энциклопедический справочник. - М.: Интрада - ИНИОН, 1996. - 319 с
15. A.N. Baranov, Yu.N. Karaulov
16. Грамматика английского языка. Пособие для студентов педагогических институтов / В. Л. Каушанская, Р. Я. Ковнер, О. Н. Кожевникова, Е. В. Прокофьева и др. — 5-е изд., испр. и доп. — М.: Айрис-пресс, 2008. — 384 с.
17. Гальперин И.Р. Грамматические категории текста. - Известия АН СССР, серия Лит-ра и яз-ие, 1977. - Т.36. - №6.
18. Alkebayeva, D.A. (2014). *Pragma-stylistics of the Kazakh language*. Almaty: Kazakh University/
19. Карасик В.К. Язык социального статуса/Волгоградский гос. пед. ин-т. — М. 1992.-329 с.
20. Матвеева Т.В. Функциональные стили в аспекте текстовых категорий: Дис...докт, филол. наук. - Свердловск: Уральский гос. ун-т . -1991.-450 с.
21. Баранов А.Н. Парламентские дебаты: традиции и новации /А.Н.Баранов, Е.Г. Казакевич. -М.: Знание,1991.- 64с.
22. Demyankov, V.Z. (2002). *Political discourse as subject of political philology, Political science. Political discourse: History and modern researches* (pp.32-43). Moscow: INION of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
23. Parshin, P. B. (1999). *Concept of an idio-political discourse and methodological bases of political linguistics*. Moscow
24. Pocheptsov, G. G. (2000). *Information wars*. Moscow.
25. Chudinov A. P. (2007). *Political linguistics: manual* (2nd edition). Moscow: Flint: Science.

26. Shakhovsky V.I. (1998). Voice of emotions in the Russian political discourse, Political discourse in Russia. Moscow.
27. Karasik, V.V. (2000). About types of discourse, Language personality: institutional and personal discourse (pp.5-20). Volgograd: Peremena
28. Гаврилова М.В. Лингвистический анализ политического дискурса/ М. В. Гаврилова. URL: <http://politanalysis.narod.ru/gavrilova3.html>.
28. Фалилеев А.Е. Политический текст как феномен культуры (лингвокультурологический анализ): авторреф. дисс... канд. культурологии/ А.Е. Фалилеев.-Саранск, 2009.-20с.
29. Косьянова О. Г. Мова політики та політичний дискурс як взаємозалежні категорії. Англїстика та американїстика. 2013. Вип. 10. С. 20–23. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/antame_2013_10_8.
29. Баранов А.Н. Лингвистическая теория аргументации (когнитивный подход)/ А.Н. Баранов-М.-Эдиториал, 2001. – 346 с.
30. Ван Дейк Т.А. Дискурс и власть. Репрезентация доминирования в языке и коммуникации / Пер. с англ. – М.: Либроком, 2013. – 344 с.
31. Politically speaking: a worldwide examination of language used in the public sphere/ Ed.by O. Feldman, C.de Landtsheer.-N.Y.,1998. – 212 p.
32. Dijk T.A.van. What is political discourse analysis? /T.A.van Dijk [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://discourses.org/OldArticles/What%20is%20Political%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf>
33. Опарина Е.О. Метафора в политическом дискурсе/ Е.О. Опарина // Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: История и современные исследования: сборник научных трудов/отв. ред. и сост. В.И. Герасимов, М.В. Ильин. - М.: РАНИНИОН, 2002.- С.20-25.
34. Кривий А. Дискурсний аналіз і сучасне мовознавство/ А. Кривий // Дискурс іноземномовної комунікації : [колективна монографія]. – Л.: Вид-во ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2001. – С.158-162.

35. Крылова И.П. Грамматика современного английского языка: учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. / И.П. Крылова, Е.М. Гордон. – М.: Кн. дом „УН-Т”, 1999. – 448 с.
36. Alekseeva, M. V (2001). Scientific text as polylogue (Monograph). Moscow: Signal.
37. Konkov, V.I. (2011). Speech structure of the newspaper text (abstract of a thesis of doctors of phil. sciences). St.-Petersburg.
38. Hlevova, Yu. A. (1999). Types of modal meanings. Bulletin of the Amur state university. Vol. 7. URL: http://www.amursu.ru/vestnik/7/9_7_99.html.
39. Barack Obama: 44th President of the United States.(2008). Washington..
40. Karasik, V.V. (2000). About types of discourse, Language personality: institutional and personal discourse (pp.5-20). Volgograd: Peremena)
41. Komarov, E. N. (2003). Value orientations in headings of French and Russian mass media (abstract of a thesis of candidate of phil. sciences). Volgograd).
42. Dickson P. (2013). Words from the White House: Words and Phrases Coined Or Popularized by America's Presidents. New York. Walker, 2013. 197 p.
43. Mazayev A.Yu. (2005) Political discourse: factor of addressee. Retrieved 2005 from <http://www.ostu.ru/conf/ruslang2005/trend1/mazaeva.htm>).
44. Pine J. (2009) Wit and wisdom of American Presidents: a book of quotations, published by Dover publication. New York, Mineola)
45. Barack Obama addresses the Chicago Council on Global Affairs. (April 23, 2007). Retrieved from April 23, 2007. URL: <https://my.barackobama.com/page/content/fpccga>
46. Filonenko, T. A. (2005). Genre and stylistic characteristics of an English-speaking scientific and methodical discourse (abstract of a thesis of cand. Phil.sciences). Samara.)
47. Шевченко І.С. Інтердискурсивність політичного дискурсу. Вісник Харківського національного університету ім. В.Н. Каразіна. 2009. № 848. Романо-германська філологія. Методика викладання іноземних мов. Вип. 58. С. 53–57.

48. Горіна О.В. Когнітивно-комунікативні характеристики американського електорального дискурсу республіканців: автореф. дис ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Х.: ХНУ імені В.Н. Каразіна, 2008. 21 с.
49. Лосєва І.В. Мовностилістичні особливості політичної полеміки кандидатів у президенти США (на матеріалі інтернет-дискурсу): дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Л.: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2016. 261 с.
50. Тхір М.Б. Створення іміджу президента в американському політичному дискурсі: лінгвокогнітивний та комунікативно-когнітивний аспекти (на матеріалі політичних промов Барака Обама): дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Херсон. держ. ун-т. Херсон, 2014. 295 с.
51. Прокопенко А.А. Президентський дискурс Барака Обама: когнітивно-комунікативні аспекти: дис... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Х.: ХНУ імені В.Н. Каразіна, 2016. 253 с. URL: http://dspace.univer.kharkov.ua/bitstream/123456789/12081/2/Prokopenko_dis.pdf
52. Понікарьова А.Ю. Аргументативно-сугестивний потенціал складних синтаксичних структур англomовного політичного дискурсу: дис... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Х.: ХНУ імені В.Н. Каразіна, 2016. 20 с. URL: http://ekhnuir.univer.kharkov.ua/bitstream/123456789/12206/2/дис_Понікарьова.pdf
53. Ільченко М.Л. Тактики ініціації говоріння в англomовному електоральному дискурсі (на матеріалі передвиборчих теледебатів). Вісник ХНУ ім. В.Н. Каразіна. 2012. № 1003. Романо-германська філологія. Методика викладання іноземних мов. Вип. 70. С. 34–40.
54. Рябокoнь Г.Л. Дискурсивні особливості інтернет-публікацій дебатів британського парламенту: дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.01.08. К.: КНУ «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2005. 276 с.
55. Тхір М.Б. Реалізація комунікативної стратегії презентації в політичних промовах Президента США Б. Обама. Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету імені Лесі Українки. РОЗДІЛ II. Комунікативна лінгвістика. 4, 2015. С. 168–172.

56. Брандес М.П. Стилистика текста: Теоретический курс: учебник для студентов вузов. 3-е изд. пер. и доп. М.: Прогресс-традиция. ИНФРА-М, 2004. 416 с.
57. Clinton vs. Trump (3rd debate) URL: <https://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/full-transcript-third-2016-presidential-debate-230063>
58. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (5th Ed). (2000). Oxford University Press.
59. The Wordsworth Thesaurus (1993). Wordsworth Editions Ltd.
60. Шейгал Е. Й. Семиотика политического дискурса / Елена Йосифовна Шейгал. – Волгоград : Гнозис, 2004. – 328 с.
61. Нагель В.В. Різновиди оцінки як лінгвістичної категорії / В.В. Нагель. URL: http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/dlgum/2007_6/15.html
62. Кожина М.Н. Стилистика русского языка / М.Н. Кожина, Л.Р. Дускаева, В.А. Салимовский. – М.: Флинта; Наука, 2008. – 464 с.
63. Вольф Е.М. Функциональная семантика оценки. - М.: Наука, 1985. - 228 с.
64. Арнольд И.В. Стилистика современного английского языка: (Стилистика декодирования). - М.: Просвещение, 1990. — 300 с.
65. Арутюнова Н.Д. Типы языковых значений. Оценка. Событие. Факт. — М.: Наука, 1988. - 341 с.
66. Телия В.Н. Коннотативный аспект семантики номинативных единиц. - М.: Наука, 1986. -142 с.
67. Солганик Г.Я. Без кавычек. Об одном новом явлении в языке газеты // Журналистика и культура русской речи. - М.: МГУ, 1996. - вып.5. - С. 30-36.
68. Эпштейн М.Н. Идеология и язык (построение моделей и осмысление дискурса). - Вопросы языкознания. - 1991. - № 6. - С.19-33.
69. Патрушева Е. В. Лингвокультурологический и функционально-прагматический аспекты афоризмов в политической дискурсе: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19 / Екатерина Владимировна Патрушева. – Ставрополь, 2011. – 22 с.
70. Шилина М. В. Лингвистические средства создания экспрессивности в английском художественном тексте / Марианна Владимировна Шилина. – Москва, 2000. – 205 с.

71. Holly W. Credibility and Political Language / W. Holly // Language, Power and Ideology. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. – 1989. – № 2. – С. 34–40.
72. British political speech. URL: <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?>
73. Рецкер Я.И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. Очерки лингвистической теории перевода / Дополнения и комментарии Д.И. Ермоловича. - 2-е изд., стереотип. - М.: "Р. Валент", 2006. – 240 с.
74. Селиванова Е.А. Матасова Я.Р. Композитная эквивалентность и проблема ономаσιологической импликации // Вісник Черкаського університету. - Серія Філас. науки. - Черкаси, 1997. - Вип. 3. - С.74-80.
75. Балли Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка. М., Издательство иностранной литературы, 1955. – 416 с.
76. Бунь О.А. Художній текст крізь призму можливих світів: модально-референційний аспект // Вісник київського лінгвістичного університету. - Серія Філологія: наукове видання. т.6, № 1/за ред. М.П. Кочергана. - К.: КНЛУ, 2000. - С.141-148.
77. V.Vinogradov, On the category of modality and modal words in the Russian Language, in: V. Vinogradov, Research into Russian Grammar, Moscow, 1975, pp. 53-87.
78. Воробьева О.П. О коммуникативно-функциональной гомогенности высказываний в монологическом тексте // Высказывание и дискурс в прагмалингвистическом аспекте / Под ред. Г. Г. Почепцова. - Сб. науч. тр. - К: КГПИИЯ, 1989. - С.22-30.
79. Козловский В.В. Предложения с конъюнктивом (структура, семантика, прагматика) / В.В. Козловский // Монография. – Черновцы: Рута, 1997. – 281 с.
80. Сафонова Н. М. Еволюція поглядів на суб'єктивну модальність / Н. М. Сафонова // Серія філол. – Львів: ЛНУ, 2004. – Вип. 34, Ч. I. – С. 74-80.
81. Безугла Л.Р. Вербалізація імпліцитних смислів у німецькомовному діалогічному дискурсі / Л.Р. Безугла. – Харків: ХНУ ім. В.Н. Каразіна, 2007. – 332 с.
82. Ткачук В.М. Категорія суб'єктивної модальності: дис. ... кандидата філол. наук : 10.02.15 / Ткачук Вадим Миколайович. – Донецьк, 2002. – 221 с.

83. Корунець І.В. Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад): Підручник. - Вінниця: "Нова книга", 2001. - 448с.
84. Рецкер Я.И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. Очерки лингвистической теории перевода / Дополнения и комментарии Д.И. Ермоловича. - 2-е изд., стереотип. - М.: "Р. Валент", 2006. – 240 с.
85. Карабан В.І. Посібник-довідник з перекладу англійської наукової та технічної літератури на українську мову - І частина, К.: "Політична думка", 1997. – 299 с.
86. Ільченко О.М. Етикет англомовного наукового дискурсу: Монографія. - К.: ІВЦ "Політехніка", 2002. – 288 с.
87. Hoyer, L. Adverbs and Modality in English. London and New York: Longman, 1997.
88. Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. K. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 1860 p.
89. (TPCDCS) – Tory Party Conference 2015: David Cameron's speech. URL: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/tory-party-conference-2015-david-camerons-speech-in-full-a6684656.html>
90. (BTGMPMS) – Britain, the great meritocracy: Prime Minister's speech. URL: https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/30099/1/Britain%2C%20the%20great%20meritocracy_%20Prime%20Minister%27s%20speech%20-%20GOV.UK.pdf
91. (BOVS) – Barack Obama's victory speech. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/nov/07/barack-obama-speech-fulltext>
92. (FSMHSATLMEB) – Foreign Secretary's Mansion House speech at the Lord Mayor's Easter Banquet 2018. URL: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/foreign-secretarys-lord-mayorseaster-banquet-speech-at-mansion-house-wednesday-28-march>
93. Presidential Speech Archive URL: <http://millercenter.org/president/speeches>.
94. British Political Speech. URL: <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech—archive.htm>