

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:
«Лінгвориторичні особливості політичного дискурсу Барака Обами»

Допущено до захисту

« ___ » _____ року

Студентки групи МЛа 60-19
 факультету германської філології
 освітньо-професійної програми
Сучасні філологічні студії (англійська мова і друга
 іноземна мова): лінгвістика та
перекладознавство
 за спеціальністю 035 Філологія
 (назва)
Шаповаленко Карини Вікторівни
 (ПІБ студента)

Науковий керівник: *Завідувач кафедри германської і Фіно-
 угорської філології імені
 професора Г.Г. Почепцова*
 доктор філ. наук,
 професор Шутова Марія
Олександрівна

_____ Національна шкала _____
 (підпис)

(ПІБ) Кількість балів _____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

**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

Linguorethorical features of political discourse of Barack Obama

Karyna Shapovalenko
Group MLa 60-19
Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser
Prof.
SHUTOVA MARIIA
Doctor of Philological Sciences

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER ONE. Theoretical background of linguorethorical features of political discourse	6
1.1 Political discourse in modern linguistics	10
1.2 Rhetorical organization of political speech	23
1.3 Linguorethorical means of actualization of political discourse	31
Conclusions to Chapter One	35
CHAPTER TWO. Analysis of the linguorethorical features of political discourse of Barack Obama	37
2.1. Phonetic devices in Barack Obama’s speech	39
2.2. Lexico-grammatical devices in Barack Obama’s speech	44
2.3. Stylistic devices in Barack Obama’s speech	54
Conclusion to ChapterTwo.....	62
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	65
REFERENCES.....	66

INTRODUCTION

The study of the phenomenon of political communication is important for understanding the socio-political changes taking place in society. They are impossible without the effective exchange of information between the elements of the political system. Political communication is a key concept in implementation interaction between the subjects of the political system, namely - the state, public associations, people.

To reach a desired effect and to create a desired image, it is important to know the basis of persuasive speech, the study of which is called rhetoric. Rhetoric is understood as the study of writing and speaking effectively, that is, to appreciate how language works when we write or speak and employ any lessons learned in making our own writing and speaking better.

Rhetorics includes a great number of cultural and linguistic phenomena as a part of the process of social communication. The description of linguistic, stylistic and socio-pragmatic specific features typical of a politician's speech behavior helps to define his/her main communicative strategies.

Rhetorical persuasion leads to a successful result and helps realize the corresponding communicative strategies. The analysis performed in our investigation results in the description of the lingual and communicative strategies typical of the political leader, Barack Obama.

Relevance of the topic is determined by the leading role of communication, primarily socio-political, in modern society. It is also connected with a great interest of linguists in defining linguistic and rhetorical peculiarities of political speeches, Barack Obama's in particular.

The **aim** of the research is to study the linguorethorical features of Barack Obama's political speeches.

During the investigation the following tasks are to be resolved:

- to define the notion of political discourse;
- to explain the organization of political discourse;

- to reveal the linguorethorical feature in Barack Obama's speeches;
- to distinguish the components that contribute to the formation of the Obama's speeches;
- to find out how planned effects are implemented in speeches;
- to determine how various effects are implemented in different speeches.

The **object** of this investigation is speeches of Barack Obama while the **subject** is the linguorethorical features implemented in Obama's speeches.

The following **methods** have been applied during the investigation: structural method to define the components of political discourse; generalization; description; discourse analysis to find the way of social power abuse, dominance and influence in the social and political context; stylistic analysis to define the linguistic means creating the political speeches of Barack Obama.

The novelty of the research is represented in distinguishing linguorethorical features of Barack Obama's speeches, as this aspect of linguistic research is not fully researched in modern linguistics.

This paper consists of two parts: Chapter One focuses on defining the theoretical background of political discourse, rhetorical organization of political speeches and linguorethorical means. Chapter Two is practical where we will distinguish linguo rhetorical features, such as phonetic, lexico-grammatical and stylistic devices, of speeches of Barack Obama.

CHAPTER ONE. Theoretical background of linguorethorical features of political discourse

Present-day linguistics is characterized by serious interest towards such topics as discourse, discourse typology, differentiation between discourse and text, application of discourse analysis to different types of written and spoken communication as well as its functioning as a research tool in different interdisciplinary scientific investigations.

The study of discourse presupposes the solution of such a key question as classification: subdivision into different types of discourse with their corresponding subtypes, referential criteria, typological peculiarities of separate discourses, spheres of functioning and their overlapping, etc. With the advancement of society there appear not only new literary genres, but also new types of texts and modes of communication. Far from being an academic abstraction, the notion of discourse type is something we all use every day in order to orient ourselves towards the communication in which we are involved.

Traditionally, in linguistics, discourse is correlated with such concepts as speech activity, speech, utterance, text, dialogue, monologue, communicative situation, which leads to an understanding of the place of discourse in a number of phenomena, on the one hand, and contributes to the creation of a false idea of the identity of data phenomena on the other hand.

Political discourse analysis is a field of discourse analysis which focuses on discourse in political forums (such as debates, speeches, and hearings) as the phenomenon of interest. Political discourse is the formal exchange of reasoned views as to which of several alternative courses of action should be taken to solve a societal problem.

The value of political communication in modern society has increased dramatically, since in a democratic social order issues of power are openly discussed. And solutions to many political problems depend on how adequately these problems might be interpreted. In recent years, some problems of political

discourse have been targets of discussion in journalistic and scientific literature. The category of discourse in general and political discourse in particular is currently the subject of different scientific debates. Overall, basic concepts of political discourse, its characteristics, functions and features need to be covered.

Few areas in the social sciences are as closely related as those of the study of politics, ideology, and discourse. Politics is one of the social domains whose practices are virtually exclusively discursive; political cognition is by definition ideologically based; and political ideologies are largely reproduced by discourse.

The relations between discourse and political ideologies are usually studied in terms of the structures of political discourse, such as the use of biased lexical items, syntactic structures such as actives and passives, pronouns such as us and them, metaphors or topoi, arguments, implications, and many other properties of discourse.

Classic works, which deal with the problems of discourse, belong works of T. van Dijk, J. Habermas and M. Foucault. Some aspects of political discourse are reflected in the works of local and international scientists, among which should be noted the following: V. Grigoryeva, P. Kuzmin, O. Sheigal, Y. Pereverzev, V. Gerasimov, G. Pocheptsov, O. Mikhalyova, V. Pavlutska, O. Baranov, M. Gavrilov and others.

Another peculiarity of political discourse is its oratory character including declamations, propaganda, triumphant style, ideologies, abstract notions, references to science and logic, criticisms, bumper-sticker rhetoric, and claims of undeniable truth. All these features make political speech sound theatrical and aggressive. The intention of politicians in this case would be to discard their opponents and impose their ideas and beliefs upon the audience. The researchers put together summarized criteria of political discourse, including description of actions or stating a fact, embedded statements put forward in interrogative sentences; answers to particular questions, descriptions of issues existing in the

society (these would also include a course of actions needed positive or negative one); novel ideas and beliefs; stating general truth or God's truth, inquiries and claims to the public authorities and calls for some actions or decision to be made.

Discourse analysis has been used to comprehend different types of texts including political rhetoric, interviews, natural speech, professional credentials, internet communication, magazines, newspapers and broadcast media. In regard to politics, it can be said that the specific political situations and processes (discursive practices, such as parliamentary debates, political press briefings) determine discourse organization and textual structure of a wide range of discourse types in which political discourse as a complex form of human activity is realized.

Politics is a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. In this process, language plays a crucial role, for every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. This paper analyzes discourse of political speaking, namely the inaugural address of President Barack Obama. Given the enormous domestic and global significance of the said speech in times of international economic turmoil it is crucial to decipher ideological traits typical for Barack Obama's enshrined in his inaugural address. Inaugural address predestines policies of the newly inaugurated president and its overall significance is enhanced in the case of Obama's policy of change. The aim of this paper is to examine persuasive strategies of President Barack Obama and its ideological component.

Modern political linguistics focuses on the problem of effective communication (A.D. Belova, M.P.Dvorzhetska, H.H.Pocheptsov, A.P. Chudinov) studies the problem of political speech genres (M.D. Huley, V.Z. Demiankov; O.I. Sheyhal) and peculiarities of their functioning (K.V. Pishchikova; T.A. Skuratovska, O.S. Fomenko). However, an important place is occupied by a comprehensive study of political discourse in the plane of interaction of semantic, pragmatic, and prosodic levels of its structure.

Political discourse comprises all types of interaction of an individual and society, creating worldview. Political discourse reveals the way cultural values and social order are imposed in different societies. This type of discourse includes a variety of political discussions in the society, including ones with the politicians and officials and public rhetoric.

1.1 Political discourse in modern linguistics

Nowadays the notion of discourse is widely used in a variety of academic fields including political science, linguistics, philosophy, psychology, cultural studies and many others. This notion is attributed to a certain paradigm as well. Thus, there are a variety of approaches to define this notion depending on a certain academic field. In linguistics, discourse refers usually to the study of speech patterns and the usage of language etc.

The connection between politics and language is manifested mainly in the fact that no political regime can exist without communication. Politicians use language to inform, guide, legislate, persuade, etc. The specificity of politics, in contrast to other areas of human activity, is its predominantly discursive nature: most political actions by their nature are speech actions. It is no coincidence that some scholars believe that political activity in general can be reduced to linguistic activity, and in modern political science there is a tendency to consider language not as a means of displaying political reality, but as a component of the political field [11].

To understand the speech patterns one needs to be clear about the term ‘discourse’ and ‘text’. Discourse, put simply, is structured collections of meaningful texts (Parker, 1992). A text is a part of the process of discourse. It is the product of any communication by writer/speaker. A text consists of cues for interpretation processes and traces of production processes. As Fairclough (1989) says this process includes in addition to the text the process of production, of which the text is a product, and the process of interpretation, for which the text is a resource.

Discourse, as such, is a broad term with many definitions, which “integrates a whole palette of meanings” (Titscher et.al. 1998: 42), ranging from linguistics, through sociology, philosophy and other disciplines. For the purposes of this paper we apply the definition of discourse, based on van Dijk’s (1977: 3), and his general concept of discourse as text in context, seen as “data that is liable for empiric analysis” (Titscher et.al. 1998: 44), with focus being put on discourse as action and

process. From this it follows that “discourse” is a wider term than “text”: “I shall use the term discourse to refer to the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part” (Fairclough 1989: 24).

When giving the definition of discourse, N. D. Arutyunova provides three perspectives to discuss. The first one would be when discourse is regarded as a coherent text together with a set of extralinguistic aspects including pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological ones and others. Discourse can also be viewed as a text within a specific context. The last would be when discourse is regarded as speech viewed as intended social action, a component of human interaction and cognition. It is worthwhile mentioning that N.D.Arutyunova sees discourse as speech embedded in context [1, p. 136]. As E.S.Kubryakova points out, from the point of view of cognitive linguistics the distinction between the two notions (text and discourse) is quite natural since it correlates with the contrast between cognition and its outcome [5, p. 191].

According to E.S.Kubryakova, discourse can be assumed as a cognitive process related to speech production while a text is the outcome of speech. Thus, researchers distinguish discourse and text according to a number of criteria, such as functionality and structure, dynamics and statics, process and outcome, topicality and virtuality. In Russian linguistics, V. Z. Demyankov provided the most comprehensive definition of this notion. V. Z. Demyankov claimed that discourse is ‘an arbitral part of text consisting of more than one sentence or an independent part of sentence; which is usually wrapped around some basic concept, creates the overall context, describing people, objects, circumstances, time, actions and etc.’ According to this definition, the initial structure of discourse is a sequence of simple prepositions connected by conjunction, disjunction, etc. [4, p. 7].

Thus, we can suggest that discourse is a wide notion including two unequal components, i.e. text and speech. At the same time, discourse is a cognitive process, and text is its outcome. On the whole, discourse is a complex

communicative phenomenon within the context of extralinguistic aspects, which is not equal to text.

The study of discourse directs our attention to how the words we use are central to both our perception of social reality and to the actual formation of that reality. The anthropological approach to political discourse anchors texts and talk within contexts of use in which control, persuasion, and domination occur. It allows for the study of the dialogic emergence of politics as well the integration of such issues as audience reception and circulation of discourses. Struggles for power are evident at the levels of language structure, patterns of interaction, and broader discursive formations. Recent work attends to agency, multimodality, ideology, political economy, and materiality.

As a resource for the interpreter, the text consists of lexico-grammatical realisations of three kinds of meaning relating to three basic language functions (the ideational, interpersonal and textual functions of systemic linguistics). These lexico-grammatical cues to ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings are interpreted with the help of other resources beyond the text.

The researchers' interest between politics and language dates back to ancient Greece and Rome. So, political conduct is dependent on language and intertwined with it since then. The close tie between politics and language is evident in the name of the venue where politics takes place: the word parliament derives from the French word *parler*, which means “to speak.”

Plato and his successors, ancient as well as modern, have been well aware and wary of the manipulative power of language. Political discourse is ubiquitous and highly potent: it permeates all the major issues in the public sphere, shapes people's understanding of social and political realities, and may affect the very quality of public life.

Discourse, as such, is a broad term with many a definition, which “integrates a whole palette of meanings” [1998: 42], ranging from linguistics, through sociology, philosophy and other disciplines. For the purposes of this paper we

apply the definition of discourse, based on van Dijk's [1977: 3], and his general concept of discourse as text in context, seen as "data that is liable for empiric analysis" [1998: 44], with focus being put on discourse as action and process. From this it follows that "discourse" is a wider term than "text": "I shall use the term discourse to refer to the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part" [1989: 24].

Certain types of discourse stand out. On the one hand, these are national discourses (for example, Russian, English, German, etc.), on the other, such types as poetic, scientific, political, economic, pedagogical. The main criterion for the existence of the second classification is that all these types of discourse stand out within one of the national discourses. According to V. V. Krasnykh, they "are not separate types of discourse, but only some "modifications" of the latter, in a certain way "adapted" in accordance with the sphere in which it functions" [6, p. 146].

According to the classification of types of discourse proposed by V. I. Karasik, discourse is divided into two main types: personal (personality-oriented), in which the speaker acts as a person in all the wealth of his inner world, and institutional (status-oriented), in which the speaker acts as a representative of a certain social status [4, p. 5-20].

As applied to modern society, the following types of institutional discourse are distinguished: political, diplomatic, administrative, legal, military, pedagogical, religious, mystical, medical, business, advertising, sports, scientific, scenic, mass information.

The functions of political discourse include the following:

- The function of political propaganda, persuasion and influence.
- An instrumental function that involves the struggle for power, seizure of it and its preservation.
- Informative function - informing the population about political problems.
- The function of control is to control the dissemination of information.

— The prognostic function is reduced to predicting the directions of political development

processes based on the analysis of past experience.

Along with these functions, there is also a function of speech construction reality, which can manifest itself in two ways: totalitarian and democratic.

Politics is often viewed as a formal expression of power in the public sphere, such as in the act of governance of a particular social body. For anthropology, where culture is found in everyday practices, so too are politics. Political discourse is a central object of anthropological studies of politics. Struggles for power are evident not just in the substance of speech but also at the levels of language structure, patterns of interaction, and broader discursive formations.

Interest in the issues of political linguistics appeared in the last century and was associated, first of all, with an increase in the level of verbosity of public policy in general and of political figures, whom the electorate increasingly judged not by real actions, but by generated texts, the volume of which was growing. Statistics confirm that over the 30 post-war years, the number of speeches by American presidents has increased by 500% and continues to grow [Smith, 1994, p. 21], and “presidential speech and action increasingly reflect the opinion that speaking is control” [Hart, 1984, p. 10].

There are some problems with defining political discourse, as the concept of political discourse is a slippery one and is rather difficult to define. One reason is that it straddles two disciplines, linguistics and political science [2: p. 25]. During the research and studying modern literature we would find out some key points that linguists and scientists suggest to define “political discourse”.

The main goal of political discourse is to make the listeners believe in the importance of politically correct actions or evaluations. Politicians operate with symbols, it is successful depending on the extent to which these symbols correlate with public consciousness. A politician should be capable of finding the best way

to address his audience talking into consideration their opinions, beliefs and so on [3: p.43].

Politicians use particular notions and terms in their speeches, so they are professional: common words and phrases might contain a different meaning opposed to their usual one. The structure of political discourse is also specific. It comprises particular speech strategies typical of political discourse. Discourse possesses an outstanding spoken and written form, such as intonation and pauses.

Another peculiarity of political discourse is its oratory character including propaganda, declamations, triumphant style, abstract notions, ideologies, references to science and logic, bumper-sticker rhetoric, criticisms, and claims of undeniable truth. These features make political speech sound theatrical.

The criteria mentioned above contribute to the effectiveness of political discourse which is to suit specific requirements. Speakers usually tend to suggest that recipients have a particular set of beliefs and ideas, what they support and what they are opposed to. This knowledge makes speakers follow a certain pattern within their speech.

Political discourse is closely interconnected with mental outlook, ideology, and philosophy of life and feelings of a recipient. The rhetoric of political discourse correlates with overcoming its negative features such as ideological pretentiousness and monopoly, dictatorship, aggressiveness, pragmatism, and propensity towards conflict.

Political language in its interpretation is considered not only as a tool to describe those or other political phenomena, but also as a factor of active influence on the political process by forming values and stereotypes of behavior. Modern ideas about

interaction of political and linguistic practices are based on the recognition of the self-worth of the proposed linguistics of methods of research of language activity, first of all methods of content analysis and discourse analysis [4: p. 49–50].

In the modern world, along with the global spread of democratic principles of political structure, a public political discourse addressed to the broad masses is of particular importance. A specific feature of public political discourse is its pragmatic focus on the management of public opinion, on the formation in the mass addressee of a certain assessment of information and a given emotional reaction to it. In public political discourse, the addressee is represented by a large group of people with different linguistic competencies and with different views of the world in their minds, conditioned by their national political culture [6: p. 3].

The value of political communication in modern society has increased dramatically, since in a democratic social order issues of power are openly discussed. And solutions to many political problems depend on how adequately these problems might be interpreted. In recent years, some problems of political discourse have been targets of discussion in journalistic and scientific literature. The category of discourse in general and political discourse in particular is currently the subject of different scientific debates. Overall, basic concepts of political discourse, its characteristics, functions and features need to be covered [5: p. 74-76].

Classic works, which deal with the problems of discourse, belong works of T. van Dijk, J. Habermas and M. Foucault, V. Grigoryeva, P. Kuzmin, O. Sheigal, Y. Pereverzev, V. Gerasimov, G. Pocheptsov, O. Mikhalyova, V. Pavlutska, O. Baranov, M. Gavrilov and others.

Political discourse is a kind of discourse that aims to conquer and retain political power. In linguistic literature, political discourse is presented as a multifaceted and multifaceted phenomenon as a complex of elements that form a single whole. Political discourse is a collection of “all languages acts used in political debates as well rules of public policy, sanctified by tradition and proven experience” [7: p. 46].

The most important postulate of modern political linguistics is a discursive approach to the study of political texts. It means that each specific text is

considered in context the political situation in which it was created, in its relation to other texts, taking into account the targets, political views and personal qualities of the author, the specifics of the perception of this text by different people. Be sure to take into account the role which this text can play in the system of political texts and - more broadly - in the political life of the country.

For example, the same idea and even the same statements will be completely different perceived in the text of a journalist's newspaper article and in the official statement of the President of the Russian Federation or the President United States of America. Completely different weights can have the statements of the same politician, uttered by him in the fervor of the election campaign and after entering an important state post [8: p.9].

At the end of the last century, a new direction took shape in foreign linguistics - critical discourse analysis that examines the ways in which social power exercises its domination in society. Experts seek to find out exactly how with the help of communicative social inequality is prescribed and reproduced, and ways to language resistance. Representatives of this trend take an active social position, looking for ways to prevent social conflicts.

These studies represent a kind of reaction to traditional publications of "prescription" and "praising" directions previous scientific paradigm. The material for critical discourse analysis is political texts created in situations of social risk and reflecting the inequality of communicants. Definition of "critical" used in studies like this to emphasize what is usually hidden for non-specialists connections between language, power and ideology. A detailed study of the texts helps to identify implicitly expressed unconscious attitudes of the communicants and on this basis show the results of the impact discourse on the perception of information. Since 1990 a special magazine "Discourse and Society" has been published ("Discourse and Society"), representing publications of the named direction, created in various countries [8: p. 15].

Crystal defines discourse as “continuous stretch of (especially spoken) language larger than a sentence, “it is a set of utterances which constitute any recognizable speech event”[10: p.148] . Discourse is a socially determined entity and specific principles of a speech system according to which the reality is being classified and represented during certain periods of time. It is, according to Foucault (1972), a historically given material practice by means of which power relations are exercised. It is a communication realized in discursive “practices”.

The term ‘discourse’ depicts the formal way of thinking that is expressed through and by means of language. It also represents a specific type of a social boundary that determines what can be said regarding certain issues. There exist many types of discourses in any particular society. Opposing discourses struggle for domination against each other. Finally, one particular discourse holds a dominating position. This phenomenon is known as Discursive Dominance [11: p.126].

Political discourse can be defined as a communicative act participants of which try to give specific meanings to facts and influence / persuade others. In other terms, political discourse can be defined as a manipulative linguistic strategy which serves concrete (ideological) goals. Political discourse may involve both the formal debates, speeches, and hearings and the informal talk on politics among family members [12: p.202].

The texts of public speeches, which include political ones, are based on general literary vocabulary. In every society there are generally accepted universal rules of communication, which include modal, pragmatic and communicative components. At the same time, commonly used political vocabulary and political terms can also be attributed to linguistic universals. All politicians appeal to universal human values, they use terms and lexical items that help change the psychological state of the audience or achieve a certain psychological effect. Therefore, knowledge of commonly used political vocabulary and terms allows the audience to understand and correctly interpret political articles, speeches, appeals, etc.

Common political vocabulary and frequently used political terms are peculiar concepts. Concepts, according to Likhachev D.S., realize their potential meanings within a certain context. The set of concepts that are included in the lexicon of an individual, make up the conceptual sphere of the individual. The set of stable concepts, induced by the lexical composition of the language as a whole, constitutes the conceptosphere of the national language, which is the conceptosphere of national culture. Continuing this opinion, Stepanov Y.S. argues that the concept as a clot of culture in the human mind exists in words and phrases [12, p.59].

At the heart of the semantic pyramid, which illustrates the nature of keywords, are the subject / object (referent), a typical idea of it in the human mind (denotation), a verbalized concept (signification) and a cognitive concept of the subject of the nomination. The word is associated with each of the components of a special functional relationship: reference (names the subject or object of reference), denotative (denotes a typical idea of the subject / object), significant (expresses reflected in the human mind objective and / or sub objective and evaluative features of the subject / object), cognitive (correlation with the cognitive concept). Given that the denotative component represents the extensional (scope of the concept), and the significant component represents the consensual (content of the concept) as part of the meaning of the lexical unit, they both form a plan of the content of the sign, and the word is a plan of expression.

In general, the language sign is characterized by such functions as representative, nominative, deictic, expressive, interpretive function and pragmatic. The political discourse is dominated by pragmatic, deictic, expressive and interpretive function [1, p.65-66]. After all, the speaker uses a language sign to influence the audience, expresses the modal and evaluative relations of society to the object of the name, while the audience uses a language sign to comprehend the concept reflected in the mind; as a result, the linguistic meaning goes beyond the conceptual reflection of the subject / object, which enriches such an interpretation

of the linguistic sign with various associative and figurative meanings. The meaning of the sign as an element of the language system, or systemic meaning is the totality of all uses of the word [1, p.67]. Words used in a certain speech communicative act are characterized by an actual meaning, which may not correspond to the linguistic meaning of such a word. Linguistic meaning and linguistic meaning are considered as invariant content of linguistic consciousness. It is stable, and therefore common to society. In contrast to linguistic meaning, linguistic meaning is revealed only to a certain context, which allows to distinguish communicatively significant meanings of a particular linguistic unit. Such linguistic signs, which are at the same time generally accepted in a certain society and accumulate all uses of a lexical unit with all its inherent modal and evaluative nuances, available in social memory and experience of society, and whose communicative meaning is actualized only in a certain context. in words.

Interest in the study of political discourse led to the emergence of a new direction in linguistics - political linguistics. "In a series of events of the 20th century, the starting point for the formation of political linguistics was World War 1, which led to unprecedented human losses and a radical change in the outlook of mankind ..." [9: p. 91].

To be able to decipher ideological components in the Obamite discourse, we should give an outline on what constitutes liberal discourse and in what way it is differentiated from the conservative discourse. The basic difference of liberal narrative from that of the conservatives lies in emphasizing the importance of Enlightenment ideals over the religious ones. The creation of the nation is not perceived as the act of God but rather as based on principles of humanity. The National Education Association, for example, insists that "when the Founding Fathers drafted the Constitution with its Bill of Rights, they explicitly designed it to guarantee a secular, humanistic state" (cited in Hunter 1991: 113). However, despite the conservative efforts to monopolize the religious principle, the God and religion are not completely excluded from the liberal narrative: "America and

every nation on earth is called by God to seek justice and serve the common good of humanity, not as a special privilege, however, but as special responsibility” (cited in Hunter 1991: 113).

The problem of liberal ideology is the concept of equality that especially in the 20th century became linked with Marxist theories and their implementation after the Second World War. The Democratic Party therefore struggles to form a new narrative that would stress the differences with Marx, but at the same time, will be consistent with the Democratic Party's role of the correcting force in the course of American history (desegregation, civil rights, women rights, New Deal etc.). So, as to sum up the main difference between the two ideologies, the quote from Hunter (1991: 114) can be borrowed: “Where the cultural conservatives tend to define freedom economically (as individual economic initiative) and justice socially (as righteous living), progressives tend to define freedom socially (as individual rights) and justice economically (as equity).”

US political discourse is democratic in nature and is generally characterized by a focus on universal and American values: patriotism, national unity, peace, independence, and freedom of religion. By using abstract nouns, adjectives of the highest degree, parallel constructions, lexical repetitions, the speaker manipulates the consciousness of the audience, instilling the idea of domination of the American people over others as a model of rights and freedoms.

In contrast to the American democratic discourse, we have the right to put a totalitarian discourse, which is characterized by a focus on the destruction of any moral and ethical values.

So, based on the above, it should be noted that the whole set of scientific ideas about discourse, interacting with each other and being inseparable parts of one concept, testifies to the frequent use of this term in modern science, but at the same time emphasizes the absence of transparent boundaries and a finite number of structural components of this concepts.

1.2. Rhetorical organization of political speech

The speech behavior of a subject of political discourse should be understood as a multifaceted and complex phenomenon, which is determined by the intentions of the communicant. In the struggle for power, politicians use all possible means, and the authors of political texts carefully select tactics and strategies for the implementation of political discourse. Speech strategies implement speech genres and form their originality and individuality.

Skills and abilities of effective communication are increasingly in demand in modern society, because most professional fields need professionals who can control information flows in modern society, form public opinion, use communication opportunities for cultural, educational and social spheres.

The study of political communication from the standpoint of a rhetorical approach arose earlier than others in this direction. The rhetorical approach (developed by R. Ivey, R.D. Anderson, R. Carpenter, M. Osborne, etc.) involves focusing on ways to decorate the text using linguistic means that actually contribute to the expression of thoughts, then is in the language as a means performing aesthetic and pragmatic functions. Researchers began the study of political communication with the study of archetypal metaphors based on the universal archetypes used by political actors.

In studying the structure and content of political speech, you can use modern linguistic theories that offer various features of the genre. T.V. Shmelyov includes the communicative purpose, the author's model, the concept of addressing, the content of the event, the factors of the communicative past and future, as well as the language design [5, p. 22]. Another researcher, OA Zemskaya, considers the nature of communication (official / unofficial), type of communication (personal / public), purpose, number of participants, typical concept of the addressee (equal / subordinate, woman / man), appeal to the addressee as genre criteria. sata or its absence, activity or passivity of the addressee [1, p. 205].

O.J. Sheigal considers one of the most important features that gives grounds for the assignment of a political speech to a particular genre, the nature of the main intention. In fact, this feature is taken as the basis of the proposed classification of the researcher, which distinguishes the following genres within the political discourse:

- 1) ritual genres (inaugural speech, anniversary speech, traditional radio address);
- 2) orientation genres (party program, constitution, message of the president about the situation in the country, report, decree, agreement);
- 3) agonal genres (slogan, advertising speech, election debates, parliamentary debates) [4, p. 9].

Political discourse is interpreted as an institutional communication that uses a certain system of professionally-oriented signs, i.e. it is characterized by its own sublanguage (vocabulary, phraseology and paremiology).

Investigation of the mechanism of realization of political rhetoric leads primarily to the study of functioning of a political speech as an important social genre, immersed in a semiotic sphere that reflects different ways of conceptualization of reality by means of sustainability and variability balance naturally reproducing the rhythm of the space-time continuum.

To implement a communicative strategy, a set of tactics is used that are predetermined by the speaker's intentions and are represented by a set of techniques that determine the use of linguistic means.

The rhetoric of political discourse correlates with overcoming its negative features such as ideological pretentiousness and monopoly, aggressiveness, dictatorship, pragmatism, and propensity towards conflict. These features of political discourse impose the information instead of making it the subject of the recipient's reflection, thus, leading to aloof perception of text. The maxims of reflexivity and dialogism are the basis for the main concept of this rhetoric. The maxim of reflexivity implies that any word bears certain ideas and energy passed by the author or speaker to the recipient. During the perception of these words, the

recipient understands the text and fits it within his reflection. When this occurs, researchers note that it provides for dialogism as this text is adapted by means of recipient's perception. Rhetoric means are applied to make the recipient more interested in the text and its meaning, in answering questions and providing arguments for his position, agreeing or disagreeing with the speaker [3, p.49].

However, often researchers mention the maxim of monologue as one that is typical of political discourse since sometimes the text does not reflect the reflection of the speaker and does not call for recipient's reflection as well.

Modern political linguistics focuses on the problem of effective communication (A.D. Belova, M.P. Dvorzhetska, H.H. Pocheptsov, A.P. Chudinov) studies the problem of political speech genres (M.D. Huley, V.Z. Demiankov; O.I. Sheyhal) and peculiarities of their functioning (K.V. Pishchikova; T.A. Skuratovska, O.S. Fomenko).

At present, the analysis of text structure seems to have fallen out of the grace of linguistics. Admittedly, analysis of 'rhetoric structure' do exist (e.g. van Dijk, 1977; Swales, 1981; Halliday and Hasan, 1985; Medhurst, 1987; Winter, 1994; Cumming and Ono, 1997; Eggins and Martin, 1997), however, they are few and basically follow the Classical Rhetoric pattern of study. Thus, they have not managed to provide significant new ways of perceiving and understanding the matter. Moreover, modern research on text structure may, clearly, be argued to display a common disadvantage of being cognition-unrelated.

Understanding text structure, moreover, may very likely prove to have far-reaching implications for all kinds of different-order linguistic units (e.g. syntactic features and metaphoric expressions) as well as for scientists' general understanding of how the human mind works. To those ends, the method adopted here is one never applied to research on text structure so far - cognitive.

However, an important place is occupied by a comprehensive study of political discourse in the plane of interaction of semantic, pragmatic, and prosodic levels of its structure. Rhythmic organization of political speeches as a basic rhetorical

factor is the communicative appropriateness of combinability and change in the information capacity of the verbalized context components, characterized by specific configuration of semantic resources, stereotyping of mental images and certain level of correlation of semantic and prosodic levels, preconditioning the effective rhetorical model of an oratorical speech. It determines topicality of the study of the rhythmic organization of the political discourse in terms of integration of semantics and prosody as important components of the receptive scheme of political communication [13: p.189].

Modern scholars of theoretical rhetoric greatly expanded the object of their research. So, for example, Yu. Rozhdenstvenskyi considers rhetoric as "a way to harmonize the interests of the speaker and the audience" [14: p. 10], stressing the communicative component of persuasion. According to S. Onufriv, rhetoric is, above all, the art of persuasion [15: p.102].

Both language and politics are based on symbolic consensus and in today's democratic order; language is the lifeblood of politics. As Mey pointed out: 'In all such institutions and bodies, certain human agreements and customs have been legalized, and this legalization has found its symbolic representation in language'[16: p.115-116].

The political speech as a genre of political discourse belongs to the institutional kind of communication [Чудинов 2006], which, unlike personal one, has a rigidly fixed status of each communicant. In addition, it should be noted that a public speech is traditionally the main object of rhetoric. In our view, the rhetorical approach provides an opportunity to examine all elements of an effective political speech. Throughout the long history of rhetoric, understanding of its subject, objectives, internal structure underwent major changes. Thus, the classic understanding of the science of rhetoric as persuasion, proposed by Aristotle, was already reinterpreted by Quintilian for whom persuasion acts as a possible, but not the main purpose of the speech of the speaker. From "the art of speaking well" (*ars recte dicendi*) rhetoric turns into the art of eloquence (*ars pulchre loquendi*).

As all political actions are systematized and institutionalized, it is inevitable for politics to have a discourse of its own. Discourse, which is language in use, frames the perception, signification and communication with a specific grid. Hall argued that although physical entities and actions exist autonomously, they can only gain meaning and become objects of knowledge within discourse [17: p.19]. In other words, knowledge about the real world is generated and exchanged discursively.

Ideological standing and identity markers such as class, race and gender shape the encoding and decoding of discourse. Political discourse is quite different from the discourse of journalism or law since it employs particular lexico-grammatical structures and discursive strategies to gain approval via persuasion.

The Russian linguist Bakhtine [18: p.83] argued that as language use becomes conventionalized, speech genres, which can be defined as fixed language patterns in particular contexts, become predictable and relatively stable. In no other discourse type, the Self/Other dichotomy is as prominent as it is in political discourse. This binary opposition is obviously the building block of political communication as positioning oneself by drawing the group boundaries is essential for political identity formation.

Political groups need their own language and portray themselves via this language; they define their territory by means of their language; they signal their ideology through certain slogans and stereotypes; their ideological structure is joined together in a certain way and so is their argumentation. In the field of politics, a particular text is planned and organized for a specified audience to achieve a definite objective. Politicians may try to get the support of the Parliament for a military act or shirk responsibility of a failure.

van Dijk defined social power 'in terms of the control exercised by one group or organization (or its 'members') over the actions and/or the minds of (the members of) another group, thus limiting the freedom of action of the others, or influencing their knowledge, attitudes or ideologies'[19 :p. 65].

Ideology as a socially shared cognitive framework refers to the beliefs, attitudes and opinions of a specific group [20: p.8]. Ideologies as mental schematas are inherent in the collective consciousness of a group and they stimulate shared understanding and attitude in specific circumstances. Ideology is ubiquitous and immanent in every aspect of social life and it contributes to the identity formation of the group by communicating what is appropriate or inappropriate [21: p.22].

Public speaking is a vivid and diverse conglomerate of verbal, mimic and other means of expression. A special role in forming public speech expressiveness and realization of a direct impact on the audience is played by an impressive prosodic colouring of a political speech, manifested in increasing and varying basic prosodic parameters. In a political speech, prosody serves as a conscious and deliberate tool of a direct impact [Cарач 2000, 12].

Another striking characteristic of political discourse is its persuasive nature. Persuasion can be defined as A's use of language skillfully and deliberately to cause a desirable change in B's attitude or opinion [22: p.76].

A politician's persuasive success is based on his/her use of three modes of proof which are ethos, pathos and logos [23: p.67]. These three modes indicate the reciprocal bond among the audience, rhetor and argument. Instead of basing their arguments on one of them, rhetors prefer using a blend of these three modes.

Ethos is about the moral credibility of the speaker. For the mode of ethos, identification has a very important role. The arguer must present himself/herself as a certain kind of person and the audience must believe that this certain type of person is in their group boundaries. The speaker's physical appearance, voice, body language, clothes, social status, selection of words all contribute to the audience's perception of the message. All these features will help the formation of the speaker's image as a sincere, trustworthy and wise person.

Pathos is about the psychological mood of the audience [24: p.5]. Pathos is concerned with politicians' effort to arouse certain emotions to gain approval. Undoubtedly, negative emotions such as anger, fear, hatred and shame are aimed

to be evoked for the perception of the Other while positive emotions like pride, hope, courage are intended to be awakened for the perception of the Self. Negative emotions will cause avoidance behaviours from the Other while positive emotions will promote intimacy with the Self. Moreover, negative emotions associated with the Other will also make the audience more closer to the Self. While forming their speeches, the audience profile and political goals are taken into consideration by the politicians. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca [25: p.43] defined the audience, ‘as the ensemble of those whom the speaker wishes to influence by his argumentation’

The rhetor aims at stimulating a specific sentimental atmosphere to make the audience more responsive and open to the message. As Aristotle stated : ‘persuasion may come through the hearers, when the speech stirs their emotions. Our judgments when we are pleased and friendly are not the same as when we are pained and hostile’[26: p.25]. A large scale of emotions from rage to mercy can be aroused by emotive vocabulary and accompanying images.

Finally, *logos* is about the logical configuration and rationality of the argumentation. The audience can be persuaded by proof and steps of reasoning. A politician can use inductive or deductive reasoning to support his standpoint or refute the Other’s standpoint. The Self and Other representation of a politician should satisfy the emotional, logical and moral needs of the audience. Persuasion in election campaigns aims at influencing the voting behaviour of the audience. Compliance is manufactured by making the audience believe that the Speaker is the most desirable one.

A further study of ways of realization of the rhetorical orientation of political discourse will promote identification of effective models of communication and definition of adequate prerequisites for using means of all language subsystems taking into account extra-linguistic factors of the communicative situation.

Everything ascribed to political language can be applied to political speech. However, speeches are usually prepared in advance by people whose job is to

“control how certain events are described to the public”– spin doctors (Merriam-Webster online). A political speech can be defined as a “coherent stream of spoken language that is usually prepared for delivery by a speaker to an audience for a purpose on a political occasion” (Charteris-Black 2014: xiii).

The sole concern of political speakers then is simply to deliver the speech appropriately and “achieve the maximum required effect on the audience” (Wilson 1990: 60). What the speaker actually does is perform the speech in accord with the requirements of a specific situation. Although a spin doctor prepares a speech, the public always identifies the speech with the one who delivers it, which is actually the goal of such a prepared piece of language. The purpose of a political speech is to “satisfy emotional, moral and social needs” (Charteris-Black 2014: xii), and one of the greatest social necessities is hope.

The study of political communication from the position of a rhetorical approach opens up a wide research field: from the rules for using words to achieve political goals to the deep aspects of the manipulation of consciousness. In general, the approach can be called scientifically developed, but its practical orientation should be taken into account: the mandatory study of empirical material allows one to draw conclusions that are useful both for practicing politicians and for the scientific community.

1.3. Linguorethorical means of actualization of political discourse

Language conveys a powerful meaning, especially when they are used in political discourses. Focusing on the ethos, pathos, and logos, this study specifically analyzed the rhetorical appeals and devices used in their speeches using discourse analysis. It also analyzed the most commonly used rhetorical devices by the speakers in making successful rhetorical appeals.

Political speech, as a type of socio-political rhetoric, is characterized by the specifics of ways and methods of potential influence on the recipient of information. The effectiveness of such influence and the effectiveness of manipulative strategies and tactics in the delivery of political speeches forces politicians to be balanced in the content and form of speech, especially the use of language, style, design of the composition of the political speech. The problem of linguistic, linguistic-stylistic, linguistic-pragmatic, linguistic-functional analysis of political speeches remains relevant despite the presence of a large number of works in this field of scientific studies (I.V. Arnold, N.D. Arutyunova, A.D. Belova, M.O. Vasilieva, A .A. Zalevskaya, A.A. Markovich, R.A. Popov, G.G. Pocheptsov, K.S. Serazhim, I.F. Ukhvanova, E.I. Sheigal, T.V. Yudina, etc.) . For the most part, scholars explore and analyze the most effective and common stylistic and rhetorical techniques used in politicians' speeches.

The main purpose of speeches is to convince the listener, and this is why speakers use a variety of language tools to achieve their goal. One of the well-known means of persuading the listener is rhetoric, an art that has been known for over 2,000 years. The most common definition of rhetoric is its definition as a theory of persuasive communication [Bezmenova 1991, p. 57].

Politicians employ rhetorical devices in order to deliver persuasive speeches (cf. Jefferson 1990). As Crines and Heppell (2016, para. 14) point out, politicians use several rhetorical devices or techniques: “irony, humor, metaphors, analogies, anecdotes, quotations, rebuttals, hyperbole, utilitas (i.e. identifying shared objectives with the audience) or antithesis-based rhetorical techniques involving reasoning via opposites.” It has often been claimed that rhetorical devices such as three-part lists and contrastive pairs are the most effective strategies that prominent politicians depend on (cf. Atkinson 1983, 1984a, 1984b as cited in Lin 2011; Uvehammer 2005). Such three-part lists and contrasts are claimed (Atkinson 1984a, pp. 33-34 cited in Bull & Noordhuizen 2000, p. 275) to be “consistently effective in “inviting” audience applause to political speeches.” As David (2014,

p. 167) argues, three-part structures and lists are” memorable and resonant in many kinds of text”.

The art of audience management in the process of public speaking is based on the leading role of personal influence, ie, the need to form an evaluative attitude of listeners to the personality of the speaker: the use of verbal and nonverbal means of increasing social prestige. speech, obligatory and intensive use of gestures, attention to facial expressions and posture; use of slogans, advertising techniques, methods of attracting attention, formulation of an attractive speech title [4, 20]. Thus, political eloquence affects the interpersonal motivational mechanism for regulating changes in cultural relations in society.

Rhetorical devices (also known as stylistic devices, persuasive devices, or simply rhetoric) are techniques or language used to convey a point or convince an audience. Rhetorical devices evoke an emotional response in the audience through use of language, but that is not their primary purpose. Rather, by doing so, they seek to make a position or argument more compelling than it would otherwise be.

Rhetorical devices can be used to facilitate and enhance the effectiveness of the use of rhetoric in any of the four above modes of persuasion. Rather than certain rhetorical devices falling under certain modes of persuasion, rhetorical devices are *techniques* authors, writers or speakers use to execute rhetorical appeals. Thus, they overlap with figures of speech, differing in that they are used specifically for persuasive purposes, and may involve how authors introduce and arrange arguments (see the section on discourse level devices) in addition to creative use of language.

Figures of speech refer to a phrase or word having different meanings than its literal meanings. It is a form of speech varied from a common usage that helps convey meaning in a sophisticated manner (Brummett, 2008). In summary, figures of speech are a language that changes its meaning or sentence structure from literally forms to give a vivid picture in the audience's mind.

Metaphor is a word or phrase that means one thing and is used for referring to another thing in order to emphasize their similar qualities (Rundell, 2007).

Simile is a phrase that describes something by comparing it to something else using the word like or as (Rundell, 2007).

Metonymy is expressions in which you refer to something using the name of something else that is closely related to it (Rundell, 2007).

Hyperbole is a way of emphasizing what you are saying by describing it as far more extreme than it really is (Rundell, 2007).

Oxymoron is an expression that contains words with opposite meanings (Rundell, 2007).

Paradox is a person, thing, or situation that is strange because they have features or qualities that do not normally exist together. It is a statement consisting of two parts that seem to mean the opposite of each other, or the used of this kind of statement in writing (Rundell, 2007).

Personification is the practice of showing a particular quality in the form of person, or an instance of this (Rundell, 2007).

Synecdoche is a figure of speech in which a part is made to represent the whole or vice versa (Pearsall, 1998).

Antithesis is the exact opposite of something (Rundell, 2007).

Repetition is something that happens in the same way as an earlier event, the act of repeating something (Rundell, 2007).

Parallelism is the quality or state of being similar to something else. It is a quality or feature that makes something similar to something else (Rundell, 2007).

Alliteration is the use of the same letter or sound at the beginning of words in a sentence, especially in poetry (Rundell, 2007).

Assonance is the repeating of sounds in words that are close together (Rundell, 2007).

Irony is a form of humor in which you use words to express the opposite of what the words really mean (Rundell, 2007).

Understatement is a statement that makes something seem less important, serious, big etc than it really is (Rundell, 2007).

The main goal of public speech is to get the corresponding result through persuasion. Through persuasion a politician wishes: to get the addressee to vote for a certain candidate; to gain people's love and to strengthen his image; to make people share his opinion and to agree with his words; to inform the general public of his viewpoint on a certain question (Aristotle, 2000.). This is usually achieved with the help of a great number of cultural and linguistic features in the process of social communication. They are as follows: non-fact verbs, the verbs of mental activity, the verbs of estimation, the performative verbs expressing promise, declaring; different types of questions, both direct and indirect, reduced and full; cleft sentences, sayings and proverbs, Bible quotations, formulae of participation, syntactic parallelism (anaphora, anadiplosis), inversion, phraseological units, emphatic do and did, reiteration, metaphors, historical comparisons, antithesis, violent expressions which make the speech abrupt (categorical, raising no objections), and many others. Their use satisfies the requirements and ensures the success of communicative interaction. Moreover, the process of establishing communicative contacts must take into account the concrete goal of communication, the contents of the speech, and the circumstances under which it is made. Through all of these, rhetorical persuasion leads to a successful result and helps realize the corresponding communicative strategies.

Conclusions to Chapter One

The relations between discourse and political ideologies are usually studied in terms of the structures of political discourse, such as the use of biased lexical items, syntactic structures such as actives and passives, pronouns such as us and them, metaphors or topoi, arguments, implications, and many other properties of discourse.

The main goal of political discourse is to make the listeners believe in the importance of politically correct actions or evaluations. Politicians operate with symbols, it is successful depending on the extent to which these symbols correlate with public consciousness. A politician should be capable of finding the best way

to address his audience talking into consideration their opinions, beliefs and so on [3: p.43].

A politician's persuasive success is based on his/her use of three modes of proof which are ethos, pathos and logos [23: p.67].

Focusing on the ethos, pathos, and logos, study specifically analyzed the rhetorical appeals and devices used in their speeches using discourse analysis. It also analyzed the most commonly used rhetorical devices by the speakers in making successful rhetorical appeals.

Political rhetoric is, in fact, the theory of political speech, which studies speech as a means of obtaining and exercising state power and influencing power structures.

Palonen and Summa (1996) distinguish different levels of rhetoric (analysis of rhetoric). They are: 1) Rhetoric of speeches and speeches, in which speeches, texts or images are considered as whole; their dexterity or their impact on the addressee is evaluated. 2) Rhetoric of argumentation, in which attention is fixed on those features of presentation, with the help of which they seek to change or strengthen the concepts and opinions of the audience about a particular issue. 3) Rhetoric of tropes, which can be seen as skill or a means of argumentation, or analysis of style. The main tropes are metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony. (pp. 10-11.) These three levels of analysis of rhetoric are not very easy to distinguish from each other.

Political communication does not exist by itself. It forms part of a larger area of political activity. Political communication is a set of theories and methods that can be used by political organizations and authorities in order to determine their tasks and influence the behavior of citizens. With its help, it becomes possible to transfer political knowledge and experience, as well as to form the "image" of power, because today, as at all times, the rulers try to appear before the masses from the most advantageous side, depending on the requirements that were presented to the leader, the sovereign, the president in every historical epoch. Consequently,

political communication is a kind of political relations, without which the movement of the modern political process is impossible.

CHAPTER TWO. Analysis of the linguorethorical features of political discourse of Barack Obama

If we take into account the study of linguistic, textual or discursive phenomena, in the first case, the subject of attention is the use of units related to a particular linguistic level (vocabulary, phraseology, morphology, syntax). The most noticeable changes are in vocabulary and phraseology. Each new turn in the historical development of the state leads to a linguistic "restructuring", creating its own lexico-phraseological thesaurus, which also includes conceptual metaphors and symbols.

Communicative effectiveness of speech is the integrated use of verbal and nonverbal (intonation and kinesthetic, among all facial expressions and gestures).

Among the important linguistic aspects that are designed to help the politician in achieving his goals, we can name the following: rhetorical, stylistic, lexical-semantic, intonation and segmental. Verbal influence is carried out with the help of language units endowed with potential pragmatic content. Stylistic, lexical, grammatical, phonetic levels of language - both individually and collectively - have a high potential for influence and are able to identify and update certain meanings.

In modern speech communication theory, rhetorics is defined as a verbal content of peoples' social life and as a source of communicative interaction (Hudson, 1978; Volkov, 2001; Daletskiy, 2003). That is why political rhetorics is considered to be an instrument of government in the political system of any society. Rhetorics includes a great number of cultural and linguistic phenomena as a part of the process of social communication.

At the present stage, in connection with the extensive development of text linguistics and related searches for new ways and methods of text analysis, researchers (J. Antoine, M. Creso) point to the need for convergence of poetics and linguistics in terms of studying compositional structures of different types of texts. In this perspective, political speech is considered as a text of a special type, based on a "transcendent structure" (OO Reformatsky's term), which reflects the specifics of the communicative situation of the text and is characterized by the following linguistic-stylistic parameters: argumentative nature of the text objective way of organizing information, frank author's intention, direct and constant appeal to the addressee, the specifics of which are also determined by unidirectional and specially organized means of speech and a set of relevant communicative and pragmatic guidelines.

We can identify the following: 1. Each ideology has its corresponding discourse (and vice versa), and, ideologies are generally explicitly expressed, acquired and reproduced by discourse. 2. Political discourses are being produced and operated within certain (ideological) frames. Thus, discourses reflect particular ideological

frameworks using specific linguistic strategies. 3. Political discourse can be identified as an intentional act which in every individual case is meant to reach certain objectives and those objectives as a rule are of a material character; in other words: production of a particular (political) discourse serves a purpose of articulating, protecting/preserving, challenging/deconstructing certain interests.

It is essential to know the type of political discourse and its characteristics in order to be effectively involved in it. Political discourse can be classified according to the ideologies it tries to promote (socialist, liberal / democratic, conservative & totalitarian) or sub-genres (LGBT, feminist, green, religious, nationalistic). It may be dominant (primary) or subordinated (secondary) according to the presence/absence of the power / hierarchy.

The construction of political speech takes place according to the ancient trichotomous scheme: introduction, main part, final part.

Rhetorics presupposes a convincing speech effect produced on the addressee by the sender. The description of linguistic, stylistic and socio-pragmatic specific features typical of a politician's speech behavior helps define his/her main communicative strategies.

These strategies promote establishing harmonious communication and communicative contacts between the political leaders, on the one hand, and the electorate, on the other hand. They help the politician seize his/her political power and positions. The analysis performed in our investigation results in the description of the linguistic means and communicative strategies typical of the political leader, Barack Obama.

2.1. Phonetic devices in Barack Obama's speech

The most powerful expressive means of any language are phonetic. Pitch, melody, stress, sounds, pausation, drawling, whispering, a sing-song manner of speech are very effective EM. These EM are studied by phonetics. Stylistics observes the nature of EM and their capacity of becoming stylistic devices . The phonetic SD are alliteration, assonance, onomatopoeia, rhyme, rhythm.

A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics[11] defines phonology as “the study of sound systems of languages.” This level of description involves the basic sound units and combination of such sound units. Bilal et al (2012) [12] define phonological analysis of a text as the analysis of sound pattern in that text, formation of words and utterances by systematic use of sound in a language.

It is at this level also where we examine possible syllabus structure of a given language and the various ways in which syllables can be combined to achieve certain effects and create aesthetic appeal. The Phonological devices include alliteration, consonance, assonance, repetition, rhyme and onomatopoeia. In Obama's speeches, alliteration, consonance and assonance stand out.

The question of the phonetic specificity of political speech has been raised by many scholars. Thus, L.V. Postnikova conducted a comparative analysis of the peculiarities of the implementation of prosodic categories in the coherent political discourse of two versions of the English language: British English and American English. She also observed that in the American political context, the implementation variability of prosodic categories is less pronounced. K.L. Ulanova focused on the components of intonation, which is an important means of forming various communicative units during the organization of oratorical political monologue. Her works reveal the peculiarities of the intonation of oratorical speeches of a political nature, depending on the content or emotional factors. The rhythmic structure of political speeches is studied by VV Danilina, O.V. Koretska and Yu. A. Vasik.

When preparing a political speech, it is necessary to take into account its sound component, the quality of which largely depends on the effectiveness of public new speech.

The sound series is able to enhance the visual and expressiveness of language. Sometimes politicians and speechwriters resort to means of sound symbolism and phonaesthetics to make the language more melodious and expressive [23, 123].

The most pleasant for the listener in English are consonant sounds [l], [m] and [n], long vowel diphthongs, enhanced by a smooth polyphonic rhythm, while words with consonant sounds [g], [k] and short voice - they, as well as intermittent rhythm are considered unpleasant [5].

Therefore, it is not surprising that in the speeches of all American presidents we constantly hear the words liberty, believe, alliance, values, nation, democracy, interdependence, life. They combine positive meaning and sound.

Characteristic features of political discourse at the lexical level of language are the widespread use of professional political terminology and the frequent use of "high", i.e. book words.

Linguistic influence in political discourse is carried out mainly through the careful selection of lexical items, with special attention paid to both meaning and their sound shell.

Modern American politicians resort to the same effective rhetorical tools that have the greatest impact on listeners. Their speeches are characterized by expressiveness and imagery, easy to remember and help to form the image of brilliant speakers who are able to skillfully play with phonetic means of all the texts they sound.

The most common means of phonetic influence are anaphora, alliteration and rhythm.

Alliteration

Alliteration is the use of the same sound at the beginning of words which are close together. It is a sound device aimed at creating additional musical effect produced by the utterance of a speaker. The musical effect attracts listeners' attention by creating the desired political mood. In Obama's 2008 victory speech, the most outstanding illustration is the following:

- a) block by block, brick by brick, calloused hand by calloused hand
- b) ...the love of my life, the nation's next first lady....

c) ...to restore prosperity and promote the cause of peace...
 In (a), the sounds [b], [k] and [h] alliterate. The significance of this alliteration is two -fold: the first one

is to create rhythm and the second and the most important one is to emphasize the strong resolve to remake or reconstruct America-it will be long and tedious. In (b) and (c), the alliterating consonant sounds [l] and [p] help add musical effect to the utterances. In the 2009 speech, there are a number of examples:

a) b) c) d)

Magnificent Mall

The snow was stained with blood

With old friends and former foes

We will work tirelessly

Apart from creating rhythm which makes the lines musical, in (a), there is emphasis on the prospect of life for Americans; (b) emphasizes the sacrifices made by the founding fathers; in (c), a sense of a better inclusiveness is expressed while in (d), both sense of inclusiveness and resolve to work are expressed. In “I have a Dream,” alliteration is used as follows:

a) Sweltering summer

b) Battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by winds of police brutality

Apart from intensity, alliteration in these lines contributes to the musicality of the speech.

Consonance

Consonance refers to the recurrence of final consonant sounds in two or more words in a given line. Just like alliteration, the main purpose of consonance is to hold the attention of the audience through the rhythm that it creates in a speech. The following are examples from Obama's speeches:

- a) Why men and women and children... (2009)
- b) ...fascism and communism...(2009)
- c) There are mothers and fathers... (2008)
- d) What free men and women can achieve...(2009)

Assonance

Assonance is the recurrence of a vowel sound in two more words in a sentence or utterance. The overall effect, just like alliteration and consonance, is to create rhythm. It is the rhythm that holds the interest of an audience. Here are examples drawn from Obama's speeches.

- a) Why men and women and children... (2009)
- b) ...fascism and communism... (2009)
- c) You didn't do this to win an election...you didn't do it for me... (2008)
- d) So it must be with this generation of Americans. (2009)
- e) We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines...(2009)
- f) We will begin to responsibly leave Iraq to its people...(2009)

The two orators, Obama and Martin Luther King Jr., do not seem to use sound patterns as much as they use other linguistic strategies.

The sound picture of political speech is extremely important for the implementation of the function of persuasion. Linguistic influence in political discourse is carried out mainly through the careful selection of lexical items, with special attention paid to both meaning and their sound shell.

Modern American politicians resort to the same effective rhetorical tools that have the greatest impact on listeners. Their speeches are characterized by expressiveness and imagery, easy to remember and help to form the image of brilliant speakers who are able to skillfully play with phonetic means of all the texts they sound. The most common means of phonetic influence are anaphora, alliteration and rhythm.

2.2. Lexico-grammatical devices in Barack Obama's speech

Speech reflects the ideology of a certain class, introduces a set of ideas, political judgments, a system of symbols, ideological guidelines and values, and is realized primarily through thematic (political) vocabulary. Such vocabulary is characterized by the presence of a wide range of condensed semantic, emotional, ideological and political connotations and expresses an ideological assessment.

According to A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics, lexicon "in its most general sense...is synonymous with words." What gives rhetoric its creative beauty is how a speaker (a rhetorician) ingeniously spins lexical items to crystallize his or

her thoughts, to conjure emotions and to concretize events and characters in their speech. A speaker's choice of words determines the aesthetic appreciation of his or her speech. This level of linguistic description therefore investigates the manipulation of language at word level.

Use Of Pronouns

Rhetoricians use pronouns creatively to achieve certain effects. Pronouns can be used to reduce or augment the distance between the speaker and the audience.

- a) So let us summon a new spirit of patriotism; of service and responsibility where each of us resolves to pitch in and work harder and look after not only ourselves, but each other. Let us remember that if this financial crisis taught us anything, it's that we cannot have a thriving Wall Street while Main Street suffers – in this country, we rise or fall as one nation; as one people. (2008)
- b) This is our chance to answer that call. This is our moment. This is our time – to put our people back to work and open doors of opportunity for our kids; to restore prosperity and promote the cause of peace; to reclaim the American dream and reaffirm that fundamental truth – that out of many, we are one; that while we breathe, we hope, and where we are met with cynicism and doubt, and those who tell us that we can't, we will respond with that timeless creed that sums up the spirit of a people: yes, we can. (2008)
- c) We are the keepers of this legacy. Guided by these principles once more, we can meet those new threats that demand even greater effort – even greater cooperation and understanding between nations. We will begin to responsibly leave Iraq to its people, and forge a hard-earned peace in Afghanistan. With old friends and former foes, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat, and roll back the specter of a warming planet. We will not apologize for our way of life, nor will we waver in its defense, and

for those who seek to advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents, we say to you now that our spirit is stronger and cannot be broken; you cannot outlast us, and we will defeat you. (2009)

Obama uses first person plural pronouns such as we, us, our, ours to create a sense of unity of the speaker with the audience (this increases closeness by reducing the distance between the two). This gives a sense of inclusiveness; Obama and his audience are one indivisible entity. He is part of the society to which he speaks.

I know you didn't do this just to win an election and I know you didn't do it for me. You did it because you understand the enormity of the task that lies ahead. (2008)

Obama also uses pronouns I and you to conjure strong emotions in his listeners and to create an informal relationship between the two. In other words, Obama is spreading out the responsibility to his listeners. He uses I to build what Aristotle calls ethos and to give personal gratitude as seen in the following extracts:

I congratulate him, I congratulate Governor Palin, for all they have achieved, and I look forward to working with them to renew this nation's promise in the months ahead. (2008)

In his inaugural speech of 2009, he uses I only three times:

- a) I stand here today humbled by the task before us...
 - b) I thank President Bush for his service to our nation...
 - c) Today I say to you that the challenges we face are real...
- First person singular pronoun I is used to identify the person who takes responsibility for what is said.

It is also used as a show of shared interests between the speaker and the audience thereby appealing to their emotion.

He has established his character and is therefore keen on bringing everyone on board. He uses pronouns other than I to suggest power and solidarity.

King uses me, us and us as an expression of power and solidarity and also to stir up emotions in his listeners.

- a) I must say to my people who stand...
- b) Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst of freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred.
- c) We must not allow our creative protests to degenerate into physical violence
- d) We cannot walk alone
- e) We can never be satisfied...

Use Of Nouns

Generally, Obama uses simple language at word level. Proper nouns are used to indicate historical sites of past wars; where his campaign was hatched; where a memorable vote was cast; places where social injustice took place among others. Examples in the 2008 speech include:

- a) Our campaign was not hatched in the halls of Washington- it began in the backyards of Des Moines and the living rooms of Concord and the front porches of Charleston
- b) But one on my mind tonight is about a woman who cast her vote in Atlanta
- c) She was there for the buses in Montgomery, the hoses in Birmingham, a bridge in Selma...

In his 2009 speech the following is an example:

d) For us, they fought and died, in places like Concord and Gettysburg; Normandy and Khe Sahn To show the inclusivity of his leadership, Obama uses common and collective nouns.

e) It's the answer spoken by young and old, rich and poor, Democrat and Republican, black, white, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, gay, straight, disabled, and not disabled...(2008)

In the two speeches, collective nouns such as the United States of America, or simply, America, men, women, mothers, fathers and generation are used.

In addition, abstract nouns are used to describe events, perceptions, moral and social qualities.

f) Let us resist the temptation to fall back on the same partisanship and pettiness and immaturity...(2008)

g) When there was despair in the dust bowl and depression across the land, she saw a nation conquer fear itself with a New Deal... (2008)

h) In reaffirming the greatness of our nation, we understand that greatness is never given (2009)

i) The success of our economy has always depended not just on the size of our Gross Domestic Product, but on the reach of our prosperity, on our ability to extend opportunity... (2009)

j) On this day, we gather here because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord(2009)

King also uses picture-building nouns to make his message more forceful and appealing. The following are a few examples.

- a) ...seared in the flames of withering justice.
- b) ...manacles of segregations and chains of discrimination
- c) ...bitterness, unspeakable, horrors of police brutality
- d) ...freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered bywinds of police brutality

Grammatical Level

This level of description encompasses syntax and morphology. In morphology, morphemes are affixed to words which, in normal usage should not be affixed. This is not very common in speeches. At syntactic level, we consider incomplete sentences, exaggerated repetition, and unusual arrangement of words, sentence structure and enumeration among others.

Enumeration

Enumeration refers to the listing of more than two elements of the same meaning or similar character. This is meant for precision and to create rhythm. It also stirs up emotions in the audience. Obama uses enumeration as exemplified below.

It's the answer spoken by young and old, rich and poor, Democrat and Republican, black, white, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, gay, straight, disabled and not disabled – Americans who sent a message to the world that we have never been just a collection of individuals or a collection of Red States and Blue States: we are, and always will be, the United States of America (2008)

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. These things are true. They have been the quiet force of progress throughout our history. What is demanded then is a return to these truths (2009)

King also uses enumeration as shown below.

With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail

together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

Inversion

Inversion is a syntactic structure where prominence, the informative center of a speaker's or writer's statement, is shifted from the subject to the other elements of a sentence. This makes the statement more emotionally appealing. Obama uses inversion, more visibly in his inaugural speech of 2009. Examples include the following:

- a) Today I say to you that the challenges we face are real.
- b) On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord.

Parallelism

Parallelism is a device that expresses a series of structures, yet not identical structures. The structures match in their grammatical forms. Leech (1969: 65) argues that "in any parallelistic pattern, there must be an element of contrast," and that "linguistic parallelism is very often connected with rhetorical emphasis and memorability." Parallelism is a product of balanced arrangement achieved through repetition of the same syntactic form. Parallelism creates a sense of symmetry and rhythm. Its other function is to draw attention to a particular part of the message and to make it stand out from the rest of the speech. Parallelism is extensively used in Obama's inaugural speech of 2009.

a) Homes have been lost; jobs shed; businesses shuttered. Our health care is too costly; our schools fail too many; and each day brings further evidence that the ways we use energy strengthen our adversaries and threaten our planet.

b) On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord.

On this day, we come to proclaim an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations

and worn out dogmas, that for far too long have strangled our politics.

c) For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and traveled across oceans in search of a new

life.

For us, they toiled in sweatshops and settled the West; endured the lash of the whip and plowed the hard earth.

For us, they fought and died, in places like Concord and Gettysburg; Normandy and Khe Sahn

d) To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict, or blame their society's ills on the West – know that your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy. To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent, know that you are on the wrong side of history; but that we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist.

King also uses parallelism in “I have a Dream.”

We cannot walk alone.... We cannot turn back... We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is

the victim.... We cannot be satisfied as long as our bodies... We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility.... We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro in Mississippi....

Another example of parallelism as used by King is the following:

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to South Carolina, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed.

Parallel structures as used in these speeches serve to create an effect of balance, thereby reinforcing the impact of the message of the speakers. Parallel structures not only create rhythm, but they also echo the intensity of the speaker's message.

Rhetorical Questions

These are questions that do not require actual answers. They are merely asked for rhetorical effect but the answers are implied in the context. Rhetorical questions are emotive devices which are used to appeal to the emotions of an audience.

So tonight let, let us ask ourselves-if our children should live to see the next century, if my daughters should be so lucky to live as long as Ann Nixon Cooper, what change will they see? What progress will we have made?

Epistrophe

This occurs when a word or a phrase is repeated at the end of two or more clauses. In Obama's victory speech (2008), the creed, yes we can is repeated at the end of several clauses. Apart from giving a speech a rhythmical pattern, epistrophe invites the participation of the audience in the delivery of the speech by allowing them to call out the repeated words. As a result, the belief (that Americans, especially black Americans are capable), is emphasized.

- a) ...the times we were told that we can't, and the people who pressed on with that American creed: Yes, we can.
- b) At a time when women's voices were silenced and their hopes dismissed, she lived to see them stand up and speak out and reach for the ballot. Yes, we can.
- c) When there was despair in the dust bowl and depression across the land, she saw a nation conquer fear itself with a New Deal, new jobs and a new sense of common purpose. Yes, we can.

The lexical and semantic level of political speech texts is represented by common vocabulary that forms the basis of any speech text, and political vocabulary that reflects the ideology of a particular class, introduces a set of ideas, political judgments and reflections, a system of symbols, ideological guidelines and values. Individual words from the political vocabulary become key words and slogans that directly affect the addressee due to the emotional potential, brevity, simplicity, accuracy and precision.

Among the grammatical means in the texts of Barack Obama's political speeches, pronouns and verbs play an important role. When using pronouns as appeals, the speaker, depending on his intentions, establishes connections within the group consciousness, creates a sense of unity, identifies the government, the country and himself with the addressee, which allows us to consider these tools the most important indicators of the communicative situation. The use of verbs that express subject-object relations, prepares the mind of the addressee for the perception of information and signals the intentions of the speaker.

2.3. Stylistic devices in Barack Obama's speech

What is examined at semantic level is transmission of messages by using unconventional combinations of words. There two levels of meaning: the superficial (surface) meaning and deeper meaning. Many of the devices that belong here are referred to as figures of speech.

The leading trend in the development of modern linguistics is the study of stylistic features that present the national-linguistic picture of the author's world in texts of different styles, including political. The stylistics of political language is an extremely interesting subject to study, as it is one of the most effective means of linguistic influence, persuasion and manipulation. By transferring the properties of real-life objects to political phenomena, he creates in people's minds images and constructions that become patterns of political views and behavior.

Many works are devoted to the problem of defining the essence of stylistics as a science. Among their authors are IR Halperin, L.I. Matsko, OO Taranenko, G. Vynokura, O. Peshkovsky, L. Shcherba and others. I. Halperin defines stylistics as the science of "subsystems literary language (language styles) and means of linguistic expression, the use of which provides the desired effect (purpose) of expression "[8, p. 6]. In the interpretation of E. Aznaurov," stylistics studies the meaning of expression, which is determined by the conditions of the context or speech situation "[1, p. 10]. I. Arnold notes that stylistics" compares the national norm with the characteristics of different areas of communication subsystem, called functional styles and dialects, and studies the elements. languages in terms of their ability to express and evoke emotions, additional meanings and evaluation "[2, p. 12].

However, despite the significant amount of research on the stylistic features of speech communication, a number of issues remain poorly covered or need to be addressed. , which is the relevance of this study.

The basic LEXICAL means of Obama's rhetoric is METAPHOR. We can say that the political speech of the President of the United States is completely metaphorical, because it creates whole images of events that help politicians to convey a large amount of information in a short sentence.

Metaphor

Simpson (2004: 41) [15] defines metaphor as "the mapping between two conceptual domains." These Are the source domain and the target domain. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:5) [16] posit that "the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another." That is to say that the hearer is made to see an unfamiliar object and its qualities in an object that is quite familiar.

Kovecses (2010:4) [17]states: “A conceptual metaphor consists of two conceptual domains, in which one domain is understood in terms of another.” The central claim of the proponents of the conceptual metaphor theory is that metaphor is grounded on more basic kinds of experiences, for example, war, journey, construction, height or size, light and darkness, animals, influence and so on. Metaphor is a kind of spice in good speaking.

Obama uses metaphor extensively in his speeches.

Metaphors Of Construction

Structural metaphors generate new metaphors out of a single conceptual domain Lakoff and Johnson (1980). One such conceptual experience, especially in rhetoric, is that POLITICAL ACTIVITY IS CONSTRUCTION.

a) The rock of our family... (2008)

Obama uses the above metaphor to paint a picture of the immeasurable support and invaluable role of his wife, Michele. She is the pillar of the Obama family.

b)... the unsung hero of this campaign who built the best campaign... (2008)

For a political campaign to come off, it must be strong, with a sturdy foundation and meticulous execution, just like a building or construction.

c) ... I will ask you to join in the work of remaking this nation... (2008)

d) ...your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you can destroy. (2009)

Obama would like his opponents to look at leadership in terms of building a positive course, but not destruction which is negative.

e) Starting today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin again the work of remaking America. (2009)

By using this metaphor, Obama is telling Americans that they must shun old habits, which may not have been helpful, and adopt new habits. It is a new era, new habits and new political leadership intended to make a “new” America. Metaphors of construction are also evident in King’s speech.

- a) ...lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood
- b) ...palace of justice

Metaphors Of Journey

In this conceptual domain, political activity is conceived as a journey; it can be long and tedious and is therefore not for the faint-hearted; everybody should be on board in this process. On this long rugged path, we must always make a forward movement; any backward movement is derailing the process and is therefore negative. Journey in this context refers to the American history.

- a) I want to thank my partner for this journey... (2008)
- b) My chief strategist David Axelrod, who has been a partner with me, every step of the way... (2008)
- c) The road ahead will be long. Our climb will be steep... (2008))
- d) It has never been the path of the faint-hearted...but more often men and women obscure in their labor, who have carried us up the long rugged path towards prosperity and freedom (2009)
- e) This is the journey we continue today... (2009)
- f) As we consider the road that unfolds before us... (2009)
- g) Where the answer is yes, we intend to move forward. (2009)

- h) ...our ability to extend opportunity to every willing heart-not out of charity, but because it is the surest route to our common good.(2009)
- i) So let us mark this day with remembrance, of who we are and how far we have traveled.(2009)

Metaphors Of Light And Darkness

Metaphors of light and darkness are largely used to imply hope, openness, a new beginning on one hand, and evil, atrocities and difficulties of the past on the other.

- a) And all those who have wondered if America's beacon still burns as bright... (2008)
- b) ...but our destiny is shared, a new dawn of America leadership is at hand (2008)
- c) ...through the best of times and the darkest of hours...(2008)
- d) Those ideals still light the world (2009)
- e) ...to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day...(2009)
- f) ...we have tasted the bitter swill of civil war and segregation, and emerged from that dark chapter...(2009)
- g) ...see a friend lose their job which sees us through our darkest hours.(2009)

In King's speech, the following metaphors of light and darkness are used:

- a) ...flames of withering justice
- b) ...light of hope
- c) ...now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley...

Metaphors Of War

POLITICAL ACTIVITY IS A WAR metaphor is commonly used by politicians. Politicians conceptualize political processes such as elections as battlefields with political opponents as adversaries. However, in the two speeches, Obama portrays war as destructive; it leads to loss of life and incessant discord. Excessive use of energy is a threat to the planet.

- a) ...tonight we proved once more that that the true strength of our nation comes not from the might of our arms or the scale of our wealth...(2008)
- b) ...each day brings further evidence that the ways we use energy strengthen our adversaries and threaten our planet. (2009)
- c) ...the fallen heroes who lie in Arlington whisper through the ages...(2009)
- d) On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord...(2009)

In conclusion, it should be noted that metaphor is widespread in the space of political discourse and is a tool for influencing understanding between political representatives and ordinary people.

Metaphorization plays an important role as a means of expression and transmission of content in various political speeches and provides a more emotional reproduction of the opinion of the author of the speech. Further study of the use of metaphors in political discourse and classification of their application is promising.

Personification

Personification refers to the transference of certain qualities from animate beings to inanimate objects. In other words, objects and things are treated as if they were human beings.

- a) For that is the true genius of America-that America can change. (2008)
- b) ... worn out dogmas... strangled our politics (2009)
- c) At those moments, America has carried on (2009)
- d) America's birth (2009)
- e) At those moments, America has carried on (2009)

Personification is also evident in King's speech.

- a) America has defaulted on this promissory note
- b) America has given Negro people a bad check

Metonymy

Metonymy is the act of referring to something by the name of something else that is closely connected with it. It is a "cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same domain, or Idealized Cognitive Model (ICM)" Kovecses(2002:145) [18]. In Obama's speeches, place-for-inhabitant and body-part metonymies are evident.

- a) We cannot have a thriving Wall street while Main street suffers-in this country, we rise and fall together (2008)
- b) For that is the genius of America-that America can change (2008)
- c) At those moments, America has carried on (2009)
- d) ...to nourish the starved bodies and feed hungry minds.
- e) ...at a time when voices were silenced (2008)
- f) ...on our ability to extend opportunity to every willing heart...(2009)

In (a), (b) and (c), places-streets and a country (America)-are used to refer to the people inhabiting

those places whereas in (d), (e) and (f), body parts- bodies, minds, voices and heart are used to refer to human beings. This is a way of making a speech more emotive and expressive.

King's speech employs whole-for-part metonymies. It is only a small section of America, the leadership, which has betrayed the black people.

- a) America has defaulted on this promissory note
- b) America has given Negro people a bad check

As we can see, the use of syntactic stylistic means based on the expansion of the syntactic model of a sentence, in particular repetitions, enumerations, and parallel constructions, is dominant for Barack Obama's political speeches. Following the frequency of use is the transposition of the meaning of the sentence, namely the rhetorical question and the change of word order (inversion). However, in political discourse we have also recorded a high frequency of use: quotes that serve to inform fragments of statements and enhance the meaning of the words of a political leader.

We can summarize the features of Barack Obama's speeches as follows. First, he used more simple words and short sentences instead of difficult ones. His language is easy and colloquial. Thus, it can easily shorten the distance between him and the audience. Second, from transitivity analysis, we can see the material process, a process of doing, has been used most in his speeches.

From this process, Obama showed us what the government has achieved, what they are doing and what they will do. And also we can see that with applying transitivity, his speeches are trying to arouse the American people's confidence toward the president and his government in the following four years. Third, modality refers to a speaker's attitudes towards or opinion about the truth of a proposition expressed by a sentence.

Through the analysis of modality, we can find that Obama made his audience more easily to understand and accept his political speeches by means of modal verbs, tense and first person pronouns.

He used simple present tense to present the domestic and world wide situations ranging from political, economic and cultural fields at present. And then depending on simple future tense, he laid out his following reforms and steps taken in his term. In this way, the government's objectives are shown and at the same time, the audience's confidence is built.

Moreover, by using first person pronouns and religious belief, he successfully shortened the distance between him and the audience. So it can help him persuade the public to accept and support his policies.

Conclusion to Chapter Two

From the analysis, we can conclude that in rhetoric, it is not only the content that matters, but how that content is relayed, hence the linguistic spin. Obama has been successful in politics largely due to his unequivocal oratory skills.

His linguistic spin doctors have proved that they are among the best in the world, endearing Obama not just to the American populace, but to the whole world. Obama's speeches are not heavily built on phonological aspects of language, but they are largely anchored on graphological, syntactic and semantic levels of

linguistic description. He uses, in a colossal measure, metaphors to not only build a convincing vision, but also to reinvigorate American dream and democracy.

The metaphors are conceptual in nature; drawn from everyday experiences and so his audience can easily identify with them. His ingenious use of personal pronouns for instance, places him as a humble ordinary citizen inseparable from his compatriots. It is also noteworthy that whereas Martin Luther King relies on concrete adjectives and descriptive nouns to conjure up emotions, Obama uses simple vocabulary but intensifies the other levels of linguistic description such as metaphor, modality, personal pronouns and a variety of sentence structures.

We claim that the persuasive strategy is realized as an efficient tool by means of rhetoric and argumentation. Persuasiveness is a subtle power that wins over hearts and minds by the strategies of emotional and rational argumentation. Political speeches fully exploit the persuasion to convey ethos, logos, pathos, and persuasive argumentation strikes a fine balance between them with the communicative goal to inspire or call to action in order to achieve the intended result. We analyzed the power of persuasion from the viewpoint of the pragmatic employment of strategies and tactics such as argumentative, emotive, evaluating etc., which are the manipulative tools of influencing people, their thoughts, and behaviors.

We distinguished that the strategy of persuasion is a key factor in the semantic organization of speech as well as its composition and stylistic register. The semantic organization employs such linguistic means as rhetorical questions, list of the tree (putting very different or opposing ideas together for effect), state opinion as a fact, emotive language, statistics, exaggeration, repetition of words and phrases, contrasts. Logic, reasoning and particular composition help to construct argument.

The political rhetoric of the 44th President of the USA Barack Obama is characterized by clearness and precision of his arguments. In his introduction he gets the attention of the audience by inclusive language, usually a question that is designed to prompt a thought or by direct appeal to the listener. Then he produces the main claim, supports it by bifurcated arguments with the topic sentence, evidence, support, and examples. He uses a classical rhetoric toolkit and the composition of his arguments is explicit and versatile having the resultant force.

Thus, in order to effectively influence the listener, his imagination and feelings, epithets, comparisons, metaphors, figurative means and phraseology are widely used in political speeches, colloquial and even spatial vocabulary is found, which enhances the emotional impact of speech. In addition, they are characterized by a fairly high percentage of verbs, which emphasizes that the speaker is ready to act, ready for change. Characteristic semantic and stylistic features of speeches are antithesis and oxymoron. The stylistic functions of the antithesis are to contrast the referents, on the one hand, in order to hold attention, and on the other hand, to give the expression rhythm and clarity. The stylistic effect of oxymoron arises due to the use of contrasting concepts and thus gives the expression of emotionality, expressiveness, shows the contradiction of the situation [Khudoliy 2006, p. 58]. The texts of the speeches contain parallels and rhetorical questions.

That is why political speech, which is a model of oratory, is an effective means of persuasion due to the developed tools of lexical and rhetorical tools.

Thus, the rhetorical features of the speech of the President of the United States help to form the image of a confident, purposeful, moderate leader who is able to lead and take responsibility for the future of the nation. Pervasive metaphor, frequent repetition of keywords and phrases, and skillful use of syntactic rhetoric enhance listeners' empathy with the politician and, consequently, trust in him.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

During the investigation was done following tasks:

- defined the notion of political discourse;
- explained the organization of political discourse;
- revealed the linguorethorical feature in Barack Obama's speeches;
- distinguished the components that contribute to the formation of the Obama's speeches;
- found out how planned effects are implemented in speeches;
- determined how various effects are implemented in different speeches.

Political discourse can be defined as a communicative act participants of which try to give specific meanings to facts and influence / persuade others. In other terms, political discourse can be defined as a manipulative linguistic strategy which serves concrete (ideological) goals. Political discourse may involve both the formal debates, speeches, and hearings and the informal talk on politics among family members.

The political rhetoric of the 44th President of the USA Barack Obama is characterized by clearness and precision of his arguments.

REFERENCES

- Aristotle (1984). Rhetoric. W. R. Roberts (trans.). In *The Rhetoric and the Poetics of Aristotle*, 1–218. New York: The Modern Library.
- Anthonissen, C. (2001) 'On the effectiveness of media censorship: linguistic, paralinguistic and other communicative devices of media regulation'. PhD thesis, University of Vienna.
- Bakhtine, M. (1984). *The Problems of Dostoyevsky's Poetics*. C. Emerson (ed.) and (trans.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Burkhardt, 1996, cited in Wodak & de Cillia, 2006.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkley: University of California Press
- Boden, D., & Zimmerman, D. H. eds. 1991 *Talk and social structure. Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Boynton, G. R. (1991). When senators and publics meet at the Environmental Protection Subcommittee. *Discourse & Society* 2: 131-156.
- Brown, W. (1988). Supposing Truth Were a Woman... Plato Subversion of Masculine Discourse. *Political Theory* 16(4): 594-616.
- Bruce, D. D. (1982). *The rhetoric of conservatism: the Virginia Convention of 1829-30 and the conservative tradition in the South*. Los Angeles: Huntington Lib.
- Crystal, D. (2006). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. (6th ed.). London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Concepción, H. (2012). 'Outstanding Rhetorical Devices and Textuality in Obama's Speech in Ghana', *Africa. Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 0203.
- Corbett, E. P. (1971). 'Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student (2nd edition)'. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1979). Effects of message repetition and position on cognitive responses, recall and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37: 97-109.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. 1990. Deeds done in

words: presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carbó, T. (1984). *Educación desde la Cámara de Diputados*. Mexico: CIESAS.

Castañeda, A. 1. (1992). Women of Color and the Rewriting of Western History: The Discourse, Politics, and Decolonization of History. *Pacific Historical Review* 61(4): 501-533. Chaffee, S. H. ed 1975. *Political communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Chaiken, S., & Eagly, A. H. (1976). Communication modality as a determinant of message persuasiveness and message comprehensibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 34: 605-614.

Cheney, G. (1993). *We're Talking War: Symbols, Images, and Strategies in Discourse*.

Persian Gulf War. In B. Greenberg, & W. Gantz eds, *77w Media and Desert Storm*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Chilton, P. (1985). Words, Discourse and Metaphors: The Meanings of Deter, Deterrent and

Deterrence. In P. Chilton ed, *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate: Nukespeak Today*:103-127. London: Pinter.

Chilton, P. (1987). Metaphor, Euphemism and the Militarization of Language. *Current Research on Peace and Violence* 10(1): 7-19.

Chilton, P. (1988). *Orwellian language and the media*. London: Pluto Press.

Chilton, P. (1995). *Security metaphors. Cold war discourse from containment to common house*. New York: Lang.

- Chilton, P., & Ilyin, M. (1993). Metaphor in political discourse: The case of the common European house. *Discourse & Society* 4(1): 7-32.
- Clark, T. D. (1979). An Analysis of Recurrent Features of Contemporary American Radical, Liberal, and Conservative Political Discourse. *Southern Speech Communication Journal* 44(4), 399-422.
- Clinton, W. D. ed. (1988). *Nacional interest: rhetoric, leadership, and policy*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Coates, J. (1990). Modal Meaning: The Semantic-Pragmatic Interface. *Journal of Semantics* 7(1): 53-63.
- Condit, C. M. (1987). Democracy and Civil-Rights: The Universalizing Influence of Public Argumentation. *Communication Monographs* 54: 1-18. Daniel, C. Sabine, K. Edward, J. S. John, et al. (2010). *Start-up Rhetoric in Eight Speeches of Barack Obama*. *Journal of Psycho-linguistic Research*, 395.
- Dillon, G. L., Doyle, A., Eastman, C. M., Kline, S., Silberstein, S., & Toolan, M. (WAUDAG). (1990). The Rhetorical Construction of a President. *Discourse and Society* 1(2): 189-200. Dotan, F. M., & Dumm, T. L. eds. (1993). *Rhetorical republic. Governing representations in American politics*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Dorrien, G. J. (1993). *The neoconservative mind. Politics, culture, and the war of ideology*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple Univ. Press.
- Dryzek, J. S. (1990). *Discursive democracy. Politics, policy and political science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edelman, M. J. (1977). *Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail*. New York: Academic Press.

- Edelman, M. J. (1985). *The symbolic uses of politics. Second Edition.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Eelen, G. (1993). Authority in international political discourse: A pragmatic analysis of United Nations documents on the Congo Crisis (1960). *Text* 13(1): 29-63.
- Entman, R. M. (1991). Framing United-States Coverage of International News: Contrasts in Narratives of the KAL and Iran Air Incidents. *Journal of Communication* 41(4): 6-27.
- Fairclough, N. L. (1994). Conversationalisation of public discourse and the authority of the consumer. In N. Abercrombie, R. Keat & N. Whiteley (eds) *The Authority of the Consumer.* London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. L. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Papers in the Critical Study of Language.* London: Longman.
- Fischer, F., & Forester, J. eds. (1993). *The Argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning.* Durham: Duke Univ. Press.
- Fish, S. E. (1994). *There 's no such thing as free speech... and it's a good thing too.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fox, C. J., & Miller, H. T. 1995. *Postmodern public administration. Toward discourse.* London: Sage.
- Fraser, N. (1989). *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing The Brain: Metaphor and Hidden Ideology.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing
- Gove. (1981). *Webster's Third New International Dictionary.* The USA: G. & C. Merriam, 01.

- Halmari, H (2005). In search of “successful” political persuasion: A comparison of the styles of Bill Clinton and Ronald Reagan. In H. Halmari and T. Virtanen (eds.), *Persuasion Across Genres: A Linguistic Approach*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. pp. 105- 34.
- Hall, S (1996). The Question of Cultural Identity. In S.Hall, D. Held, D. Huert and K. Thompson (eds.), *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Mass and Oxford, pp.595-634.
- Huang Ren, (1999). *An Introduction to English Rhetoric* [M], Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Education Press.
- Li Xiao,(2009) *A Stylistic Analysis on Obama’s Victory Speech* [J], *The Journal of Hubei Economics Institute (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 09: 122-123.
- Liebes, T. and Ribak, R. (1991). A mother's battle against TV news: a case study of political socialisation. *Discourse and Society*, 2, 2, p. 202-222.
- M. H. A, Geoffrey H. (1981). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Mey, J.L. (2001). *Pragmatics An Introduction*. Cornwall: Blackwell Publishers. New Courant (English Dept, University of Helsinki), pp. 135-161.
- N, R. C. (1983). ‘*Oxford English Dictionary- synecdoche*’, University of Pennsylvania: 2303-2304.
- Prosodic and kinetic means of aggressive impact in political communication / N. Petlyuchenko // *Записки з романо-германської філології*. - 2015.
- Perelman, C. and Olbrechts- Tyteca, L. (1969). *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. (trans.) J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Random, H. (2001). *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language*. Thunder Bay Press: 1509-1510.
- Sweet, Furnivall, Murray. (1989). *The Oxford English Dictionary* 2nd ed. 1989. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.

- Sharma, C.K. (2011). A discursive dominance theory of economic reform sustainability: The case of India. *India Review*, 10, 2, p. 126-184.
- van Dijk, T.A (1995). Ideological Discourse Analysis. In E. Ventola and A. Solin (eds.), Special issue Interdisciplinary approaches to Discourse Analysis
- van Dijk, T.A (2002). Political Discourse and Political Cognition. In 'Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse, (eds) Paul A.
- Sears, D. O. (1993). Symbolic politics: A socio-psychological theory. In S. Iyengar, & W. J. McGuire (eds) *Explorations in political psychology*. Duke studies in political psychology: 113-149. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Seidel, G. (1987). The White Discursive Order: The British New Right's Discourse on Cultural Racism with Particular Reference to the Salisbury Review. In I. M. Zavala, T. A. van Dijk, & D. M. Díaz (eds) *Approaches to Discourse, Poetics and Psychiatry*: 39-66. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Seidel, G. (1988) The British New Right's "Enemy Within": The anti-racists. In Smitherman-Donaldson & van Dijk (eds): 131-143.
- Seidel, G. (1988b). Verbal strategies of the collaborators. A discursive analysis of the July 1986 European Parliament debate on South African sections. *TEXT 8*: 111-128.
- Seidel, G. (1988c.) The nature of the right. A feminist analysis of order patterns. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Shakir, A., & Farghal, M. (1992). Gulf War Jokes: Cohesion and Coherence. *Text* 12(3): 447-468. Sidanius, J., & Liu, J. H. 1992. The Gulf War and the Rodney Ring beating: Implications of the general conservatism and social dominance perspectives. *Journal of Social Psychology* 132(6):685-700.
- Silverman, M., ed. (1991). *Race, discourse and power in France*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Skjeie, H. (1991). The Rhetoric of Difference: On Women's Inclusion into Political Elites. *Politics & Society* 19(2): 233-263.

Chilton and Christina Schaffner, John Benjamins Publishing Yu.A. Vasik, PhD, Associate Professor: Political speech: rhythm and rhetoric, p. 188-250.

Walter, D. (1913). *"Parallelism"*. *Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

Winterowd. (1965). *W. R. Rhetoric and Writing*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Zhang Li & Hu Mingxia, *The Stylistic Analysis on the data retrieval to Obama's Inaugural Speech* [J], *The Journal of Baicheng Normal Institute*, 2009, 04: 48-52.

Zheng Lingling, *The Analysis on Obama's Two Inaugural Speeches from the Perspective of Neo-Aristotle's Rhetoric*, [D], An Hui University, 2014.

Zhang Li & Hu Mingxia, *The Stylistic Analysis on the data retrieval to Obama's Inaugural Speech* [J], *The Journal of Baicheng Normal Institute*, 2009, 04: 48-52.

Павлова Е. К. Политический дискурс в глобальном коммуникативном пространстве (на материале английских и русских текстов) : автореф. дисс. на соискание уч. степени д-ра филол. наук : спец. 10.02.20 «Сравнительно-историческое, 12 типологическое и сопоставительное языкознание» / Е. К. Павлова. – М., 2010. – 45 с.

Чудинов А. П. Политическая лингвистика : Учеб. пособие / А. П. Чудинов. – М. : Флинта : Наука, 2008. – 256 с.