

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

КВАЛІФІКАЦІЙНА РОБОТА МАГІСТРА

ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧНІ ЗАСОБИ ВИРАЖЕННЯ МАНІПУЛЯЦІЇ В
АНГЛОМОВНИХ ПОЛІТИЧНИХ ПРОМОВАХ

Студентки групи МЛа 57-21
факультету германської філології
і перекладу
Линник Юлії Сергіївни

Науковий керівник
доктор філологічних наук,
доцент **Шутова М.О.**

Допущена до захисту
«_____» _____ року

Завідувач кафедри
_____ доц. Шутова М.О.
(підпис) (ПІБ)

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів: _____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE
KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY
Department of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Master's Thesis

**LEXICO-SEMANTIC MEANS OF EXPRESSING MANIPULATION IN
ENGLISH POLITICAL SPEECHES**

Yuliia Lynnyk
Group MLa 57-21
Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser
Assoc. Prof. **M.O. Shutova**
Doctor of Linguistics

Kyiv –2022

Contents

Introduction	5
1. Chapter I. Linguistic manipulation..	7
1.1 What is manipulation..	7
1.2. The notion of American Dream and its manipulative power..	13
1.3. Types of manipulation and manipulative techniques.	17
1.4. Manipulation and pragmatics.....	25
2. Chapter II. Manipulation in political speeches..	34
2.1. Implementation of lexico-semantic and pragmatic means of manipulation in political discourse.....	34
2.2. Stylistic means used for manipulation and its manifestation in political discourse	41
2.3. Instances of manipulation found in Barack Obama’s political speeches....	46
2.4. Instances of manipulation found in Donald Trump’s political speeches	55
Conclusion.....	61
Резюме	65
References	67
List of illustrations.....	75

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Donald Trump’s red tie as a symbol of the Republican party	78
Appendix 2 – An example of manipulation of STM, taken from Daily Mail and The Guardian magazines	79

Introduction

This paper is concerned with the topic of manipulation and manipulative strategies employed in political speeches. Manipulation itself can be defined as a behaviour designed to exploit, control or otherwise influence others to one's advantage. It is a pragmatic aspect that achieves its goals without evident detection of communicative intention: the speaker purposefully chooses such a form of utterance that lacks direct signals of their intention.

The topic of manipulation is of great interest for linguists, because manipulative effect is being achieved with the help of natural language. In linguistics, the study of manipulation is closely related to the problem of effectiveness of communication, influence of speech on the addressee, communication strategies used to effectively influence the recipient.

This paper is mainly focused on American political discourse, therefore, the notion of American Dream has been disclosed, and it is demonstrated how American ex-presidents appeal to this notion with a manipulative aim.

The object of the work is manipulation as a linguistic, social and psychological phenomenon. It is difficult to define the exact nature of manipulation; therefore, it is often treated as a multimodal phenomenon. However, it is undeniable that manipulation is based on lingual structures and is implemented in speech activity.

The subject of the work consists of the manipulative strategies implemented in the political discourse, namely in inauguration speeches of the former presidents of the USA Barack Obama and Donald Trump, public speeches of Joe Biden and Hillary Clinton.

The aim of this work is to outline the notion of manipulation, determine main strategies of manipulation and discover how these strategies are exploited in English political speeches to achieve the desired effect. To be aware of those strategies means to be forewarned and be able to withstand their effects.

The objectives of this work include:

- generalizing the theoretical results of the study of manipulation in the works of Van Dijk, R. Noggle, A. Akopova, de Saussure Louis;
- analysing of the political speeches and debates of American politicians;

- investigating the implementation of manipulation in political discourse;
- exemplifying the use of manipulative strategies at different language levels (phonological, lexical, syntactical, pragmatic);
- estimating the effect of manipulation on people;

During the investigation, the following research methods have been utilized: deduction, classification, comparison, generalisation, data analysis (analysing theoretical literature) and description.

The significance of this paper is explained by the contribution to the investigation of manipulation and manipulative strategies in political speeches. Considering that manipulative patterns are similar and recurrent, this work might help spot manipulation in current political discourse and, hence, conceive information without being manipulated.

The dissertation is comprised of introduction, table of contents, two chapters (with theoretical and experimental foci), conclusions, resume, list of reference materials and list of illustration materials.

Chapter I. Linguistic manipulation.

1.1. What is manipulation.

Manipulation as a term is defined in the Collins Dictionary and comes from Latin *manipulus* that means 'handful'. Thereby it can be inferred that the purpose of manipulation is to turn the other person into a useful means on the way to gaining the desired thing (Collins Dictionary). From a psychological point of view, manipulation is defined as "behaviour designed to exploit, control, or otherwise influence others to one's advantage" (APA Dictionary of Psychology). Manipulation can be achieved through various ways like body language as it impacts the interlocutor's subconsciousness; actions, which will undermine the person's beliefs in what is true, and verbal communication that is the most widely-used means of manipulation. Thus, the topic of linguistic manipulation is of current interest and the awareness of its influence might serve as a protective mechanism. It comes to reason that manipulation can occur on a small-scale level like everyday communication between friends or on a large scale where grassroots are involved. An eloquent example of the latter can be manipulation in political discourse. This work focuses on manipulation employed by English speaking politicians and it will be elucidated which manipulative techniques they resort to in order to produce a desired effect on people.

The problem of manipulation of consciousness as a kind of socio-psychological influence which has been studied by social sciences. However, manipulation cannot be viewed as a purely linguistic phenomenon. It is rather universal and, therefore, has many definitions in various fields. Yet it is undeniable that manipulation is based on lingual structures and is implemented in speech activity, especially in the political discourse.

From the standpoint of sociology, "manipulation is a system of means of ideological and socio-political influence used to change the way of thinking and people's behaviour against their interests", writes Dr. Akopova (2013). At the same time, people do not realize that their needs, worldview, interests and the way of life largely depend on those who manipulate them.

The key features of manipulation are 'negative' intention of the speaker and covert (not evident for the listener) character of influence according to the Stanford

Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. Manipulative functions of discourse create covert, masked layer of linguistic data that is not easily separated from purely informational content, says Robert Noggle (2018) in his article “The Ethics of Manipulation” (2018). Language mechanisms operating the processes of speech manipulation have appeared spontaneously, as the language itself to a certain degree facilitates distortion of objective reality offering not only specific designations, but also imprecise, blurred, ambiguous denominations. Manipulation can be sometimes confused with lies; however, while a lie contradicts ‘semantic truth’, manipulation opposes ‘pragmatic truth’. Manipulation is realized when the listener cannot see the speaker’s hidden intentions behind what is actually being said. Manipulation is a pragmatic aspect that achieves its goals without evident detection of communicative intention: the speaker purposefully chooses such a form of utterance that lacks direct signals of their intention. As a result, the perception of objective reality is being distorted and instead a manipulated person is offered an illusionary subjective reality. Therefore, manipulation is viewed by Robert Noggle (2018) as a negative social psychological phenomenon exercising a destructive effect upon an individual and the whole society.

Verbal manipulation can be planned as a complex, multi-stage, phase-by-phase procedure (as in case of informational propaganda and project promotion companies), or it can be a singular, relatively simple act of influencing the recipient in the course of interpersonal communication. Dr. Akopova (2013) finds consideration of linguistic means typical for manipulative texts important for identification of the fact of manipulation. A discourse becomes manipulative not due to usage of specific lexical or grammatical units, but, first and foremost, through association with the speaker’s intentions, unclear influential character of the utterance, conditions of communication (social context). The implementation of manipulation is abused especially in media and political discourse which invokes negative consequences. Exclusion of a manipulative component from modern politics will facilitate the establishment of a truly democratic political culture, claims Akopova (2013). Collaborating, dialogical and liberal communication aimed at absolute revelation of intention, can help reduce manipulative influence. In the conditions of democratisation of society, mechanisms of manipulative influence conducted by the media should be made transparent. Linguistic manipulation

in a broad sense is any verbal interaction regarded from the point of view of its motivation and realised by the subject (speaker) and the object (listener) of communication. A subject of communication regulates behaviour of their interlocutor through speech, stimulating them to commence, alter or accomplish an action whenever the need arises. The speaker can either stimulate a proper responsive verbal or non-verbal action, or exercise indirect influence in order to mould certain emotions and perceptions required by the speaker (Akopova, 2013).

From the perspective of ethics of manipulation, two major questions arise: the identification question and the evaluation question. The former one concerns the definition and identification - How can we identify which forms of influence are manipulative and which are not? A definition of the manipulation could serve as an answer to this question, as it illuminates what the diverse forms of manipulative influence have in common. In addition to explaining how the various instances of manipulation serve as manifestations of a single more basic phenomenon, an answer to the identification question should also provide criteria for determining whether a given instance of influence is manipulative. Thus, context will play an important role for defining it. Manipulation can be viewed as an influence that undermines or bypasses rational deliberation; a form of pressure and a trickery according to the article from Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy by R. Noggle (2018).

Manipulation is often said to “bypass” and “undermine” the target’s rational deliberation. It perverts the way that person reaches decisions, forms preference, or adopts goals according to Raz (1988). However, not all non-rational influences will produce a manipulative effect. For example, graphic portrayals of the dangers of smoking or texting while driving are not obviously manipulative even when they impart no new information to the target (Blumenthal-Barby, 2012). Another example is dressing up before going on a date or job interview. Although dressing up provides little rational basis that would allow to draw conclusions about a person, it functions as an attempt at non-rational influence. Ex-President of the US Donald Trump used to wear red tie as a symbol of Republicans (Appendix 1). Thus, red colour is endowed with a symbolic meaning and might produce a strong non-rational influence.

One more way of treating manipulation is regarding it as a form of trickery according to R. Noggle (2020). From this perspective, manipulation is related to deception in that it tricks the target into adopting a faulty mental state. Indeed, many versions of the trickery account treat manipulation as a broader category of which deception is a special case. Whereas deception is the attempt to get someone to adopt a faulty belief, manipulation is the attempt to get someone to adopt any faulty mental state: belief, desire, emotion, etc.

Typically, the manipulator hopes that adopting the faulty mental state will lead the target to act in ways that the manipulator prefers, insists Noggle in his article “Pressure, trickery and a unified account of manipulation” (2020). Noggle (2020) distinguishes the following ways in which manipulation can be realized as a trickery: via playing on emotions (the manipulator makes the other person feel guilt or other strong emotion), gaslighting (the manipulator makes a victim doubt their own judgments), giving selective attention (emphasizing the advantages of the choice convenient for the manipulator). However, these kinds of manipulation work out under certain circumstances.

Trickery manipulation proves to be effective, Noggle (2020) suggests, only when the tactics employed evoke a faulty mental state. For example, an emotional appeal only seems manipulative if the emotion is inappropriate. Thus, it does not seem manipulative to get someone to fear something that does not serve as a source of fear for the target. Similarly, convincing someone to doubt his own judgment is only manipulative gaslighting when his judgment is sound. However, if his judgment is faulty indeed—if the person is intoxicated, for example—then convincing him to take someone else’s advice does not seem manipulative (especially when the advice is good).

It appears to be that trickery manipulation might have some advantages, Noggle (2020) says. The purpose of this sort of manipulation does not always contradict with the target’s interests. It can recognize as manipulative cases where the manipulator tricks the target into adopting a faulty mental state that leads her to make a decision that is in the target’s best interests. For example, a manipulative physician might induce a patient to feel an exaggerated fear of some condition to get him to comply with a treatment that will improve their health.

Finally, manipulation can be regarded as a pressure. This view portrays manipulation as the exertion of pressure to get the target to do what the manipulator wants. Manipulation involves pressure which raises the cost of failing to do what manipulator wants, but not so much as to be genuinely coercive. The pressure account is a plausible response to the observation that manipulation is neither rational persuasion nor coercion. If rational persuasion exerts no pressure at all and works only by providing reasons, and if coercion exerts a high level of pressure, then it makes sense to think that manipulation exerts a moderate level of pressure – more than rational persuasion, but less than coercion (Noggle, 2020).

Manipulation as pressure is commonly viewed as negative as it involves threatening negative consequences if the target fails to do what the manipulator wants. However, there are cases when manipulative techniques offer positive consequences. For doing as the manipulator wishes. Thus, a manipulator might offer approval instead of threatening disapproval for doing what the manipulator wants. R. Noggle (2020) designates the following ways in which manipulation can be exerted: via nagging (the manipulator repeats their requests or arguments until the target concedes); reciprocity exploitation (the manipulator offers favours which will induce the target to comply with the target's request); emotional blackmail (threatening to withdraw certain favours from the target unless they do as the manipulator wishes).

Another question about manipulation deals with its morality: how should we evaluate the moral status of manipulation? A sufficient answer would be the one which helps us understand whether manipulation is immoral or not. And if manipulation is not always immoral, a satisfactory answer to the evaluation question should tell us how to determine when manipulation is immoral. It is also essential to identify what features make manipulation immoral. Manipulation is wrong for reasons similar to those that make lying wrong. Both tactics involve the attempt to degrade the target's decision-making situation by introducing a faulty mental state into it. What separates manipulative from non-manipulative influence, and what makes the former morally wrong, is the presence of this intention to degrade the other person's decision-making situation by tricking her into adopting a faulty mental state. As Claudia Mills (1995) writes, "a manipulator tries to change another person's beliefs and desires by offering

her bad reasons, disguised as good, or faulty arguments, disguised as sound—where the manipulator themselves know these to be bad reasons and faulty arguments” (Mills, 1995, p. 100).

However, the claim that manipulation is always wrong might be challenged. One might argue that ‘manipulation’ is, or at least should be, a morally neutral term without even the presumption of immorality. On this view, whether a given instance of manipulation is immoral will always depend on the facts of the situation. Thus, manipulation can be justified by the intentions or consequences of the act of manipulation. Clearly, there are non-moralized notions of manipulation. When we speak of a scientist manipulating variables in an experiment, or a pilot manipulating the plane’s controls, our use of the term does not have any hint of moral disgrace (Noggle, 2018).

1.2. The notion of American Dream and its manipulative power.

Manipulation can be used in different spheres of life starting from relationship ending with a speech of a politician. The implementation of manipulation in political discourse is of high interest for this paper, as it is concerned with the manifestation of manipulation in political speeches. The political manipulation is the major problem of research of socio-political sciences. In politics, manipulation is understood as a special kind of influence when the manipulator induces the person to actions which they have not intended to carry out at present. Manipulation differs from power, imperious influence with absence of the direct instructions or the order. In a course of manipulating influence, the person does not feel external compulsion, it seems to them that they make a decision, choose the form of the behaviour themselves. It is necessary to mention that the general technology of political manipulation is based on regular introduction of socio-political myths-illusory of the ideas confirming certain values and the norms grounded mainly on trust without rational critical judgement of realities, the validity in mass consciousness. When myths manage to be introduced imperceptibly in consciousness of grassroots, they can affect the majority of people who do not suspect about occurring manipulation (Benkler, Faris, Roberts, 2018).

In the USA, according to the American professor Herbert Schiller (1971), acted five socio-political myths that confirmed domination of the ruling elite:

- 1) about individual freedom and a personal choice of citizens;
- 2) about a neutrality of the major political institutes: the congress, court and the presidential power, and also mass-media;
- 3) about invariable egoistical human nature, its aggression, propensity to moneymaking and consumption;
- 4) about absence of social conflicts, operation and oppression in a society;
- 5) about pluralism of mass-media which actually, despite their abundance, are supervised by large advertisers and the government – they represent the uniform industry of illusory consciousness (Shiller, 1971).

The notion of the American Dream has been employed by many politicians to reinforce the importance of things mentioned in their speech. Roger L. Pearson (1970)

defines American Dream as a belief that every man, whatever his origin, may pursue and attain his chosen goals, be they political, monetary, or social. It is the literary expression of the concept of America: the land of opportunity. Although the definition itself does not literally reflect desires connected with material possession, rather emphasizes pursuit of goals of non-material substance, in contemporary western society, in which the concept resides, one's personal happiness is inevitably tied to wealth and financial (in)stability. The concept of the American Dreams changes in accordance with changes that American society faces.

Nowadays there are various interpretations of the American Dream, which are used depending on the social group they are aimed at. For example, Jennifer Hochschild (1995) adds a new aspect to the formula of the American Dream that is hard labour: "The American Dream that we were all raised on is a simple but powerful one — if you work hard and play by the rules, you should be given a chance to go as far as your God-given ability will take you" (Hochschild, 1995, p.17). Thus, it pertains the social groups who are not provided with financial support. According to this definition, following the rules and working hard will bring one the desired happiness. The common implication emphasized by the Dream is hope that effort might be turned into success; however, this implication is often inadequate and deceptive. Individuals, who are not fit for competition because of their nature, may experience disillusioned fury when pushed into a predesigned pursuit of happiness.

Semiotician Roland Barthes (2013) proves that the American Dream is a myth by demonstrating the connection between semiotics and cultural studies. As Barthes (2013) points out, each sign has its primary meaning describing an object and a state of being that the sign denotes. However, cultural experience can affect the meaning of the connotation according to the cultural codes of a specific speech community. The American Dream is a concept perceived from two basic points of view taking into consideration its primary meaning and its connotative meaning; however, it is the connotative meaning that takes over its basic interpretation. When people speak of the American Dream, they obviously do not speak of a dream dreamt at night, but rather of a notion induced in their minds during the state of vigilance connoting its unique association with American character. According to Barthes (2013), when a connotative

meaning dominates over a denotative and becomes ‘natural’ and ‘normal’, thus creating a metalanguage, it illustrates the mythical function of a sign based on specific cultural codes. In this case, the mythical character dwells in the belief that the dream can be pursued by people entering the land of opportunity and in hope in what the land can offer to those who put some effort in it.

Media and politicians have exploited the American Dream to present their ideas in favourable light. For example, the ex-president of the US, Donald Trump, became notorious for his motto “make America great again” which referred to the American Dream and encouraged people to follow it. Yet his true intentions diverted from the main principles of the American Dream. In general, his politics were viewed as oriented at white men from rural areas with poor education and other citizens of the US or immigrants were discarded. Disintegration of communities and social organizations in rural, white, working class America has created a chasm between these populations and the well-educated, wealthier section of the white Republican electorate. The upper tier of Republicans treated impoverished working class Americans as a lower class demonstrating no interest in their lives and desire to help. Donald Trump has manipulated these grievances through deceitfully passionate emotional appeals to the sentiments of white, rural, poor, or working class Americans (The Bull & Bear, 2016).

Another example of the use of American Dream in politics was the political course of Barack Obama, the 44th president of the US. Barack Obama’s election came to reinforce the global attraction of the American dream at a time when the United States was being strongly rejected all over the world. Barack Obama’s presidency was aimed at reinforcing his country’s attractiveness in the eyes of Africans, an active part of whom turned away from the “European Eldorado” in favour of the “American dream”, which remains one of the main driving forces behind the migratory flows towards the United States.

Not only politicians addressed the concept of the American Dream, but also social networking media. After the survey in 2019, more than a half of young Americans expressed a desire to become a social media influencer. With rapid boost of new technologies and the growing popularity of Instagram, YouTube, Facebook and other social platforms, new professions have appeared such as blogger, influencer and

so on, concludes Johnson (2022). These occupations seem very alluring and promising for young people who want to become successful in the easier way. Social media implement the American Dream as the guiding light in pursuing the career of an influencer, for instance, but many people oversee the fact that influencers gain success only if their content and platform are valued. Otherwise, they have no chance to turn this activity into a source of income. Hence, the American Dream proves to be used as kind of manipulation over different categories of people (Johnson, 2022).

1.3. Types of manipulation and manipulative techniques.

The topic of manipulation is of great interest for linguists, because manipulative effect is being achieved with the help of natural language. In this part, it will be discussed what kind of manipulative techniques are differentiated. Manipulation combined with forceful and economic methods provides the subject of management with the ability to direct the activities and behaviour of the masses, social groups and individuals in order to control the social situation.

In linguistics, the study of manipulation is closely related to the problem of effectiveness of communication, influence of speech on the addressee, communication strategies used to effectively influence the recipient.

Корнійчук (2009) suggests that there are two major types of manipulation according to the subject of manipulation:

- interpersonal manipulation – the use of various means and technologies of information and psychological influence on one individual;
- collective manipulation – the suppression of the will of the people through the spiritual influence on them by programming their behaviour.

This influence is carried out covertly and aims at alternating thoughts, motivations and goals of people in accordance with the point of view of another group of people.

In modern linguistics, there is no single approach to defining strategies and tactics of linguistic manipulation. While some scholars point out the differences of these terms, others insist that they mean the same. We are going to take a look at some of the definitions of these terms. This term originated in military sphere. In the general scientific sense, it denotes the art of guiding something based on the right and long-term forecasts (Корнійчук, 2009).

‘Communication strategy’ (from Greek *Stratos* - army and *ago* - lead) – is a cognitive process, i.e. the global level of awareness of the situation in which the speaker correlates their communicative goal with a specific language expression, claims Шкіцька (2012). In the theory of speech communication, the strategy of speech communication is viewed as the optimal realization of the speaker’s intention to achieve a specific purpose of communication, gain control and choice of effective courses of communication and in a particular situation.

In a dialogical discourse, manipulation strategies are distinguished depending on the way of dealing with the communication partner according to КОЧКИН (2002):

a) cooperative strategies – a set of speech actions applied by the addressee to achieve the communicative goal by cooperating with the recipient;

b) non-cooperative strategies – a set of speech actions used by the addressee to achieve their strategic goal with the help of a conflict with the recipient (КОЧКИН, 2002).

Teun A. van Dijk (1993) in his work “Discourse and manipulation” dwells upon the notion of manipulation and its connection with conceptual analysis, cognition and its impact on society. What is more important, Dijk (1993) differentiates kinds of discourse manipulation based on short-term memory manipulation, episodic manipulation, manipulation of social cognition, strategies of manipulative discourse (Dijk, 1993).

When it comes to discourse, it becomes clear that certain cognitive processes take place. In the case with discourse, especially manipulative discourse, short-term memory (STM) plays an important role as it is involved in processing information resulting in ‘understanding’ of (words, clauses, sentences, utterances and non-verbal signals) for instance, in terms of propositional ‘meanings’ or ‘actions’. Such processing is strategic in the sense of being goal-directed, operating at various levels of discourse structure, and hypothetical: fast and efficient guesses and shortcuts are made instead of complete analyses.

One form of manipulation consists of controlling some of this, partly automatized, strategy of discourse understanding. For instance, by printing part of the text in a salient position (e.g. on top), and in larger or bold fonts; these devices will attract more attention, and hence will be processed with extra time or memory resources, as is the case for headlines, titles or publicity slogans – thus contributing to more detailed processing and to better representation and recall (Appendix 2). Hence, visual representation of the text specifically affects the management of strategic understanding in STM, so that readers pay more attention to certain pieces of information. This might result in partial and biased understanding of the topic. For example, news about the presidential campaign which brings about unnecessary details, thus, averting attention from the gist.

Since discourse processing in STM involves such different forms of analysis as phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical operations, all geared towards efficient understanding, each and any of these processes of STM may be influenced by various means, asserts Dijk (1993). For instance, more distinct, slower pronunciation, less complex syntax and the use of basic lexical items, a clear topic on a subject the recipients know well, among many other conditions, will generally tend to favour understanding. This also means that if the speaker intends to hamper understanding, they will tend to do the opposite - speak faster, less distinctly, with more complex sentences, with more abstruse words; a confused topic on a subject less familiar to the recipients. That might be the case with politicians who often aspire to shape the way people should think and perceive information.

Not only STM but also long-term memory can be affected by manipulation. LTM includes knowledge, attitudes, ideologies and so on. Also forming part of LTM, however, are the personal memories that define our life history and experiences (Neisser and Fivush, 1994), representations that are traditionally associated with 'episodic' memory. Our memory of communicative events – which are among our everyday experiences – is stored in episodic memory, namely as specific mental models with their own schematic structures. So, when we tell a story, we formulate a personal subjective model of the real even we experienced. In addition, understanding a news report or a story involves the construction of such a (subjective) mental model by the recipients. Hence, we construct mental models of the perceived information including our emotions and past experiences. Given the fundamental role of mental models in speaking and understanding, manipulation may be expected to especially target the formation, activation and uses of mental models in episodic memory. Thus, manipulators will aim at shaping the way people form the mental models restricting their freedom of interpretation.

One of the strategies employed by the manipulators that leads to imposing a "preferred" model is blaming. Blaming the victim is one of the forms of manipulation in which dominant groups or institutions discursively influence the mental models of recipients, for instance by the re-attribution of responsibility of actions in their own

interests. Any discursive strategy that may contribute to the formation or reactivation of preferred models may thus be used in manipulative discourse use.

In the political discourse, says Dijk (2000), manipulation of social cognition happens to be a frequent phenomenon. For instance, a political party wants to increase its popularity with the voters. To achieve that it will typically try to positively change voters' attitudes towards such a party, because a general, socially shared attitude is far more stable than the specific mental models (and opinions) of individual language users. Thus, the most influential form of manipulation does not focus on the creation of specific preferred mental models but on more general and abstract beliefs such as knowledge, attitudes and ideologies. Therefore, if governments, for example, want to restrict immigration, they will try to form or modify the attitudes of citizens about immigration (Wodak and Van Dijk, 2000).

To manipulate social cognition, i.e. opinions of masses, a **generalization** strategy is used. In the case of generalization strategy, a concrete specific example that has made an impact on people's mental models, is generalized to more general knowledge or attitudes, or even fundamental ideologies. A striking example of generalization is the manipulation of US and world opinion about terrorism after 9/11, in which highly emotional mental models of citizens were used to create a general picture of fear, attitudes and ideologies connected with terrorism in the world and related issues. This kind of manipulation was used to dramatically raise military spending, legitimate military intervention and pass legislation that imposed severe restrictions on civil rights and freedoms.

When it comes to favourable presentation on media, a strategy of **positive self-presentation** and **negative other-presentation** is frequently used. This strategy can be applied to the structures of many discourse levels according to Dijk (1998):

- Overall interaction strategies:
 - positive self-presentation
 - negative other-presentation
- Macro speech act implying Our 'good' acts and Their 'bad' acts, e.g. accusation, defence;
- Semantic macrostructures (topic selection):

- (de-)emphasize negative/positive topics about Us/Them
- Local speech acts implementing and sustaining the global ones, e.g. statements that prove accusations;
- Local meanings Our/Their positive/negative actions:
 - give many/few details
 - be general/specific
 - be vague/precise
 - be explicit/implicit
- Lexicon: select positive words for Us, negative words for Them;
- Local syntax:
 - active vs passive sentences, nominalizations: (de)emphasize Our/Their positive/negative agency, responsibility
- Rhetorical figures:
 - hyperboles vs euphemisms for positive/negative meanings
 - metonymies and metaphors emphasizing Our/Their positive/negative properties
- Expressions (sounds and visuals):
 - emphasize (loud, etc.; large, bold, etc.) positive/negative meanings
 - order (first, last: top, bottom, etc.) positive/negative meaning

While Van Dijk is keeping focus on the discursive nature of manipulation, Dr. Akopova Asya states that every manipulation includes a subject and object of manipulation and influence upon the listener's motivation sphere. The above-mentioned factors and other conditions create a foundation for classification types of manipulation.

The type of subject-object interaction determines whether the manipulation is direct (the subject publicly presents his requests to the target of the manipulation) or indirect (the manipulation is focused at the environment rather than the target). Such forms of the language system that are related with a given meaning directly conveying corresponding illocution, i.e. the communicative goal of the speaker, are included in the direct way of linguistic manipulation. Declarative and interrogative speech, for instance, is conditionally linked to a message's illocutionary forces. The use of

language forms to convey illocution force unrelated to their direct linguistic meaning is a precondition for the indirect mode of communicating. The speaker's aims are not explicitly stated in indirect forms.

Understanding linguistic behaviour enables us to distinguish between purposeful and accidental manipulation, supposes Akopova (2013). In cases of deliberate language manipulation, the subject seeks a specific outcome from the targeted party. Non-intentional linguistic manipulation occurs spontaneously because the topic is not trying to elicit a response from the listener. According to Akopova (2013), different types of linguistic action that can be used to manipulate people include:

- social (social non-informational speech acts with clichés in the form of greetings, oaths, and prayers);
- volitional (speech acts that follow the speaker's will in the form of orders, requests, refusals, advise, etc.);
- informational and estimative (speech acts that set public moral, legal, and interpersonal emotional relations in the form of reprobation, praise, accusation, insult, and threat)

The perlocutionary criteria (response of the addressee) provides a foundation for differentiating between the following categories of linguistic manipulation:

- emotional (creation of a general emotional state);
- rational (reconstruction of the categorical structure of the individual conscience, introduction of new categories);
- evaluative (changing of the subject-object relation, connotative meaning of the object for the subject).

Manipulation can be person- or society-oriented depending on the interlocutor's attitude. Akopova (2013) considers that the speaker manipulates language in a person-oriented way to the listener by creating an impression of his interlocutor in order to get the desired result. In case of society-oriented manipulation, the speaker does not construct the image of a separate listener, but creates generalized image of a group as a whole. (Akopova, 2013)

Earlier in this paper, the view of manipulation as trickery suggested by Robert Noggle (2020) was presented. In his work "Pressure, Trickery and a Unified Account

of Manipulation”, Robert Noggel (2020) suggests hypothetical situations that are happening to Manny – the manipulator, and Tara – the target of manipulation. They are casual friends who graduated from the same small-town high school. Tara decided to go to college, whereas Manny prefers to stay and does not wish Tara to leave him. So he resorts to the following manipulative techniques to achieve the manipulative effect.

Nagging is repetitive behaviour in the form of harassing or persistent inducement of a person to comply with previously discussed requests or follow advice. Nagging is a very common form of persuasion used in all aspects of life including domestic and professional. It is also a common practice in order to avoid more aggressive persuasive moves like threats. Manny continually pesters Tara about her decision to go to college, hoping that she will eventually give in and reconsider. His nagging does not provide any new information about college; it is simply meant to annoy her so much that she gives in.

Emotional blackmail occurs when someone uses information, often secrets, to manipulate another person. Manny makes it clear that he will immediately stop being friends with Tara if she persists with her plans to attend college. Manny supplements this tactic by flattering and being especially attentive to Tara, in an effort to get her to care more about their friendship and about earning Manny’s approval.

Playing on emotions. This technique involves exploiting other people’s emotions for personal purposes. Manny plays on Tara’s fears of loneliness by emphasizing that she will be alone in a new city if she goes to college. In addition, he tries to make her feel guilty for forsaking him.

Selective attention is the act of focusing on a particular object for a period of time while simultaneously ignoring irrelevant information that is also occurring. Manny continually focuses Tara’s attention on the charms of small-town life, while downplaying its lack of opportunities for career and intellectual growth. Similarly, he continually focuses on the downsides of college life, including debt, having to attend classes, and the city’s higher crime rate. Selective attention only seems manipulative if the influencer induces the target to pay too much attention to the wrong things (or too little attention to the important things). If, instead, the influencer seeks to get the target to pay the right amount of attention to something important, then the influence does

not seem manipulative. To this extend trickery manipulation intertwines with the idea of non-rational influence of manipulation with which identification question is concerned.

Gaslighting. Manny attempts to undermine Tara's confidence in her own judgment by exaggerating her past mistakes and using them as evidence that her judgment is not trustworthy and that she should heed Manny's advice to stay home instead of going to university.

These and the above-mentioned manipulative techniques and methods are implemented not only in conversational but in political discourse as well. Recognizing the means of manipulation can help prevent their influence on people.

1.4. Manipulation and pragmatics.

The complexity of the phenomenon of manipulation allows us to investigate it not only from the linguistic but also from the pragmatic point of view. Considering a problem like manipulative discourse through the question of understanding natural language is quite different from what is generally proposed on the topic within discourse analysis and the social sciences. Blair (2021) says that many trends defend the view that anything manipulative is best understood with informal tools such as those provided by text-linguistics. However, if assuming that manipulation in discourse is primarily achieved during the very construction of meaning in context, it becomes clearer that theories provide descriptions for that cognitive process, which goes on when exposed to speech or text, are likely to enlighten significantly research on manipulation (Blair, 2021).

Luis de Saussure (2013) suggests treating manipulative discourse as the one belonging to the realm of pragmatics. He claims that manipulative discourses exist not because of formal features¹; they are produced in order for the speaker to achieve specific goals. Although some formal features are more present in manipulative discourses than in non-manipulative discourses, none are exclusive to manipulative discourses. The main criterion he uses is one of intention on the part of the speaker, an intention which is not cooperative. Manipulation does not comply with the principles of cooperation recognized by Paul Grice (1975). Grice (1975) attempted to specify the principles, which underlie this cooperative behaviour, and proposed four ‘maxims’ or rules of conversation which can jointly be summarized as a general principle: “Be cooperative”.

- Maxim of Quantity: make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange). Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
- Maxim of Quality: try to make your contribution one that is true. Do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

¹ structural and/or stylistic aspects of an utterance

- Maxim of Relevance: be relevant.
- Maxim of Manner: be perspicuous. Avoid obscurity of expression.

Avoid ambiguity. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity). Be orderly. Frame whatever you say in the form most suitable for any reply that would be regarded as appropriate; or, facilitate in your form of expression the appropriate reply (Grice, 1975).

Considering Grice's principles of cooperation, it becomes obvious that manipulation flouts the maxim of quality. The speaker aims at manifesting certain number of assumptions to the hearer and have him consent to them, provided that they would be rejected under normal conditions. Manipulative discourse is therefore a pragmatic problem in his view. It is a type of natural language usage that can only be distinguished through notions like goals, intentions, and broader aspects of pragmatic processing. These ideas, points out de Saussure (2005), explain the quantitatively high presence of some formal features (some types of argument schemes and fallacies, semantically loaded expressions, connotative words) as they help the speaker achieve their goal. The ability of the hearer to recognize the manipulative aim through formal and non-formal elements is thus one of the main challenges of language manipulation; when this detection fails, manipulation is successful (de Saussure, 2005).

The main problem with Gricean maxims is that they are fairly vague, and the conversational implicatures or conclusions which can be drawn are wide and numerous. The term 'implicature' was adopted by Grice (1975) in his work "Logic and conversation". Conversational implicatures are implications deduced by speakers during conversations, asserts Allott (2018). In manipulation process, implicature has its very potent nature where it enables the manipulator to maneuver and manipulate what they want to convey indirectly. Manipulators (especially politicians) are always aware of the menace of their language so that they tend to express their messages implicitly to avoid being judged for what is said. According to P. Grice (1975), there are two types of implicatures which are conventional implicatures and conversational implicatures. A conventional implicature is an implicature that occurs as a result of reasoning logic. In her speech for CNN news in 2020, Hillary said that "...America needs a better president"(CNNPolitics, 2020, August 20). From this utterance, it can

be deduced that she does not consider Donald Trump a good president as he failed to manage economy during the Covid pandemic.

Grice (1975) contrasted a conversational implicature with a *conventional* implicature, by which he meant *one that is determined by the meaning of the sentence used*. Conventional implicatures are independent of the cooperative principle and the four maxims, remarks Cutting (2002). They are instead tied to the conventional meaning of certain particles and phrases such as ‘but, although, however, nevertheless, moreover, anyway, whereas, after all, even, yet, still, besides’, verbs such as ‘deprive, spare’, and possibly also to grammatical structures (such words and phrases are also said to trigger conventional implicatures). In addition, they are not defeasible, but have the force of entailments (Cutting, 2002).

In the following adjacency pair ² during a political debate in 2016, it can be noticed how Hillary uses conversational implicatures and hedges (a word or phrase used in a sentence to express ambiguity, probability, caution).

TRUMP: I will bring -- excuse me. I will bring back jobs. You can't bring back jobs.

CLINTON: Well, actually, I have thought about this quite a bit (First 2016 presidential debate). (POLITICO, *First 2016 presidential debate*, 2016, September 27)

Trump attacks Hillary with a fact that her politics were not successful and she will not be able to combat unemployment. To save her face, Hillary implies that she has had ideas about how to bring jobs to America with the words ‘well’, ‘actually’, ‘quite’ which serve to mitigate a damage from the face-threatening act.

To manipulate and to achieve influential goals, the speaker may use manipulative speech acts; breach the maxim(s) of cooperation; convey irrelevant information, utilize certain deictic expressions, maneuver; be engaged in fallacious arguments; be polite, and/or be impolite.

Austin (2005) has been working on the Speech Act Theory for many years and according to it, utterances can be shown to have both illocutionary force (the intentions of the speaker are expressed by using a performative verb: promise, confess, pronounce)

² an exchange of utterances between two interlocutors

and a perlocutionary effect (effect produced upon a listener) in addition to their propositional content³ (Austin, 2005).

Taking into account that manipulation is a communicative interaction process, manipulators, as such, exploit manipulative speech acts to achieve their goals, claims Leontyev (1981). A direct subject-object interaction, in which the manipulator openly states his claims and demands to the target of manipulation, may be used to achieve manipulation in this way. Alternately, one could approach such interactions indirectly (Leontyev, 1981).

Direct speech acts include verbs in the imperative form: “Just think how difficult it is to save 50,000, 100,000, 200,000, a million, and then think of 6,000 million to be saved in the next nine months... (Brown in first prime minister debate 15 April 2010. BBC News) The imperative speech act is clearly manifested in this utterance when Brown asks his audience to think of numbers to be saved.

“Do not allow anyone to tell you that it cannot be done.” (D. Trump during his inaugural speech in 2017). The use of imperative mood in this utterance sounds like an order and produces a strong effect on the listener.

“Let’s be honest with each other, net inward immigration is falling.” (Gordon Brown *ibid.*)

The verb ‘let’ in this example is used together with first person plural to indicate the involvement of the speaker and the hearer in the same issue.

According to Akimova (1992), indirect speech acts are also common in the framework of speech interaction. Although these utterances do not have a form of the imperative ones, they almost always imply inducement. These speech acts are focused on perlocutionary effect.

Akimova (1992) classifies them as follows:

1. Indirect speech acts represented by utterances containing performative verbs (verbs that do not describe action, but are an action themselves) such as declare, promise, and advise.

“We will defend our people and uphold our values through strength of arms and rule of law” (Barak Obama during his inaugural speech in 2017). Although the

³ what is commonly believed to be true

performative verb is absent in this example, its function is performed with the help of “will” that is used as a modal verb in this case.

2. Indirect speech acts of inducement represented by utterances with verbs in the form of the indicative mood conveying the meaning of instruction.

“We’re going to cut minister’s pay by 5% and freeze it for the whole of the parliament. We’re going to cut the size of white hole by a third (Cameron in first prime minister debate 15 April 2010. BBC News)

This utterance which is in the indicative mood exposes and conveys the sense of giving instructions to the government to ameliorate economic situation in the country.

3. Indirect speech acts represented by utterances containing the verbs in the subjunctive mood.

“Because America *needs* a better president than this.” – said Hillary Clinton about Donald Trump in her speech delivered in 2020 for CNN. The verb ‘need’ implies that people need to vote for a different president during the next elections and hereby she imposes her advice.

4. Indirect speech acts in the form of speech acts represented by utterances containing the verb of desire ‘wish’.

“I *wish* Donald Trump had been a better president” (Hillary Clinton *ibid.*). By expressing her wish, Hillary hints at that she does not consider Donald Trump a worthy president.

Very frequently, people, especially politicians, resort to manipulation to save their face and appear polite. In general, people cooperate in maintaining face in interaction, such cooperation being based on the mutual vulnerability of face. Two types of face are differentiated. Positive face refers to an individual’s wish to be respected and appreciated by others. Negative face refers to the wish not to be restricted or impeded in the choices one makes concerning social behaviour (Goffman, 1972). Politeness is hence understood as a means of showing awareness of another’s face. Social behaviour can constitute face saving acts by being deferential to others, emphasizing the importance of their wishes and concerns. On the contrary, a face-threatening act tends to encroach on another’s freedom of action and may be interpreted as an imposition or indeed an insult. There are many linguistic strategies for minimising

the threat to negative face, for instance by apologizing in advance for disturbing someone, and for maximising the enhancement of positive face, for instance by pointing out a common interest in some suggestion made to an addressee. (Brown, Levinson, 1979).

Brown and Levinson (1979) designate the following politeness strategies employed by people:

bald-on-record - no attempt to limit the threat to the listener's face, direct ("Watch out!")

positive politeness - attempt to limit the threat to the listener's face by finding common ground, juxtaposing criticism with compliments, telling jokes. Positive politeness strategy is present in the utterance by Donald Trump during a debate with Hillary Clinton in 2016: "I want to make America great again. I'm going to be able to do it, *I don't think Hillary will*. The answer is, If she wins, *I will absolutely support her*." He expresses his disbelief in that Hillary wins the election and at the same time promises to support her by juxtaposing criticism with support in this case.

During a political debate between Hillary and Trump (2016), Hillary tried to win the affection of the audience by utilizing a strategy of positive politeness – finding a common ground with listeners. At the beginning of the debate, she has mentioned that on that day her granddaughter was celebrating her birthday, so Hilary could not help thinking about that: "The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be and what kind of future we'll build together. *Today is my granddaughter's second birthday, so I think about this a lot*. First, we have to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top." The fact that she spoke about an event, which had little connection with politics, shows that Hilary attempted to make people feel that she is one of them with the same human needs and problems. Later on, she speaks about her father who was a small businessperson and had to work hard to earn for a living.

negative politeness - avoid any imposition on the listener by using hedging ("*I don't suppose you know when the meeting starts, do you?*")

off-record – very indirect and implicit ("I'm so tired. A cup of coffee would help.")

Among the above-mentioned strategies, the one that involves positive politeness is of big interest for this paper, as it plays a pivotal role in manipulation process. Brown & Levinson (1987) offered positive politeness strategies which aim at saving the hearer's face, giving importance to it, minimizing the potential threat of an FTA and forming bond. Brown and Levinson divide positive politeness into three mechanisms: claim common ground, convey that S (speaker) and H (hearer) are cooperative and fulfil H's want (for some x). Later they classified those mechanisms into 15 strategies. In this article, only strategies important for political discourse will be mentioned.

- Notice, attend to H (their interest, wants, needs). This strategy refers to any kind of utterances produced by S who notices H's wants, needs and so on.
- Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H). The utterances produced by the speaker with exaggeration to show the speaker's interest.
- Use in-group identity markers. By applying this strategy speaker can put hearer in the group when they use jargon, slang or colloquial terms.
- Seek agreement. This strategy is used to stress emotional agreement, interest or surprise by saying the utterance that can satisfy the hearer's desire.
- Avoid disagreement. This can be achieved by saying utterances that are used for hiding disagreement in order to maintain hearer's positive face (telling white lies).
- Presuppose/raise/assert common ground by saying any kind of utterances that can make relationship friendly: talking for a while about unrelated topics, having a small talk, giving personal examples.
- Joke to make the hearer feel relaxed.
- Assert or presuppose S's knowledge and concern for H's wants.
- Offer, promise to maintain a positive face.
- Be optimistic. This strategy refers to a desire to show that the speaker and the hearer are cooperatively involved in the related activity.
- Give (or ask for) reasons. This strategy refers to the hearer's reflexivity.
- Assume or assert reciprocity - determine what S and H should do in order to achieve cooperation.

For the sake of saving the hearer's face, politicians often employ **euphemisms** - a replacement of ordinary expressions with favourable or exaggerated ones. However, behind a benign intention, euphemisms can be used as a tool to hide scandals, disguise the truth and guide public thoughts when discussing social issues or events.

According to Swiss linguist F. de Saussure (1916), language signs are a combination of the signifier, the phonetic forms of language and the signified, objects in existence represented by linguistic forms. Due to the lack of direct or logical relations between the two, they have a loose relationship with each other, making it possible to create euphemism by replacing the signifier. Although euphemism is created by transforming the signifier without changing its initial meaning, a political euphemism can greatly deviate from the meaning expressed by its former signifier, or even distort it. An example of the use of a political euphemism when it evokes almost an opposite meaning is the replacement of 'missile' with 'peacekeeper' in the speech of an ex-president Reagan. When talking about American army's invasion into Grenada in 1983, President Reagan was quite dissatisfied with the word 'invasion' used by the journalists so instead he named it 'a rescue mission' glorifying their military invasion as an offer to help other countries.

With a rapid development of the US economy and dynamic domestic politics, there is a need in producing political euphemisms which will help outline things in favourable for politicians light. For instance, the phenomenon of "recession" was gradually substituted with "negative growth" to mitigate a face-threatening effect. In Obama's Victory Speech (2008), he referred to elderly people as to 'not-so-young' to save their face and appear polite: "...it grew strength from the **not-so-young** people who braved the bitter cold and scorching heat to knock on the doors of perfect strangers..." (Obama, 2008)

Lakoff (2003) claims that politics is language and language is politics. Political propaganda and political euphemism both seek to influence and persuade the public. Since linguists first discovered that language is not just for representing social culture but also for engaging in social events and building social relationships, a long period has passed. Actually, it is an intervention and a form of social practice. Given the

aforementioned facts, Berger and Luckmann (2007) were among the first to highlight the significance of language in the creation of social reality.

Although it does not change the signified things in existence, it really changes its conceptual connotation because sometimes people's learning of a concept or a meaning is based on their knowledge about words (Hudson, 2000). Political leaders try to shape people's recognition and knowledge of the world with the use of euphemism, hence influencing their view of world and intervening their knowledge of the world and sense of right and wrong.

Chapter II. Manipulation in political speeches.

2.1. Implementation of lexico-semantic and pragmatic means of manipulation in political discourse.

Manipulative behaviour manifests itself in various ways and at different levels of a language. In this work, lexico-semantic, stylistic and pragmatic means of manipulation will be discussed in detail.

At the lexical level, lexico-semantic manipulation takes place. While investigating articles from political magazines, the following means of lexico-semantic manipulation have been detected.

The most obvious method of lexico-semantic manipulation is the use of words with **emotionally coloured meaning**. Language is not free of values. The words we use often have emotional connotations: some of them are positive, others are negative. The choice of words during construction of statements with a positive or negative meaning can evoke certain feelings in readers and, thus, guide their opinion.

American linguist P. Roach (2001) emphasizes the power and importance of linguistic choices. Language carries a certain amount of meaning, which depends on the nature of the culture or subculture in which the language exists. He presupposes that the semantic expression of the characteristics of any particular culture will be reflected in the way the language ideas, concepts and beliefs. This kind of manipulation can prevent people from critically evaluating the opinions and attitudes that they hold. Roach insists on that advertisers, politicians, and those whose function is to manipulate social attitudes quite often rely on this means of control of people's cognition (Roach, 2001).

The following examples from the political speeches and political articles contain manipulative means based on the expressive and evaluative meanings of a word.

“The enemy insidiously attempted to fire on our aircraft as we peacefully overwhelmed his city with bombs.” (“Romea” news server, Alvarova, 2018)

In this example, we can observe how the author Alvarova (2018) puts an emphasis by accusing the other side of the armed conflict of attacking and at the same time justifying the actions of their side as defensive. Nevertheless, for the untrained

reader, even such rather direct manipulation can have a decisive effect. Such linguistic means refer to emotionally charged attitudes.

“He aimed at giving France a *unique* role within the West.” (W. Hitchcock, 1997, p. 21)

With the help of the epithet ‘unique’, the author puts a persuasive a message about France's unique role in the Western arena. The statement of a journalist carries a value-semantic load.

“The divergence of French and US/NATO *vital* interests seems to have a *crucial* role here.” (European Security & Defence, ESD Editorial Team, 2020)

In this example, it is worth noting the use of synonymous adjectives ‘vital’ and ‘crucial’ in one sentence, which was taken intentionally by ESD Editorial Team (2020), with the purpose of drawing attention and highlighting the statement.

“Joe Biden is not Hillary Clinton. This is *objectively true, of course*,” writes a CNN editor C. Cillizza in his article “Why Donald Trump’s dishonesty might actually matter in 2020” (CNN, 2020, September 8).

Cillizza (2020) uses the adjective ‘objectively’ with the construct ‘to be true’ and adds its own agreement with the assertion, which further enhances the effect of ‘undeniable truth’.

“Among people of color, 60% say Biden is ‘*honest and trustworthy*’ while 29% say Trump.” (CNN News, Cillizza, 2020) Describing the results of the poll, Cillizza (2020) does not conceal his ironical attitude towards the politicians. The use of adjectives ‘honest’ and ‘trustworthy’ carries a judgmental message.

Repetition. Repetition is a literary device that involves the intentional use of a word or phrase two or more times in speech or written work to enhance the effect produced on the reader (The Merriam-Webster Dictionary). In order for the repetition to be noticeable, the words or phrases must be repeated in close proximity to one another one another. Repetition of the same words or phrases in a manipulative context can bring clarity to an idea and/or make it memorable to the reader.

Repetitions can be often traced in speeches of the political leaders who aim at bringing only certain things into the spotlight. An instance of the use of repetition can be an excerpt of the speech delivered by the current President of the US Joe Biden.

“I appeal to those few Senate Republicans – the handful who really will decide what happens. Please, follow your *conscience*. Don’t vote to confirm anyone nominated under the circumstances President Trump and Senator McConnell have created. Don’t go there” Biden said. “Uphold your constitutional duty, your *conscience*. Let the people speak”. (CNN News, Biden, 2020)

In Biden’s speech (2020), in addition to the imperative mood of verbal constructions, the use of repetition is observed. The reiteration of the word ‘conscience’ is employed to appeal to the listener’s common sense by engaging the emotional-meaningful attitude.

Also, the call for agitation can be often traced in Biden’s speeches:

“You *know* me. You *know* my heart, and you *know* my story, my family’s story”, Biden (2020) said.

Emotional-semantic attitude is also found in exclamatory and interrogative sentences.

“Ask yourself: Do I look to you like a radical socialist with a soft spot for rioters? Really?” Biden (2020)

Metaphorization. Metaphor is a figure of speech in which a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them. Metaphors convey the emotional and semantic load in the most vivid way. G. Lakoff and M. Johnson (2003) insist on that we perceive our life through a metaphor and that metaphor is much more than a device of poetic imagination: “Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature... Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people” (Lakoff, 2003, p. 201). Thus, many politicians and advertisers resort to this method of manipulation, in order to convey ideas in an effective way.

Since metaphors are very common in language, we do not always think of them as metaphors, Lakoff (2003) reveals, as representations of an object, and this fact can be used by politicians and journalists for linguistic manipulation. Metaphors in many cases reflect the values of a culture or society, and they can reflect widespread perceptual experiences. Metaphors are models for thinking about social and physical

objects and for conveying a complex set of attributes in an abbreviated form that can be easily understood by the addressee of the message. It should be noted that metaphorical models facilitate the emergence of new thoughts of a certain kind. In other words, these models draw our attention to certain features of experience and turn a blind eye to other features.

When analysing articles from the magazines and political speeches, an abundant amount of metaphors has been found. Almost all of them induce the reader to accept the point of view of the author or speaker.

The Democratic presidential nominee Kyle Griffin (2020) called on Republican senators to prevent a constitutional crisis: “The last thing we need is to add a *constitutional crisis that plunges us deeper into the abyss, deeper into the darkness*”, the former vice president and Democratic presidential nominee said.

Metaphor is used to achieve the effect of devaluing the actions of a political leader Joe Biden (2020) in this case.

“*Cool the flames that have been engulfing our country*” (Biden, 2020)

Metaphorical language puts an emphasis on the crisis in the US and, thus, offering that Republicans will save the day. Cillizza (2020) writes: “Republicans now hold control of the U.S...and the chamber could flip if Collins and several other seats *go blue.*” (CNN News, Cillizza, 2020)

In the two previous examples, a vivid political metaphor has been used. Blue is a distinguishing feature of the Democratic Party. Considering that the Republican Party gathered more support during the election campaign in , its success was reinforced with the help of the metaphorical synecdoche ‘go blue’ which escalated the fears and excitement of sympathizers over the loss of supporters.

“Clinton was the *No. 1 bogeyman* for Republicans for years, as they fixated on scandals (some real, most imagined).” (CNN News, Cillizza, 2020)

From choice of words in the citation from the article, it becomes evident that CNN editor Chris Cillizza (2020) supports Republicans and bemeans the role of the leader of the opposing Party.

At the level of sentences, manipulation can be applied via the use of passive voice, the use of modal verbs, nominalization.

Passive voice. Depending, for example, on how causality is distributed between the participants in the action, there is a choice between an active or passive structure. The role of the participant can be emphasized, minimized or completely omitted. The emphasized or minimized role performed by the participant may also be called a “foreground or background of the action” (Beard, 2000). The active voice is preferred when it is necessary to focus on the doer, implying responsibility for the action performed. Robert Fowler (2003) speculates about the existence of some schema in English which suggests that the leftmost nominative phrase of a sentence refers to the doer of the action if, or until, there is evidence to the contrary.

While conducting the study on the use of passive voice in political speeches, M. Liu (2022) analysed Corpus data. She came to the conclusion that English political speeches, passive voice is mainly used to state facts and emphasize opinions. The study reveals that the passive voice is typically used in tiny amounts of informational portions and when speakers are trying to convey serious or traumatic information to the audience in order to increase the objectivity and gravity of the information while also evoking a reaction or worry. Usually, this kind of passive sentence in political speeches performs in the structure of was /were done or have/has been done. Examples are as below:

“Millions Of jobs have been lost. Hundreds of and thousands of businesses closed.” (PEW, T. Henderson, 2022)

“The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed all across the world.”(Trump’s Inauguration Speech, 2017)

“Homes have been lost; jobs shed; businesses shuttered.” (Obama’s Inauguration Speech, 2009)

M. Liu (2020) supposes that passive voice used to emphasize ideas with speaker’s strong will mostly appears in a large number of expressive and appealing parts in English political speeches, exerting textual and interpersonal functions, thus conveying speakers’ attitudes and enhancing the mutual trust between speakers and listeners. The structure of passive sentence for emphasizing is usually presented as will/should/can/must be done or need/have to be done. For example:

“Every child must be taught these principles.” (Bush’s Inauguration Speech, 2001)

“If our country does not lead the cause of freedom, it will not be led.” (Bush’s Inauguration Speech, 2001)

Modality. Modality refers to different ways of expressing attitude toward a person, situation, or event, representing an opinion about what should be evaluated as true, probable or desirable (Merriam-Webster Dictionary). Modality is usually expressed by means of modal auxiliary verb. (can, may, ought to, must, could, might, shall, will, should, would). Also modality can also be expressed by adverbs that reflect the speaker's attitude towards the situation (for example, possibly, necessarily, unfortunately) or with the help of modal adjectives (likely, unlikely). The frequent use of modal expressions in the text reinforces the sense of subjectivity creating “the illusion of a person” with a voice and an opinion. Writers who strive for objectivity and open-mindedness, e.g, journalists, should limit their use of modal expressions in their speech, Roach (2001) believes. Nevertheless, he argues that the use of modal auxiliary verbs and the choice of specific adverbs allows newspapers to present opinions and assumptions that can be interpreted by readers as real facts (Roach, 2001).

“France *needs to* gradually disengage from NATO if it wants to preserve the capacity to conduct military operations alone.”(Elcano, A. Pannier, 2020)

From this example, we can see that the author tries to maintain journalistic neutrality and uses persuasive speech structures to express the opposite point of view.

“That line probably doesn’t work for Clinton. Because, well, voters didn’t trust her. And it definitely doesn’t work for Trump. But for Biden it just *might.*” (CNN News, Cillizza, 2020)

This utterance is persuasive due to combining modality and contrast.

Nominalization. Nominalization is one of the most common types of lexical transformations used to conceal information in the context of an article. Nominalization is a process that involves exchanging a verb phrase for a single noun or noun phrase. In this case, the members of the sentence denoting the action, participants, time circumstances or modality markers can be omitted. The purpose of this type of

linguistic manipulation may be to present an unpleasant activity, carried out by one person without names or participants, that is, without the injured and accusing party.

Fowler (2003) argues that nominalization allows concealment of information, which is especially relevant in the so-called inter institutional relations of power and journalism. (Fowler, 2003).

An example of nominalization is the following quote from the article “France and NATO”:

“President de Gaulle has pursued a gradual disengagement from NATO’s commitments which, culminated in the country’s *withdrawal* from the Alliance’s Integrated Military Command Structures in March 1960.”

In the article, France appears as a proponent of joining the Agreement among the members of the Security Council of the United Nations United Nations. Therefore, the announcement of the withdrawal from the alliance of the organization’s armed forces is presented through nominalization in order to soften the effect on the reader.

2.2. Stylistic means used for manipulation and its manifestation in political discourse.

Political speeches and public speeches in general belong to the publicist functional style. Publicist style is a field of mass communication; therefore, this style has a very wide range. Its prior aim is the formation of public opinion, and its defining feature is a successful combination of logical presentation with emotional and expressive colouring. To influence public opinion, a speech, for example, has to be flawless in terms of logical construction and at the same time emotional and expressive. Thus, these two facets, logical sequence and emotional appeal should be well-balanced.

A characteristic feature of publicist style is the focus on oral communication with the aim of engaging the reader, listener or viewer. This style is characterized by clear political assessments and the presence of the author. Public speeches depending on the degree of spontaneity differ in intonation models. For spontaneous speech, emotional expressiveness and abrupt alternations of the intonation contours are typical. Prepared speeches are of a rather formal character, which is also reflected in the prosodic pattern of the utterance: a high volume of speech, medium tempo, sufficient number of pauses and their duration, emotional diversity. In the publicist style complex tones (fall-rise) are common. Speakers often highlight words to which they want to draw attention pronouncing them louder and more slowly. By choosing certain intonation patterns and pausation, the manipulative aim can be achieved – affecting a STW and thus diverting attention from the important information in the speech (Reva, 2021).

As it was stated above, intonation serves as a powerful tool when it comes to manipulation. The most recurrent phonetic devices which are employed to impact listeners are rhythm, tempo, emphatic stress and pauses. These devices help avoid monotonousness and therefore draw attention. They have an expressive function to specify information and focus on detail.

Rhythm of the speech can be created with the help of alliteration and assonance. Alliteration is a literary device that reflects repetition in two or more nearby words of initial consonant sounds (Literary Devices). It can be found in poetry, advertisements and lots of public speeches. For example, U.S. president Barack Obama used several alliterative phrases in his speech at the Fort Hood Memorial Service in 2009. First, he

called the U.S. military the “finest fighting force the world has ever known,” and continued by describing their work in “distant, different, and difficult places.” The repetition of the initial consonant ‘f’ creates tension and evokes associations with fights and fists. The repetitive use of the sound [d] conjures up an image of defence.

Whereas alliteration is the repetition of consonants, assonance is the recurrence of a vowel sound in two more words in a sentence or utterance. In the speech of Barack Obama (2009), the recurrent appearance of the sound [ɪ] can be spotted: “We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines...” Both alliteration and assonance contribute to setting rhythm which holds the interest of an audience.

According to Oliveira (2002), pauses play a vital role in speech perception since they help the listener process the data cognitively. Though pauses serve a variety of purposes, it is generally agreed that they are one of the most effective structuring strategies out of all the prosodic elements a speaker may use to indicate a text’s organization. In political discourse, lots of attention is given to rhetorical pauses which are considered relevant markers of this type of discourse. Rhetorical pauses serve to highlight and emphasize “the high-key information centre” of the utterance to keep and control the attention of the audience and add particular significance to the semantic core (Brown, 1990). In addition, the functional load of such pauses is to facilitate the perception of the text, enhance emotional engagement. Rhetorical hesitations are also used to create certain proximity between the politician and their audience (Duez, 1997).

In some cases, rhetorical pauses overlap structural ones. The longer duration of the rhetorical pause compared to other pauses realized at the same syntactic boundaries in the same text indicates that the structural pause proper has been replaced. To demonstrate the pausation in the excerpts from public speeches, specific symbols will be used:

- a single bar (|) to mark short pauses;
- two parallel bars (||) to mark medium pauses, usually between the end of one sentence and the end of the other;
- a tripe bar symbol (|||) to represent a distinct long pause

The use of rhetorical pauses is evident in the speech by Teresa May: “I have kept | Her Majesty the Queen | fully informed of my intentions, | and I will continue to serve | as

her Prime Minister | until the process has concluded. || It is, || and will always remain,
|| a matter of deep regret to me | that I have not been able to deliver || Brexit. || It will
be for my successor || to seek a way forward that honours | the result of the referendum.”
(Theresa May’s Resignation Speech of May 24, 2019)

Thus, the duration of the pauses separating the phrases in the second and third sentences is much longer (||) than the length of the normal pause generally realised between these units. Some additional pauses has been added by the speaker (a long pause before Brexit) to lay an emotional emphasis.

In order to achieve the effect of a more pronounced rhythmic pattern, rhetorical pauses can also be utilized to emphasize the relevance of the emotional impact of speech on the audience.

“Our politics | may be under strain, || but there is so much | that is good | about this country. ||| So much | to be proud of. ||| So much | to be optimistic about. ||| I will shortly | leave the job | that it has been the honour | of my life || to hold – ||| the second female Prime Minister || but certainly | not the last. || I do so with no ill will, || but with enormous and enduring gratitude || to have had the opportunity || to serve the country ||| I love.” (ibid.)

In this example, pauses create a certain prosodic pattern where short pauses (||) alternate with rhetorical pauses (|||) enhancing the emotional appeal to the audience acting as certain regulators between the addresser and the addressee. Thus, the pauses contribute to the effective transfer of dynamism and expressiveness of political discourse. Pausing, well adjusted to the content of the message, is essential in creating an optimal situation and having a maximal effect on the listener (Strangert, 2006).

As it was stated earlier, the aim of the publicist style and namely of public speeches is to produce and influence on the audience and shape their opinion. To achieve this, not only intonation patterns but also syntactic stylistic means are applied. The most recurrent syntactic devices are repetitions of various kinds, parallelism (anaphora, epiphora), polysyndeton and asyndeton.

Parallelism is the repetition of grammatical elements in a piece of writing to create a harmonious effect. Parallelism is particularly popular among orators and politicians because it usually simplifies the structure of sentences, so the speaker can

hold an audience's attention for longer and present their message in digestible terms. It is no accident that some of the most famous speeches in history contain examples of parallelism. Winston Churchill's stirring World War II-era address, "We Shall Fight on the Beaches" is based on a type of parallelism called anaphora: "*We shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be. We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender.*"

According to the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, anaphora is treated as a rhetorical device in which a word or expression is repeated at the beginning of a number of successive phrases, clauses, sentences or verses, especially for rhetorical or poetic effect (Merriam-Webster Dictionary).

In the excerpt mentioned above, a phrase "we shall fight" is constantly repeated and creates a sensation of a mantra the aim of which is to raise the spirit of patriotism and assure people in the victory of English army.

A counterpart of anaphora, epiphora, is considered a repetition of a word or expression at the end of successive phrases, clauses, sentences or verses, especially for rhetorical or poetic effect, such as Lincoln's "of the people, by the people, for the people". The use of anaphora and epiphora helps create an artistic effect so that information is easy to perceive and understand.

John F. Kennedy's inaugural presidential address (1961) also features an eloquent example of parallelism. Kennedy does not repeat words: it is purely the symmetry in the grammatical structure and ideas that make this a successful parallelism: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall *pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe* to assure the survival and the success of liberty." Atwood (2021) notices that this extract also contains an example of a particular kind of parallelism called antithesis, where the two parallel elements express opposite ideas. "Whether it wishes us *well* and *ill*" and "*support any friend, oppose any foe*" are antithetical elements here (Atwood 2021).

Another example of using epiphora can be found in the speech of ex-president of the US Bill Clinton (1993): "There is nothing wrong with America that cannot be

cured by what is right with America.” In this quote, epiphora is used to lay emphasis on that Bill Clinton will manage all problems in the US.

An abundant use of conjunctions, polysyndeton, accounts for creating a certain rhythm of the text, and it is utilized as a tool to lay emphasis to the ideas the conjunctions connect. ‘And’ is the most frequent conjunction used in speeches. Here is an example taken from the speech of Oprah Winfrey (2019): “... any life *and* every life is enhanced by the sharing *and* the giving, *and* the opening up of the heart space”. A conjunction ‘and’ in this case adds up to the emotional tension and appeals to the listeners’ feelings.

On the contrary, asyndeton, i.e. omission of conjunctions that usually join coordinate words or clauses serves to stress the significance of the relation between the words or clauses in question. For instance, one person may be so important that pauses between the enumerated roles instead of conjunctions generate respect and grief at the same time, adding rhetorical weight. A former president of the US, Barak Obama (2001), used asyndeton in his speech to address people who suffered from the terrorist attack on 9/11: “It would be a refutation of the forgiveness expressed by those families if we merely slipped into old habits whereby those who disagree with us are not merely wrong, but bad; *where we* shout instead of listen; *where we* barricade ourselves behind preconceived notions or well-practiced cynicism.”

Obama’s repetition of ‘where we’ without a conjunction puts direct emphasis on the ‘we’ as he aims to unify people after a national tragedy and draw public attention to the problem of terrorism.

2.3. Instances of manipulation found in Barack Obama's political speeches.

To illustrate the means of manipulation mentioned in this work, political speeches of two former presidents of the US – Barack Obama and Donald Trump – will be analyzed.

Political manipulation in inaugural speech delivered by Barack Obama in 2013 has a collective character, as it is oriented at large groups of people. In this speech, he gives many details and mentions historical events to strengthen his words.

“The patriots of 1776 did not fight to replace the tyranny of a king with the privileges of a few or the rule of a mob.” – reference to the day of declaration of Independence – one of the most important days for Americans.

“...to hear a King proclaim that our individual freedom is inextricably bound to the freedom of every soul on Earth.” – A speech “I have a dream” given by Martin Luther King in 1963.

Barack Obama (2009) tries to be cooperative and employs positive politeness strategies such as finding a common ground, attending to needs, exaggerating, playing on emotions and giving reasons. The ex-president tried to find and raise common ground by addressing the audience with ‘my fellow Americans’. The use of the word ‘fellow’ in this context helps build trust with the listeners. It equals to the word ‘friend’, which has a less powerful effect. In addition, he emphasizes the word ‘people’ by using it with a definite article ‘the’ in the utterance: “For we, *the people*, understand that our country cannot succeed when a shrinking few do very well and a growing many barely make it.” This makes listeners feel special and responsible for improving life in America.

In this line, Obama is attending to the needs of Americans: “So we must harness new ideas and technology to remake our government, revamp our tax code, reform our schools, and empower our citizens with the skills they need to work harder, learn more, reach higher.” By pointing out the needs, he implements that during his presidential term they will be satisfied. This implementation is strengthened with a modal verb ‘must’ which serves as an assertion and convincement. The use of modal verbs of necessity ‘must’ and ‘have’ are typical of Obama's speeches.

Obama also utilizes a positive politeness strategy of exaggeration: “America’s possibilities are limitless for we possess all the qualities that this world without boundaries demands...” Americas possibilities are, for sure, not limitless but calling them in this way complies with the myth of American Dream which has been discussed in detail in the previous chapter. Also, the reference to this belief can be found in the following line: “We know that America thrives when every person can find independence and pride in their work; when the wages of honest labor liberate families from the brink of hardship.” Hence, if one works hard, they will not struggle with financial issues and will get a chance of a happy life.

“Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, *hopeful immigrants* who still see America as a *land of opportunity*” – calling America a land of opportunity allures people to believe in the American Dream.

Barack Obama resorts to one of the manipulative techniques mentioned by Robert Noggle (2020) – playing on emotions. He often speaks about children to make listeners feel a strong emotion of compassion:

a) “We are true to our creed when a **little girl** born into the bleakest poverty knows that she has the same chance to succeed as anybody else, because she is an American; she is free, and she is equal, not just in the eyes of God but also in our own.” (Obama’s Inaugural Speech, 2013)

b) “For we remember the lessons of our past, when twilight years were spent in poverty and parents of **a child** with a disability had nowhere to turn.” (ibid.)

c) “Our journey is not complete until **all our children**, from the streets of Detroit to the hills of Appalachia, to the quiet lanes of Newtown, know that they are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.” (ibid.)

Obama (2009) makes explanations and gives reasons in this fragment: “But we have always understood that when times change, so must we; that fidelity to our founding principles requires new responses to new challenges; that preserving our individual freedoms ultimately requires collective action. *For the American people can no more meet the demands of today’s world by acting alone than American soldiers could have met the forces of fascism or communism with muskets and militias.*

In general, Barack Obama's inaugural speech (2009) is focused on hearer's involvement; therefore, active voice of the utterances in the speech dominates. To produce an emotional effect and reach maximum involvement, Obama uses emotionally coloured words 'devastating', 'succumb to', 'the bleakest' and others. In addition, his speech is rich in rhetorical figures and stylistic devices: epithets, euphemism, antithesis, metaphors, polysyndeton, parallelism and the use of the pronoun 'we'.

Epithets 'enduring strength', 'precious light', 'inextricably bound' are employed to create an emotional impact on the audience. For negative experiences, he used a euphemism 'twilight years' to refer to the decline of American economy in the past.

An antithesis "They do not make us a nation of takers; they free us to take the risks that make this country great" (2009 *ibid.*) serves as a compliment to Americans looking more effective when 'takes' and 'free to take risks' are juxtaposed.

Obama's speech has its distinctive feature – the use of emotionally clouded language and metaphors. "We believe that *America's prosperity must rest upon the broad shoulders of a rising middle class*" (2009 *ibid.*) – using a metaphor in this case underlines the importance of the middle class in American society.

'*The path towards sustainable energy*' is a conceptual metaphor to help visualize the way Americans need to go in order to become environmentally friendly. (2009 *ibid.*)

"Our citizens, *seared by the memory* of those we have lost, know too well the price that is paid for liberty", – the use of a metaphor '*seared by the memory*' refers to the tragic events on 11/9 and shows Obama's sympathy to it. (2009 *ibid.*)

"America will remain the anchor of strong alliances", – Obama compares America to the anchor to demonstrate its influence in the world. (2009 *ibid.*)

"My oath is not so different from the pledge we all make to the flag that waves above and that *fills our hearts with pride.*" A metaphor "fills our hearts with pride" is used to evoke patriotic feelings in listeners. (2009 *ibid.*)

To make the speech more melodic and memorable, Obama used polysyndeton: "We recall that what binds this nation together is not the colors of our skin *or* the tenets

of our faith *or* the origins of our names.” In this sentence, the repetition of the conjunction ‘or’ could be replaced by a comma, but then a rhetoric effect would be lost.

The use of pronoun ‘we’ and parallelism are two the most salient features present in almost all political speeches. Obama’s inaugural speech is not as exception. Throughout his speech, he used pronoun ‘we’ more than 70 times. This helps to make people feel united and, what is more important, let them believe that they take part in the global processed together with the president.

Parallelism in Obama’s speech creates a certain rhythm that facilities perception of information.

“Together, we determined that a modern economy requires railroads and highways to speed travel and commerce, schools and colleges to train our workers.

Together, we discovered that a free market only thrives when there are rules to ensure competition and fair play.

Together, we resolved that a great nation must care for the vulnerable, and protect its people from life’s worst hazards and misfortune.” (2009 *ibid.*)

From the phonological perspective, Barak Obama makes many rhetoric pauses where the emphasis is needed:

“We understand that outworn programs are inadequate | to the needs of our time. ||| So we must harness new ideas and technology to remake our government,|| revamp our tax code, || reform our schools,|| and empower our citizens with the skills they need to work harder,| learn more,| reach higher.||| (2009 *ibid.*)

When listening to Obama’s speech, it becomes obvious that some of the pauses are prolonged to reach a rhetoric effect and give the audience more time to digest information.

Manipulation at the phonological level is found in other public speeches delivered by Barack Obama. In Obama’s speeches, alliteration, consonance and assonance stand out.

By using alliteration, a certain musical effect is created that attracts listeners’ attention. 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)...to restore **prosperity** and **promote** the cause of **peace**

c) through **blood** drawn **by** **lash** and **blood** drawn by sword, we learned that no union founded on the principles of **liberty** and **equality**... (Inauguration speech, 2013)

d) ...forces of **fascism** or **communism** with **muskets** and **militias** (2013 *ibid.*)

The significance of the alliteration of the sounds [b] and [k] is two-fold: the first one is used 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 the line c) alliteration of the sounds [l] and [b] emphasizes the horror of times of slavery and resembles the sound of blood drops falling on the floor. In the example d) a recurrent sound [m] creates a hostile attitude towards fascism and communism - the main enemies of democracy. The repetition of this sound resembles a sound of a machine gun.

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

a) Why **men** and **women** and **children**... (2009)

b) Progress does not **compel** us to **settle** centuries-long debates about the role of government for **all** time (2013)

One more way to create a melodic rhythm is to use assonance. Here are examples drawn from Obama's speeches:

a) You **didn't** do **this** to **win** an **election**...you **didn't** do **it** for me... (2008)

b) **We** will **begin** to responsibly **leave** **Iraq** to **its** **people**... (2009)

At the lexical level, Barack Obama achieves a manipulative effect with the help of pronouns, modal verbs, adjectives and adverbs of time.

When in an augural speech (2013), a pronoun 'we' was preferred, in other speeches pronouns 'you' and 'I' are frequent. Obama also uses them to conjure strong emotions in his listeners and to create informal relationship between the two. In other words, Obama is spreading out the responsibility to his listeners.

“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)

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.”

A wise choice of modal verbs can have a particularly strong effect on the audience. Both Obama has carefully chosen modal verbs to emphasize certain aspects of his message. The most frequently used modals are *can, shall, will, and must*.

“There will be setbacks and false starts. There are many who won't agree with every decision or policy I make as president, and we know that government can't solve every problem. But I *will* always be honest with you about the challenges we face. I *will* listen to you, especially when we disagree. And above all, I *will* ask you to join in the work of remaking this nation the only way it's been done in America for 221 years – block by block, brick by brick, calloused hand by calloused hand.” (2008)

The modal verb ‘will’ is used to express desire, choice, willingness, consent, or in negative constructions refusal; used to express determination, insistence, persistence, or wilfulness (Merriam-Webster Dictionary). In the extract above, Obama uses ‘will’ to achieve three things: prepare people for a difficult way to a better life in the future, show people that he is willing to work with them, and to ask his listeners to join in the rebuilding of America.

We cannot help but believe that the old hatreds *shall* someday pass; that the lines of tribe *shall* soon dissolve; that as the world grows smaller, our common humanity *shall* reveal itself; and that America *must* play its role in ushering in a new era of peace. (2009)

The modal verb ‘shall’ is used to express determination or inevitable events in the future. In this context, Obama uses ‘shall’ to express promise, intention, and obligatory action and to show his determination. The verb ‘must’ in this context is used to demonstrate the high degree of probability expressed by Obama who is convinced

that America is bound to contribute to establishing peace. However, quite often under the euphemism ‘peaceful’ actions, military operations are meant.

To enhance the manipulative effect and create a certain mood, Obama utilizes emotionally coloured adjectives and epithets in his speeches.

a)...it grew strength from the *not-so-young* people who braved the *bitter cold* and **scorching** heat to knock on the doors of perfect strangers... (2008)

b) On this day, we come to proclaim an end to the *petty* grievances and false promises... and *worn-out* dogmas that for far too long have strangled our politics. (2009)

c) We remain a young nation, but in the words of Scripture, the time has come to set aside childish things. The time has come to reaffirm our *enduring* spirit; to choose our better history; to carry forward that *precious* gift, that *noble* idea...pursue full measure of happiness. (2009)

Obama uses adverbs of time to indicate a new beginning: a fresh start devoid of atrocities of the past in the following examples:

a) *Today*, I say that the challenges that we face are real. (2009)

b) Starting *today*, we must pick ourselves... (2009)

By laying stress on the word ‘today’, he creates an impression that things will be happening very soon.

At the grammatical level, Barack Obama implements enumeration, inversion, gradation, epistrophe, imperative sentences and rhetorical questions.

In the example below, enumeration together with repetition of the particle ‘to’ is used in the Obama’s speech:

“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.” – Enumeration and repetition account for creating a melodic rhythm making the speech memorable.

Inversion has a function of emphasis and the most significant pieces of information are placed at the beginning of the sentence.

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

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

Gradation refers to a series of successive degrees. In the series, every next element is getting more and more or less and less intensive. This is used in Obama's inaugural speech:

a) All these **we can do**. All these **we will do**. (2009)

b) For as much as the government **can do and must do**... (2009)

Epistrophe 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 making them feel a part of it.

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**.

Imperative statements are also used to foreground parts of the speeches that need immediate attention or actions. Examples include the following:

"Let us resist the temptation to fall back on the same partisanship and pettiness and immaturity that has poisoned our politics for so long. Let us remember that it was a man from this state who first carried the banner of the Republican Party to the White House – a party founded on the values of self-reliance, individual liberty, and national unity." (2008)

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?" (2008)

At the semantic level, metaphors, personification, metonymy are used in Barack Obama's public speeches.

Obama resorts to the following conceptual metaphors in his speeches to let the audience understand abstract things via specific examples:

Metaphor of journey: "The road ahead will be long. Our climb will be steep..." (2008)

Metaphor of war: "...each day brings further evidence that the ways we use energy strengthen our adversaries and threaten our planet." (2009)

Metaphor of construction: "...lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood." (2009)

During the research, the following examples of personification⁴ in Obama's speeches have been discovered:

b) "... worn out dogmas... *strangled* our politics" (2009)

c) "At those moments, America has *carried on*..."

d) "America's *birth*"

Metonymy is the act of referring to something by the name of something else that is closely connected with it. In Obama's speeches, place-for-inhabitant and body-part metonymies are evident:

a) "...at a time when *voices were silenced*." (2008)

b) At those moments, *America has carried on*." (2009)

c) "...on our ability to extend opportunity to *every willing heart*..." (2009)

The use of antithesis helps bring the essential information out and draw attention of the audience. Quite often antithesis is implemented alongside parallelism:

a) "On this day, we gather because we have chosen **hope** over **fear**, **unity of purpose** over **conflict and discord**..." (2009)

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

In conclusion, Barack Obama creates managed to create an image of a politician concerned with the future of American nation and children. He implemented various

⁴ transference of certain qualities from animate beings to inanimate objects

manipulative devices to highlight his ideas about that how to rebuild America and gather support.

2.4. Instances of manipulation found in Donald Trump's political speeches.

Inauguration speech of Donald Trump (2017) serves as an eloquent example of the use of manipulation. It is manifested at different language levels: phonological – alliteration, anaphora; lexical – epizeuxis, diacope, epistrophe, gradation; syntactical – the use of simple sentences, polysyndeton; semantic – antithesis, metaphor, hyperbole. At the pragmatic level, it will be demonstrated how Donald Trump resorts to the strategies of positive politeness, face-threatening and positive self-representation.

In general, public speeches of Donald Trump have a distinguishable feature – lots of repetitions aimed at affecting STA – shifting focus to the things which Trump considers essential. In addition, he tends to utilize short and simple sentences and active voice. In comparison to Barack Obama's speech with an abundance of emotionally coloured and emphatic vocabulary, Trump's speech sounds rather simplified but still not devoid of stylistic devices.

The examples of alliteration are found in the following utterance: “As I've said from the beginning, ours was not a **campaign** but rather an incredible and great **movement**, **made** up of **millions** of hard-working **men** and **women** who love their country and want a better, brighter future for themselves and for their family.” The alliterating consonant sounds [m] help add musical effect to the utterances. (Trump's Inaugural Speech, 2017)

Anaphora is evident in this piece: “Together, *we will* determine the course of America and the world for many, many years to come. *We will* face challenges, *we will* confront hardships, but *we will* get the job done.

‘We will’ is used to express the strong intention as well as show strong wish about the future via the repeated use of “will” as in the above examples.

According to Harris (2017), epizeuxis is a form of repetition in which one word or a short phrase is repeated in succession with no other words in between. The following sentences contain examples of using epizeuxis in Trump's speeches:

“Together we will determine the course of America, and the world, for *many, many* years to come.” (Trump’s Inaugural Speech, 2017)

“We have *great, great* power. The problem is we have politicians who *truly, truly, truly* don’t know what they’re doing. So we’re going to work *very, very* hard.” (2017 *ibid.*)

Such reiteration of words reinforces a rhetoric effect and draws listeners’ attention.

Another means of emphasizing information is diacope - the repetition of a word or phrase after an intervening word.

“We share *one* heart, *one* home, and *one* glorious destiny.” - Through this statement, Trump claimed that Americans are united. (2017 *ibid.*)

“There should be no fear. *We are protected* and we will always be protected. *We will be protected* by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement. And most importantly, *we will be protected* by God.” (2017 *ibid.*)

The extract above is a great message from Trump to all of his supporters. Through repeating “we will be protected” four times, Trump wanted his supporters to believe in his power and ability to protect them from everything. Thus, an idea of the country’s security is emphasized by repeating the word “protected”.

Epistrophe (the repetition of the same word or words comes at the end of successive phrases, clauses, or sentences) is employed by Donald Trump for the sake of emphasis.

“*Their* victories have not been *your* victories. *Their* triumphs have not been *your* triumphs, and while they celebrated in our nation’s capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land.” Alongside epistrophe, antithesis ‘their’ – ‘your’ has been used as well to mark the gap between ‘evil’ politicians who were separating themselves from citizens of American and ordinary people. This juxtaposing belongs to one of the manipulative methods described by Teun A. van Dijk where Our/Their properties are being emphasized. (2017 *ibid.*)

Emotional involvement of the audience in Trump’s speech has been achieved via gradation, earlier discussed in terms of Obama’s speech. Gradation serves as a method of escalation of emotional tension like in an example below:

“Finally, we must think big and dream **even bigger**.” – Together with a modal verb ‘must’, this message calls people to believe in “American Dream” according to which all their dreams will come true if they work hard and follow the Bible. A *conventional implicature* ‘even’ reinforces the effect of gradation by highlighting that Americans should dream as their dreams will be embodied in reality. (2017 *ibid.*)

It is worth mentioning, that Donald Trump makes a reference to the Bible in order to support his words: “When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice. **The Bible** tells us, how good and pleasant it is when God’s people live together in unity.” (2017 *ibid.*)

When analysing Trump’s speech from a syntactic perspective, it was discovered that the ex-president often resorted to parallelism by using identic syntactic structures.

“America will start winning again, winning like never before. *We will bring back* our jobs. *We will bring back* our borders. *We will bring back* our wealth, and we will bring back our dreams. *We will build* new roads and highways and bridges and airports and tunnels, and railways, all across our wonderful nation. *We will get* our people off of welfare and back to work, rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor.” (2017 *ibid.*)

Apart from parallelism, this excerpt also contains polysyndeton and enumeration: “We will build new roads **and** highways **and** bridges **and** airports **and** tunnels, **and** railways, all across our wonderful nation.” The repetitive use of conjunction ‘and’ creates a certain rhythm and helps to emphasize how much Donald Trump has on agenda and what he is going to do as soon as he starts acting as a president. (2017 *ibid.*)

“Every decision **on** trade, **on** taxes, **on** immigration, **on** foreign affairs will be made to benefit American workers and American families.” (2017 *ibid.*) The reiteration of the preposition ‘on’ functions as an additional emphasize and brings the fact out that Trumps policy will be aimed at bailing out, first and foremost, the middle class in America. He appeals to this idea several times in his inauguration speech and other speeches to shape an image of a politician who truly cares about the destiny of American nation.

One more way to manipulate and put information into a spotlight is to place it at the beginning of the sentence, as Trump did in the following example: “In America, we understand that a nation is only living as long as it is striving.” (2017 *ibid.*) Here an adverbial modifier of place ‘in America’ takes an initial position in the sentence drawing attention to the fact in America things are just and happen differently, not like in other countries.

Expressive means in political speeches play a crucial role when it comes to manipulation. Their main goal is to stress upon certain aspects of information given in the speech while the rest of information remains overshadowed.

Donald Trump successfully employed metaphor in his political performances: “For too long, a small group in our nation’s *capital has reaped the rewards* of government, while the people have *borne the cost*.” These metaphors facilitate visualizing of a problem of ruling elite who were not working for the sake of people’s wellbeing.

“We stand at the birth of a new millennium, ready to *unlock the mysteries of space, to free the Earth from the miseries* of disease and to *harness the industries and technologies* of tomorrow.” (2017 *ibid.*) In this extract, Trump celebrates the role of Americans in momentous events that are about to happen. By using pronoun ‘we’ he implies that everyone can make their contribution.

Antithesis is used to strengthen an argument by using exact opposites or contrastive ideas.

“So to all Americans in every city *near and far, small and large*, from mountain to mountain, from ocean to ocean, hear these words.” (2017 *ibid.*)

The words ‘near’– ‘far’ and ‘small’ – ‘large’ are two pairs of completely different phrases that convey opposite meanings. By using antithesis, Trump made it easier to describe the scale of the involvement of American citizens in the new policy course.

Not only contrastive ideas can be juxtaposed but also syntactic structures like in the next example: “What truly matters is not *which party controls our government*, but whether *our government is controlled* by the people.” (2017 *ibid.*)

Active ‘controls’ and passive voice ‘is controlled’ are opposed in this utterance which produces a powerful effect on the listeners and witnesses about the values that Trump protects – government should be for the people.

One more means to rivet the audience’s attention is to stylistically exaggerate information. This can be achieved with the help of hyperbole: “We’ve lost our manufacturing jobs. We’ve lost our manufacturing. *Millions and millions* of jobs, *thousands and thousands and thousands* of plants, manufacturing plants, warehouses. I mean, we are losing so much. We can’t let it happen.” (2017 *ibid.*)

Trump utilizes hyperbole, repetition and even gradation to exaggerate his point. Trump talks about “thousands of employees” as well as “millions and millions of jobs” along with “thousands and thousands and thousands of plants” .The numbers he mentions in this utterances grow bigger with every statement he makes (gradation and repetition) appealing to the emotions and worries of the audience about the economy.

“We’ve defended other nation’s borders while refusing to defend our own. And spent *trillions and trillions* of dollars overseas, while America’s infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay.” (2017 *ibid.*)

Highlighting the fact that America spent a huge amount of money on other countries instead of rebuilding its own supports ideas of Republican political party he represents. He insinuates that American should focus its resources on its own land instead.

When speaking about terrorism, Donald Trump also used hyperbole to reflect his attitude and strengthen the effect of his promise given in the following sentence: “We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones, and you unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism, which we will *eradicate completely from the face of the Earth.*” (2017 *ibid.*)

As it was mentioned before, positive politeness is aimed at saving the face of the hearer. Donald Trump utilizes these techniques by giving a promise to maintain a positive face. “Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength. I *will fight for you with every breath in my body*, and *I will never, ever let you down.*” (2017 *ibid.*)

The example below is an illocutionary act, namely a commissive, as Trump promises to protect Americans and stand for them. The effect is enhanced by the use

of metonymy ‘every breath in my body’ with the help of which he shows his commitment to American nation.

In another speech, delivered by Donald Trump at the UN General assembly, he was speaking about USA’s successes during the period of his presidency. Donald Trump uses the strategy of self-representation by saying: “In less than two years, my administration has accomplished more than almost any administration in the history of our country”. Trump overstates the real situation to make a positive image of himself as a successful president: “...the United States is stronger, safer, and a richer country than it was when I assumed office less than two years ago”. A positive image of the USA is also created thanks to the appearance of the following words: stronger, safer and richer. Donald Trump assures the listeners that the country has become richer and stronger only thanks to him in the period of just two years. That is how Donald Trump uses the tactics of proven assessment: he refers to some facts (that are difficult to check whether they are true or not). (Trump’s CPAC speech, 2018)

To emphasize the membership of a common social group, Trump uses in-group social markers and creates an image of “man of the people”: “By the way, you don’t mind if I go off script a little bit? It is sort of boring. It is a little boring... We have to, you know - but we gave them their dignity back. And that’s why our country is doing record business. (Trump’s CPAC speech, 2018). In this excerpt he uses lots of contractions and suggests not using the script which is supposed to make his words sound more natural and closer to the people.

Trump very often uses the condescending strategy by implementing the threatening tactic. When referring to North Korea, the politician thanks Kim Chen Yin for being brave enough and having a dialogue with the USA, but he still pronounces the phrase: “The sanctions will stay in place until denuclearization occurs”. This threat is supposed to make North Korea move forward to denuclearization.

One more case of threat is realized in the phrase directed at Human Rights Council. Trump accuses them of not paying attention to human rights violation and threatens not to be part of the council unless they behave the way he expects: “...we withdrew from the Human Rights Council, and we will not return until real reform is enacted”(2018). By using this ultimatum, Trump wants the Council’s policy change

and his reform to be accepted. The accusation tactic is also extensively used throughout the whole speech. Trump described his attitude to Iran leaders in the following way: “Iran’s leaders sow chaos, death, and destruction. They do not respect their neighbors or borders, or the sovereign rights of nations. Instead, Iran’s leaders plunder the nation’s resources to enrich themselves and to spread mayhem across the Middle East and far beyond”. Trump does not hesitate to use vocabulary usually used in a negative context such as chaos, deaths, destructions, etc.

Public speeches given by Donald Trump contain many rhetoric pauses, words with emphatic stress and they are delivered in a moderate tempo. As a symbol of Republicans, he always wears a red tie when performs in front of people to demonstrate support of the party whose interests he represent.

In the following example, Donald Trump utilizes many rhetoric pauses which highlight the effect produced by parallelism, repetition and contrasting your/their.

“Their victories | have not been your victories. || Their triumphs | have not been your triumphs, | and while they celebrated | in our nation’s capital, | there was little to celebrate | for struggling families | all | across | our | land.” || (2017)

Overall, having analysed the speeches delivered by Donald Trump it can be concluded that Trump uses positive politeness strategies and other manipulative means at all levels of language. Trump associates himself with all Americans and makes listeners believe that he is a very successful president by giving so-called proofs which are actually difficult to verify. By delivering such speeches, Trump creates an image of his country and himself and contrasts it with other countries that, in his view, do not do as well as America. Such an attitude to other countries is demonstrated through negative and derogatory vocabulary used to describe them.

Conclusion

The phenomenon of manipulation is a form of influence used to get the desired things from someone by adopting a false belief. It is a pragmatic aspect that achieves its goals without evident detection of communicative intention: the speaker purposefully chooses such a form of utterance that lacks direct signals of their intention.

In the first part of the paper, manipulation, its kinds and manipulative means have been described. Although manipulation can be regarded from psychological, social and linguistic perspective, in this work it is viewed mainly from the linguistic point of view. It can occur on a small-scale level, as well as on a large-scale one when more than one individual is implicated. The latter one is common for political discourse where politicians try to have an impact on large crowds. An example of such kind of political manipulation can be playing on peoples' emotions by exploiting the belief in so-called "American Dream". Robert Barthes insists that American Dream is a myth fostered by Americans and highlights its connection with cultural codes. The American Dream only appears to be a perfect tool for positive national self-imaging, creating an impression of uniqueness for the citizens by providing images of a better, brighter future. On the one hand, the Dream is perfect for the ability to justify inequalities in society using one of the most powerful tools—hope; however, on the other hand, it still remains only a concept based on a belief strongly associated with American identity.

Various linguists studied the topic of manipulation and offered ways of its interpretation. Robert Noggle suggests treating manipulation as a trickery, because the person manipulated is basically tricked into believing something imposed by the manipulator. He designated the main manipulative techniques: nagging, emotional blackmail, playing on emotions, selective attention. Another way of viewing manipulation is that of a pressure. A manipulator exerts a kind of pressure on the victim often threatening with negative consequences.

Despite the fact that manipulation is frequently associated with immoral behaviour or something, negative designed to harm, there are cases when manipulation

proves to have a positive effect. As Dr. Akopova claims, the salient feature of manipulation are the speakers' intentions. Therefore, if those are benign, manipulation can be implemented in a good sense. Another linguist Teun A. van Dijk explored manipulative discourse and alternation of cognitive processes under the influence of manipulation. He stated that by affecting the short-term memory quick guesses and snap decisions can be made. Alternation of the way we construct mental models in our long-term memory is used to manage the way of thinking and evoke false allusions. Finally, controlling social cognition by generalizing facts and so on is also a case in political discourse.

When regarding manipulation at the pragmatic level, it becomes obvious that it flouts P. Grice's maxims of communication and employs indirect speech acts, euphemisms, conversational and conventional implicatures. Moreover, manipulators often utilize positive politeness strategies described by Brown and Levinson. The main methods are attending to the hearer's interests; exaggerating; using in-group identity markers; seeking agreement, avoiding disagreement, asserting common ground with the hearer, joking; offering/promising; giving reasons; asserting reciprocity.

After investigation manipulation in inauguration and public speeches of Donald Trump and Barack Obama in the second part of the paper, the examples of manipulation have been traced at phonological, lexical, syntactical, semantical and pragmatic level.

Both speeches contain alliteration and anaphora to create a certain rhythm and make speeches easier to remember. Polysyndeton, asyndeton, repetition, epistrophe and parallelism were employed by the speakers with the same purpose of establish a melodic rhythm. Such a tool as gradation used in these speeches helps build up emotional tension and keep the listeners interested. Barack Obama as well as Donald Trump used pronouns 'we' and 'our' as a sign of unitedness with American people. However, in reality this means putting responsibility on shoulders of others instead of answering for the consequences themselves. Prepositions 'we', 'our' and 'your' were often used in the context of promises expressed, however, not directly but with the help of modal verbs 'will' and 'shall'.

While the speech by Barack Obama is rich in emotionally coloured vocabulary and complex sentences, Donald Trump tends to use simple syntactic constructions and

neutral vocabulary to appeal to a larger audience. Still, both speeches are not deprived of such expressive means as conceptual metaphors, antithesis, hyperboles and epithets. The most frequent metaphor used by politicians is a conceptual metaphor of a road/way. It is also worth mentioning that both ex-presidents appealed to the American Dream when promising to “rebuild America” or “make America great again”.

From a phonological perspective, political speeches belong to a publicist functional style that presupposes the use of rhetorical pauses, emphatic stress, complex tones and moderate tempo in order to give the audience time for reflection.

Recognizing kinds of manipulation and understanding the way people politicians employ manipulative techniques help to detect manipulation and realize whether it is deliberate or accidental.

In conclusion, it has been investigated and proved how lexico-semantic means of manipulation are implemented in political speeches. On the basis of theoretical materials and works of other scholars, the examples of manipulative techniques were discovered. The results of the work show that politicians aspire to produce an impact on the listeners/viewers and in order to achieve this, they exploit manipulation. Political speeches are logically structured and well-thought-out so that manipulation remains imperceptible. Yet with the knowledge of the ways in which it can be implemented, it is possible to trace it and eliminate its effect.

Резюме

Темою магістерської роботи було обрано лексико семантичні засоби вираження маніпуляції в англійських політичних промовах. Актуальність цієї теми пояснюється тим, що політичний дискурс має вагомий вплив на людину, і тому важливим є вчасно помітити маніпулятивні стратегії, використані в політичних промовах, аби не підпасти під їхній вплив. Загалом явище маніпуляції це форма впливу, яка використовується для отримання бажаних речей від когось шляхом нав'язування хибних переконань. Це прагматичний аспект, який досягає своєї мети без явного виявлення комунікативного наміру: мовець цілеспрямовано обирає таку форму висловлювання, у якій відсутні прямі сигнали його наміру. Тема маніпуляції викликає великий інтерес для лінгвістів, оскільки маніпулятивний ефект досягається за допомогою природної мови і вивчення цього ефекту дозволяє виявити маніпуляцію та нівелювати її вплив.

Робота складається із плану, вступу, теоретичної та експериментальної частин, висновків, резюме, списку використаних джерел і додаткових матеріалів. Основними матеріалами для дослідження було обрано інавгураційні промови колишніх президентів США Барака Обама та Дональда Трампа. Також для ілюстрації лексико семантичних засобів маніпуляції наведено приклади із виступів Джо Байдена, Хіларі Клінтон, та із політичних статей англійських журналістів.

За основу теоретичної частини роботи було взято праці Р. Ногла, Т. ван Дійка, А. Акопової, Л. де Сосюра, П. Грайса, Брауна та Левінсона, Дж. Остіна та інших лінгвістів, які вивчали тему лінгвістичної маніпуляції та прагматики.

Метою цієї роботи є окреслити поняття маніпуляції, визначити основні стратегії маніпулювання та виявити, як ці стратегії використовуються в англійських політичних промовах для досягнення бажаного ефекту.

Цілі наукової роботи:

- визначити види маніпуляції та маніпулятивні техніки у роботах лінгвістів;

- проаналізувати політичні виступи американських політиків;
- дослідити застосування маніпуляції та лексико семантичних засобів вираження маніпуляції в політичному дискурсі;
- продемонструвати використання маніпулятивних стратегій на різних рівнях мови (фонологічному, лексичному, синтаксичному, прагматичному);
- виявити вплив маніпуляції в промовах на людей

У першій частині наукової роботи було охарактеризовано поняття маніпуляції та сфери її застосування. Було виявлено, що маніпуляцію вивчають не лише з лінгвістичної точки зору, а й також з психологічної та соціологічної перспективи, адже в маніпуляції йдеться про зміну психологічного стану індивіда чи групи індивідів. Опрацювавши роботи та тематику маніпуляції, можна зробити висновок, що кожен з лінгвістів, хто досліджував цю тему, виокремлює різні методи маніпуляції. В межах політичного дискурсу США вагомим елементом стало дослідження міфу «Американської мрії». Роберт Барт наполягає на тому, що «Американська мрія» — це міф, який плекають американці, що підкреслює його зв'язок із культурними кодами. Американська мрія лише здається ідеальним інструментом для позитивного національного самоусвідомлення, створюючи враження унікальності для громадян, надаючи образи кращого, яскравішого майбутнього. Одним із важливих результатів дослідження роботи є виявлення прикладів того, як Американські політики апелюють до цього міфу, аби їхні промови звучали переконливіше.

Маніпуляція була досліджена і з прагматичного боку. Результатом цього стало виявлення стратегій позитивної ввічливості, окреслених у праці Брауна та Левінсона, які націлені на збереження обличчя політичних діячів та встановлення контакту з публікою.

Друга частина наукової роботи зосереджена на підтвердженні теорій, описаних в попередній частині та пошуку конкретних випадків застосування лексико-семантичних засобів маніпуляції, евфемізмів, стратегій позитивної ввічливості та прикладів маніпуляції та різних рівнях мови. Проаналізувавши політичні промови Барака Обами та Дональда Трампа, було виявлено спільні

риси, притаманні публіцистичному стилю мовлення: паралелізм, велика кількість риторичних пауз, посередній темп, наголос на важливих для ораторів елементах. Найяскравішою рисою промов є використання займенників ‘ми’, ‘наш’ та ‘ваш’, які допомагають створити відчуття єдності мовця із публікою. Дональд Трамп часто застосовував цю стратегію разом із тактикою позитивної ввічливості, а саме ідентифікації себе із народом, до якого він звертався, щоб заручитися його підтримкою.

Наступною рисою даних промов є використання концептуальних метафор аби пояснити ідею через конкретних приклад чи образ, який зрозумілий для всіх. Тому Барак Обама та Дональд Трамп часто говорили про «шлях» до кращого майбутнього Америки та про її «відбудову». Використання численних повторів, створення мелодичного ритму за допомогою анафори, алітерації та інших стилістичних засобів допомагають досягти маніпулятивної мети і привернути увагу слухачів/глядачів до тих моментів, які є вигідними для політичних діячів.

Отже, в даній науковій роботі було досліджено та підтверджено застосування лексико-семантичних засобів маніпуляції в політичних промовах. На основі теоретичних матеріалів та праць інших вчених було виявлено приклади маніпулятивних технік. Результати роботи показують, що політики прагнуть вплинути на слухачів/глядачів і для цього вдаються до маніпуляції. Політичні виступи логічно структуровані та ретельно продумані, аби маніпуляція залишалася непомітною. Проте, оскільки маніпулятивні патерни повторюються, результати цієї роботи можуть бути застосовані для виявлення маніпуляції і в інших політичних промовах в майбутньому.

References

1. A.(2022a, January 8). *Alliteration - Examples and Definition of Alliteration*. Literary Devices. <https://literarydevices.net/alliteration/>
2. Akimova, T. (1992). *Imperative Mood in the English Language, Typology of Imperative Constructions*. Saint Petersburg, p. 189.
3. Akopova, A. (2013). LINGUISTIC MANIPULATION: DEFINITION AND TYPES. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*, pp. 1–4. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/4909353.pdf>
4. Allott, N. (2018, January 24). *Conversational Implicature*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics. <https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-205>.
5. *anaphora*. (2022). The Merriam-Webster.Com Dictionary. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/anaphora>
6. Atwood, M. (2021, September 10). *Writing 101: What Is Parallelism?* MasterClass. <https://www.masterclass.com/articles/writing-101-what-is-parallelism#quiz-0>
7. Austin, J.L. (2005) *How to Do Things With Words*. Cambridge (Mass.) X, paperback: Harvard University Press, 2nd edition.
8. Barthes, R., Howard, R., & Lavers, A. (2013). *Mythologies: The Complete Edition, in a New Translation* (Second ed.). Hill and Wang.
9. Beard, A. (2000). *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge, p. 30

10. Benkler, Y., Faris, R., & Roberts, H. (2018). *Network Propaganda: Manipulation, Disinformation, and Radicalization in American Politics*. Oxford University Press.
11. Berger und Luckmann: *Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit*. (2007). SpringerLink, pp. 87-115.
https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-531-90671-3_4?error=cookies_not_supported&code=8446b8d9-7170-4c71-96f6-e597bcaff5a3
12. Billig, M. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: the case of nominalization. *Discourse & Society*, 19(6), 783–800.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508095894>
13. Blair, E. (2021, August 27). *Politics and the English Language*. The Orwell Foundation. <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/politics-and-the-english-language/>
14. Blumenthal-Barby, J.S. (2012). *Between Reason and Coercion: Ethically Permissible Influence in Health Care and Health Policy Contexts*, Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal, 22(4): pp. 345–366.
15. Bradford, R. (1997). *Stylistics*. New York: Routledge.
16. Brown, G. (1990). *Listening to spoken English*. London – New York: Longman, p. 135.
17. Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Gumperz, J. J. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4)* (Reissue ed.). Cambridge University Press.
18. Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing Political Discourse*. London: Routledge.

19. Chomsky, N. (1989). *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies*. Boston MA: South End Press.
20. Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics 6th Edition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
21. Cutting J. (2002) *Pragmatics and Discourse*. A Resource Book for Students / Joan Cutting. – London and New York: Routledge, p. 1–73.
22. de Saussure Louis (2005). *Manipulation and Cognitive Pragmatics: Preliminary Hypotheses*. In de Saussure Louis & Peter Schulz (Eds), *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, Language, Mind*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 113-146.
23. Duez, D. (1997). *Acoustic markers of political power*. In *Journal of psycholinguistic research*, 26 (6), pp. 641-654.
24. Goffman, E., & Ritual, I. (1967). *Essays on face-to-face behavior*. *Interaction Ritual*, 45, 18.
25. Goldstein, L., & Fowler, C. A. (2003). *Articulatory Phonology: A phonology for public language use*. *Phonetics and Phonology in Language Comprehension and Production*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110895094.159>
26. Grice, H. P. (1975) *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds) *Studies in Syntax and Semantics III: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 98-183.
27. Hall, L. (2016, October 3). *Donald Trump's American Dream: The Irony of How Trump Uses Identity Politics to Garner Votes in Rural White America*. *The Bull & Bear*. <https://bullandbearmcgill.com/donald-trumps-american-dream-irony-trump-uses-identity-politics-garner-votes-rural-white-america/>
28. Harris, R. (2017). *Writing with Clarity and Style: A Guide to Rhetorical Devices for Contemporary Writers* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

- 29.Hochschild, J. (1995). *Facing Up to the American Dream : Race, Class, and the Soul of the Nation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP. pp. 16-25. Print.
- 30.Hudson, G. (2000). *Essentials of Introductory Linguistics*. USA: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 92-93.
- 31.Jaszczolt, K. M., & Saussure, L. D. (2013). *Time: Language, Cognition & Reality (Oxford Studies of Time in Language and Thought)* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.
- 32.Johnson, M. (2022, May 24). *Influencers are the New American Dream*. Pop Neuro. <https://www.popneuro.com/neuromarketing-blog/influence-authority-psychology-american-dream-economy-marketing-social-media>
- 33.Kovecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 34.Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By* (1st ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- 35.Leontyev, A. (1981). *Problems of the development of the mind*. Moscow, Russia: Progress, p. 273.
- 36.manipulation. (2022). In *APA Dictionary of Pshychology*. <https://dictionary.apa.org/manipulation>
- 37.manipulation. (2022). In *Collins Dictionary*. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/manipulate>
- 38.Mark V. Redmond (2015). *Face and Politeness Theories*. Iowa State University.
- 39.Mills, C. (1995). *Politics and Manipulation, Social Theory and Practice*, 21(1): pp. 97–112. doi:10.5840/soctheorpract199521120
- 40.Neisser, U. and Fivush, R. (1994) *The Remembering Self: Construction and Accuracy in the Self-Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

41. Noggle, R. (2018). The Ethics of Manipulation. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-manipulation/>
42. Noggle, R. (2020). PRESSURE, TRICKERY, AND A UNIFIED ACCOUNT OF MANIPULATION. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 57(3), pp. 241–252. <https://doi.org/10.2307/48574436>
43. Oliveira, M. (2002). The Role of Pause Occurrence and Pause Duration in the Signaling of Narrative Structure. *Advances in Natural Language Processing*, 43–51. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45433-0_7
44. Pearson, R. (1970) *Gatsby: False Prophet of the American Dream*. *English Journal*, pp. 638-645. Print.
45. Phillips, M.J. (1997). *Ethics and Manipulation in Advertising: Answering a Flawed Indictment*. Westport, CT: Quorum.
46. *Politeness Theory*. (2019). StudySmarter US. <https://www.studysmarter.us/explanations/english/pragmatics/politeness-theory/>
47. Raz, J.(1988). *The Morality of Freedom*, p. 377. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/0198248075.001.0001
48. Reva, I. A. (2021). USE OF PHONETIC LAWS OF SPEECH IN BILATERAL CONSECUTIVE INTERPRETATION. *INNOVATIVE PATHWAY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES IN UKRAINE AND EU COUNTRIES*, 232–247. <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-031-5-36>
49. Riker, W. H. (1986). *The art of political manipulation*. Yale University Press.

50. Roach, P. (2001) *Phonetics: An Introduction to Language Study*. Oxford University Press, paperback ISBN 0-19-437239-1, pp. 55, 88, GBP 7.90, Oxford Introductions to Language Study.
51. Saussure, F. D. (1916). *Course in General Linguistics (Classic Reprint)*. Forgotten Books.
52. Schiller, H., I. (1971). *Mass Communications and American Empire* (1st ed.) pp. 20–25. Beacon Press.
53. Searle, J. (1991) *Indirect speech acts*. In *Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts*, ed. P. Cole & J. L. Morgan, pp. 59–82. New York: Academic Press. (1975). Reprinted in *Pragmatics: A Reader*, ed. S. Davis, pp. 265–277. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
54. Strangert, E. (2006). The prosody of public speech – a description of a project. In *Working papers*, 52, pp. 121–124.
55. Susser, D., Roessler, B., & Nissenbaum, H. (2019). *Technology, autonomy, and manipulation* [<https://policyreview.info/articles/analysis/technology-autonomy-andmanipulation>]. *Internet Policy Review*, 8(2), pp. 1–22.
56. van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
57. Van Dijk, T.A. (1998) *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
58. Wilke, J. (ed) 1998. *Propaganda in the 20th Century. Contributions to its History*. Cresskill: Hampton Press.
59. will. (2022). The Merriam-Webster.Com Dictionary. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/will>
60. Wodak, R. and Van Dijk, T.A. (eds) (2000) *Racism at the Top: Parliamentary Discourses on Ethnic Issues in Six European States*. Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag.

61. Корнійчук Ю. (2009) *Маніпулятивний вплив у політичному англомовному дискурсі. Студентські наукові записки. Серія «Філологічна».* № 2. С. 83–87.
62. Кочкін М. (2002) *О манипуляции в современном политическом дискурсе. Межвузовский сборник научных трудов.* № 3. С. 18—22. URL: [www. tpl1999.narod.ru/webstudl/sborniks](http://www.tpl1999.narod.ru/webstudl/sborniks).
63. Шкіцька І. (2012) *Маніпулятивні тактики позитиву: лінгвістичний аспект:* монографія. Київ. С 440.

List of Illustrations

1. A Corpus-based Study on the Usage of Passive Voice in English Political Speeches on the Guidance of Text Typology. (2022). *The Frontiers of Society, Science and Technology*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.25236/fsst.2022.040113>
2. *Analysis: A propaganda war needs angry, defiant, disgusted, nerve-wracked people - and the Czech Republic qualifies - Romea.cz.* (2018). Romea.Cz. <http://www.romea.cz/en/news/czech/analysis-a-propaganda-war-needs-angry-defiant-disgusted-nerve-wracked-people-and-the-czech-republic-qualifies>
3. CBS News. (2015, August 7). *GOP debate 2015: Transcript of the prime-time debate.* <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/transcript-of-the-2015-gop-debate-9-pm/>
4. Cillizza, C. (2020, September 8). *Why Donald Trump's dishonesty might actually matter in 2020.* CNN. <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/09/08/politics/trump-honesty-polls/index.html>
5. ESD Editorial Team. (2020, July 1). *Does a French Exception Still Exist? European Security & Defence.* <https://euro-sd.com/2020/07/articles/17927/does-a-french-exception-still-exist/>
6. *France and NATO - 1949.* (n.d.). NATO. Retrieved November 3, 2022, from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/declassified_160672.htm
7. *Full text: 2017 Donald Trump inauguration speech transcript.* (2017, January 20). POLITICO. <https://www.politico.com/story/2017/01/full-text-donald-trump-inauguration-speech-transcript-233907>
8. *Full transcript: First 2016 presidential debate.* (2016, September 27). POLITICO. <https://www.politico.com/story/2016/09/full-transcript-first-2016-presidential-debate-228761>
9. Hanna, J. & Setty, G. (2020, September 20). *Shooting at a backyard party in Rochester leaves 2 dead and 14 wounded.* CNN. <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/09/19/us/rochester-shooting-saturday/index.html>
10. Henderson, T. (2022, September 21). *The US Has Reversed Pandemic Job Losses. Most Individual States Haven't.* The Pew Charitable Trusts.

<https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2022/09/21/the-us-has-reversed-pandemic-job-losses-most-individual-states-havent>

11. Hitchcock, W (1997). France, the Western Alliance, and the Origins of the Schuman Plan, 1948–1950. *Diplomatic History*, 21(4), 603–630. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24913338>
12. Huizenga, T. (2011, February 24). *Sing Out Mr. President: Bill Clinton's Proverb Of Wrong And Right*. NPR.org. <https://www.npr.org/sections/deceptivecadence/2011/02/28/133973258/sing-out-mr-president-bill-clintons-proverb-of-wrong-and-right>
13. *Inaugural Address | JFK Library*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 3, 2022, from <https://www.jfklibrary.org/learn/about-jfk/historic-speeches/inaugural-address>
14. *Inaugural Address by President Barack Obama*. (2013, January 21). whitehouse.gov. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/01/21/inaugural-address-president-barack-obama>
15. *Inaugural Address*. (2003, March 14). <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/inaugural-address.html>
16. Kyle Griffin *on*. (2020, September 20). Twitter. <https://twitter.com/kylegriffin1/status/1307753905154134016>
17. *Martin Luther King I Have a Dream Speech - American Rhetoric*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 3, 2022, from <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mlkihaveadream.htm>
18. *nytimes.com*. (2020, 20. September). <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/20/us/politics/biden-supreme-court-senators.html>
19. *Oprah Winfrey On Empowering Yourself*. (2019, September 20). Goalcast. <https://www.goalcast.com/oprah-winfrey-on-empowering-yourself/>
20. *President Barack Obama's Inaugural Address*. (2015, August 13). whitehouse.gov.

<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2009/01/21/president-Barack-obamas-inaugural-address>

21. *President Barack Obama's Inaugural Address*. (n.d.). The White House. Retrieved November 3, 2022, from https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/realitycheck/the_press_office/President_Barack_Obamas_Inaugural_Address
22. *Transcript: Hillary Clinton's DNC speech - CNNPolitics*. (2020, August 20). CNN. <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/08/19/politics/hillary-clinton-speech-transcript/index.html>

Appendix 1



Appendix 2

Daily Mail
Daily newspaper of the year 2021

LET'S SPRING CLEAN BRITAIN!
JOIN THE MAIL'S GREAT TIDY-UP TODAY

PM warning on June 21 freedom ++ Hancock fears over India variant ++ But as it emerges most hotspot hospital Covid cases AREN'T fully jabbed, Mail joins MPs and business to demand:

DON'T STEAL OUR SUMMER

By John Stevens and Tom Wiltshire

BOBEN Johnson was warned last night not to 'steal our summer' after he admitted he might ditch the exit of lockdown.

With some ministers signalling the plan over the state of the Indian variant, business leaders, including John Gummer, have said the Prime Minister is acting in the Covid emergency.

They warned that stepping far back along the road to June 21 would be devastating for the economy, just as ministers are urged to take a more cautious approach to when to lift the longer than expected.

Mr Johnson's announcement to return on




Kate keeps her vow to cancer girl who stole our hearts

Cillian Murphy
From Peaky to the apocalypse

Go with the flow
Enya's top ten songs

The Guardian
For 200 years

Friday 25 May 2021
11.57
From £3.75 (inc. delivery)

Pressure on Hancock over failure to protect care home residents

Health secretary rejects Cummings claim that he lied about Covid testing

Adrian Higgins
Political commentator

Mr Hancock has a very serious problem but might be expected to continue to do his job as the Prime Minister's health secretary.

There was a very serious problem in the UK in April, and it was not until June 21st that the situation changed for the better.

Mr Hancock's failure to protect care home residents is a serious failure of leadership.

There was a very serious problem in the UK in April, and it was not until June 21st that the situation changed for the better.

Mr Hancock's failure to protect care home residents is a serious failure of leadership.

The reality is... that they didn't prioritise older people

John Hall
Member of the House of Commons

Members of the House of Commons have said that the number of patients with Covid-19 in care homes is a serious failure of leadership.

Members of the House of Commons have said that the number of patients with Covid-19 in care homes is a serious failure of leadership.

China fury at broader US inquiry into Covid

Richard Wilson
Editorial writer

The US House of Representatives has launched a broad inquiry into the origins of the Covid-19 pandemic, with the aim of determining whether the virus was spread from a laboratory in Wuhan, China.

The inquiry is a serious failure of leadership.

£1bn: cost of repairing schools in England

Richard Wilson
Editorial writer

The Department for Education has announced a £1 billion programme to repair schools in England.

The programme is a serious failure of leadership.



Clever as Einstein