

**Ministry Of Education and Science Of Ukraine
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Institute of philology
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication**

MANIPULATION IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Master's thesis

Written by the student of the 2nd year
of study of the Master's program
“English Communication Studies
and Translation and Two Western European Languages
Field of science: 03 “Humanities”
Specialty 035 Philology

Anna Tatarina

Supervised by:

ANNA A. STOLIAROVA

Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології
та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 8 від 12.05.2020

Завідувач кафедри _____ д.філол.н., проф. Бєлова А.Д.

KYIV 2020

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL BASIS AND MAIN ASPECTS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	7
1.1 The status of discourse in the English language	7
1.1.1 The concept of discourse in linguistics, its definition and theoretical foundations.....	8
1.1.2 Typology of discourse.....	12
1.2 Political discourse and its manipulative intent.....	17
1.2.1 The interpretation of political discourse in linguistic sources	17
1.2.2 Impact of the political discourse on public opinion.....	20
Conclusions to Chapter one.....	26
CHAPTER TWO. MANIPULATION AS A FUNDAMENTAL TOOL OF POLITICAL POWER.....	29
2.1 Manipulation of public opinion.....	29
2.1.1 Essence and general characteristics of the concept of “manipulation”.....	30
2.1.2 Approaches to the classification of different types of manipulation.....	35
2.2 Manipulation as a form of speech exposure.....	39
2.2.1 Survey of general receptions of a political manipulation	40
2.2.2 General signs of manipulative influence.....	46
2.2.3 Verbal countermanipulation as the response action to manipulation.....	51
Conclusions to Chapter two.....	54
CHAPTER THREE. MANIPULATION AS PART OF POWER TECHNOLOGY.....	57
3.1 Analysis of manipulation at different levels of language.....	57
3.1.1 Manipulation on the morphological level.....	58
3.1.2 Manipulation on the lexical level.....	62
3.1.3 Manipulation on the syntactical level.....	67

3.1.4 Manipulation on the supersyntactic level.....	74
Conclusions to Chapter three.....	80
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	82
SUMMARY.....	85
LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS	89

INTRODUCTION

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

Speech influence, which is the communicative and psychological essence of manipulation, is aimed at changes in the social and psychological structure of society or stimulation of direct social actions through the impact on the psyche of members of a particular social group or society as a whole.

The interest of linguists in the phenomenon of manipulation is due to the fact that manipulative influence is exercised through natural language. However, linguistic publications that touch on this phenomenon are not complex in nature and focus only on certain aspects of manipulation.

Currently, we can see how some countries use language resources for manipulation, such as an arsenal of information warfare, fact manipulation, fake news, escalation of the situation.

Since ancient times, people have understood the importance of words, and skillful speakers have reached unprecedented heights in society. Modern politicians also often employ a variety of manipulation strategies and tactics. This is especially noticeable during election campaigns, because every politician must not only stand out from the others, he must inspire voter confidence, have a good reputation and become a community leader.

The thesis is focused on analyzing of manipulation in political discourse, classification and analysis of manipulation at different levels of language, its theoretical and practical backgrounds and functions in political discourse.

There is no comprehensive study of the manipulation in political discourse, which would include both a theoretical and practical aspects of the studying in modern linguistics. Thus, it is not the easy task to identify the ways of lexical expressions of a particular question.

Topicality of the research. The relevance of the study lies in the fact that it considers the questions of manipulation in political discourse in the framework of the actively developing theory of neology and linguistic.

The object of this research is manipulation in modern political discourse.

The subject of this research is the main features of manipulation in modern political discourse.

The aim of our research is to identify and describe the most frequent features of manipulation in political discourse.

Based on the aim of our research, there are such **objectives as**:

- to describe the concept of discourse in linguistics, its definition and theoretical foundations;
- to analyze political discourse as a communicative phenomenon with manipulative potential;
- to study impact of the political discourse on public opinion;
- to find out essence and general characteristics of the concept of manipulation;
- to study approaches to the classification of different types of manipulation;
- to make an appropriate selection of language units;
- to show analysis of manipulation at different levels of language;
- to explore manipulation as a fundamental tool of political power.

In this paper we used such **methods** of linguistic analysis as method of comparative analysis, method of continuous sampling and bibliographical method.

Our research based on the material of Bernie Sanders', Joe Biden's, Elizabeth Warren's, D. Trump's, Hillary Clinton's, Barack Obama's, Kamala Harris' and Pete Buttigieg's political speeches. They are selected from the magazines, articles, newspapers, video and television, approximately 80 units were analysed in the paper.

Theoretical value of this study is that it makes a certain contribution to the theory of linguistic in the English language at this stage of its development.

Practical value. Materials of thesis can be used in courses of philology and many subjects that close to linguistics. Of course, these materials can be used for future more intensive research.

In the search, study and preparatory stages, the aim was to select theoretical literature for analysis, and the main methods were the method of purposeful selection, generalization and systematization of theoretical material. Scientific sources were deliberately selected, which contained information on political discourse in general, language strategies and manipulation tactics.

At the analytical stage, various methods were widely used. The classification method helped to organize the material in solving each of the tasks. The pragmatic analysis was aimed at determining the pragmatic potential of the original text, its pragmatic adaptation in translation and the influence of linguistic means on the recipients.

The research work consists of the introduction, three chapters, the conclusions, the summary, the list of reference materials and the list of illustration materials

In the Introduction, an explanation of the topic selection is given, its relevance is stated, the main purpose is determined and the practical tasks of the dissertation are given.

Chapter One contains the theoretical basis and general notions of the work.

Chapter Two contains the analysis of the manipulation as a fundamental tool of political power. In this chapter the analysis of concept has been shown.

Chapter Three contains the analysis of the manipulation as a part of power technology. In this chapter the analysis of concept has been shown.

In conclusion the achieved results were generalized.

1. THEORETICAL BASIS AND MAIN ASPECTS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE

1.1 The status of discourse in the English language

At the present stage of the development of scientific thought, discourse is studied in detail by a number of humanities: linguistics, philosophy, psychology, literary criticism, political science, ethnography, communication theory and others. But it should be emphasized that every science and scientific direction approaches the study of discourse, depending on the specifics of the subject. However, discourse is a rather complex and ambivalent phenomenon, due to which this term does not lend itself to an unambiguous interpretation

The word “discourse” derives from the Latin word “discourses” that means “thinking, speech”. “Discursive” means “that is performed through logical conclusions” [Білодід 1970, p. 284]. For the first time as a linguistic term, this notion was used in 1950-s after an American linguist Z. Harris has published his famous article “Discourse Analysis” [Шейгал 1999, p. 42]. The notion of discourse establishes associations with all expressions of communication in a society, expression of rules and norms of communication, methods of the embodiment of a speaker’s pragmatic goal. Discourse is a display of cultural communication; it embodies the pragmatic aims of the speakers and is formed under the influence of cognitive, linguistic, social and cultural factors [Бобровская 2011, p. 1].

From the point of view of linguistics, discourse refers to a unit of language longer than a single sentence. The word “discourse” comes from the Latin prefix dis- meaning “away” and the root word “currere” meaning “to run”. Discourse, therefore, is translated as “run away” and concerns the way that conversations flow. To study discourse is to analyze the use of spoken or written language in a social context.

Discourse deals with the form and function of language in conversation beyond its small grammatical units such as phonemes and morphemes. This field of study, to which Dutch linguist Teun van Dijk made a significant contribution, surveys how larger units

of language – including lexemes, syntax, and context – contribute meaning to conversations.

1.1.1 The concept of “discourse” in linguistics, its definition and theoretical foundations

Many terms that are used in the research field are characterized in multifaceted and contradictory way. The question of the dynamism of the term “discourse” in terms of its semantic variation is quite logical and justified, since in recent decades it has been widely used in the linguistic field. Perhaps this was facilitated by the fact that there is still no clear and universally accepted definition of this concept, which would describe all its versatility and cover all possible cases of use.

Depending on the subject of the study, scientists adhere to different approaches to the interpretation of such an ambiguous concept as discourse. Let’s pay attention to some of these interpretations.

“Discourse in context may consist of only one or two words as in *stop* or *no smoking*. Alternatively, a piece of discourse can be hundreds of thousands of words in length, as some novels are. A typical piece of discourse is somewhere between these two extremes” [Hinkel and Fotos 2001, p. 240].

“Discourse is the way in which language is used socially to convey broad historical meanings. It is language identified by the social conditions of its use, by who is using it and under what conditions. Language can never be 'neutral' because it bridges our personal and social worlds” [Henry and Tator 2002, p. 12].

Although T.A van Dijk proposes to study discourse from ancient treatises on ethics and rhetoric, M.L. Makarov [Макаров 1998, p. 72] believes that the modern study of discourse began in the 1960s. The beginning of discourse theory lies in the writings of Russian formalists (studies of the morphology of the Russian folklorist V. Propp), in studies of the German linguistic school by P. Hartman and P. Wunderlich, in the functional structuralism of Fers, in the sociolinguistic analysis of communication by the American linguistic scholar Sachs, anthropological studies of J. Gumperz, in the logical

and semiotic description of different types of texts and modeling the generation of French post-structuralists, in the sociology of the language of Erwin Hoffman, in philosophy, cognitive psychology, psycholinguistics.

For the first time, the term “discourse analysis” was presented by American linguist Sellig Harris. He used this term as a method of analyzing connected speech, using the distributive method. Later, this term was associated with the German term “Textlinguistik” and also with the term “linguística del texto” by E. Cozeriou [Косериу 1997, p. 46], i.e. the terms ‘text’ and ‘discourse’ were identified. The delineation of these terms begins in the late 70's - early 80's of the twentieth century [Степанов 1998, p. 670]. The text was equated with a formal construction, and the discourse acted as an update of this construction in connection with extralinguistic discourse factors [Dijk 2008, p. 154]. Discourse at this time was analyzed using only experimental and descriptive methods.

Sarah Mills [Mills 1997, p. 1] states that the term “discourse” has far more interpretations than all other terms in literary criticism and cultural theory. In French linguistics, the term “discourse” had the meaning “speech, text”.

The theory of discourse follows from the concept of E. Benvenist. He was one of the first who gave the word “discourse” a terminological meaning, defining it as “speech assigned to the speaker,” while in the French linguistic tradition the term “discourse” denoted speech in general. He contrasted discourse with objective narrative (récit).

A well-known discourse researcher T. van Dijk [Dijk 2008, p. 100] states that the term “discourse” can be used in the following terms:

- discourse in the broad sense can be written, spoken, as well as having a verbal and non-verbal component;
- the researcher defines discourse in the narrow sense as a verbal written or spoken product of communicative action;
- discourse as a particular conversation is always linked to specific conditions and context;
- discourse as a type of conversation is related to the types of verbal production, not to specific communicative actions;
- discourse as a genre, namely, scientific discourse, political discourse, etc.;

- discourse as a generalized representation of a particular historical period, culture, community.

The linguistic-communicative aspect of discourse can be traced in the definition of G.A. Orlov, who considers discourse as a category (natural) speech materialized in the form of an oral or written speech, relatively complete in sense and structural terms, the length of which is potentially variable: from the syntagmatic chain over a separate statements (suggestions) to a meaningfully whole work (story, conversation, description, instruction, lecture, etc.) [Орлов 1991, p. 14]. The concept of “discourse” is characterized by the parameters of completeness, integrity, connectedness and by others.

The distinguished approaches are somewhat controversial. The concept of “discourse” is understood inextricably linked with the concepts of speech and text. Discourse as a communicative phenomenon is an intermediate link between speech as verbal communication, as an activity, on the one hand, and a specific text recorded during communication, on the other. In a simpler contrast discourse should be understood as a cognitive process associated with real speech production, with knowledge of the speech product, and the text as the final outcome of the process of speech activity, resulting in a certain finished form. Such a contrast between real speaking and its result leads to the realization that the text can be interpreted as a discourse. Only when it is really perceived and falls into the current consciousness the perceiving individual. G. Widousen made an attempt to differentiate the concepts of “text” and “discourse” by including the category “situation” in this pair. So, the discourse is considered by him as “text” + “situation”.

The concept of “discourse” was introduced due to the need in science that has to take into account not only the characteristics of the “text as such”, based on its internal specificity but also the text as a “message” addressed to someone and expressing some needs of the addressee and the author.

Deborah Schiffrin [Schiffrin 1994, p. 22] proposes three approaches to defining the term “discourse”. The first one is based on positions of formally and structurally oriented linguistics. Using this approach, discourse can be defined as a language that is higher than sentence and phrase: “language above the sentence” [Schiffrin, p. 30].

B.Z. Demyankov, based on new works on foreign linguistics, gave a definition of discourse that deepens the previous definitions: “Discourse – an arbitrary piece of text consisting of more than one offer or independent part of the offer. Often, but not always, it concentrates around some supporting concept; creates a common context describing the characters, objects, circumstances, times, actions etc., determined not so much by the sequence of sentences as by the world that creates the discourse and its interpreter, which is “built” in the course of the development of the discourse.

The original structure for the discourse has the form of a sequence of elementary propositions connected among themselves by logical relations of conjunction, disjunction, etc. Elements of discourse are stated events, their participants, performative information and “non-events”, that is, a) the circumstances surrounding the events; b) background explaining events; c) assessment of the participants in the event; d) information relating to discourse with events” [Demyankov 1995, p. 7]. The core of this definition can be considered the provision that discourse is not defined as a quantity adequate to the text, or even, as it is clear from the above definitions, synonymous with it.

As you can see, the definition of the term “discourse” gradually expanded and began to include in addition to listing the main parameters of the text an indication on the terms in which this text is updated. It is appropriate to mention that there are definitions of discourse proposed by V.V. Petrov and Y.N. Karaulov. These definitions accumulate views on the “discourse” of a Dutch scientist T.A. Van Dijk, who has priority in modern linguistics in the description of the discourse: “...discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon, including, in addition to text, extralinguistic factors (knowledge about world, settings, goals of the addressee), necessary for understanding the text” [Van Dijk 2006 p. 361].

It should be noted that this concise definition was the starting point for many linguistic studies of the text of modern period.

To put it another way, the bottom line is that the term ‘discourse’ is quite vague and ambiguous and there is no single universally accepted definition of it. Moreover, the

spectrum of its interpretations is expanding every day. Taking this into account, we can attribute this concept to linguistic universals. The prospect of further exploration in this direction is the study of the relations of discourse with the basic linguistic concepts of “text” and “speech”.

In our work we adhere to the definition of the discourse of N. D. Arutynova, according to which “discourse is a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic – pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors; this is an event-based text; it is a speech that is seen as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes). Discourse is an “immersed in life” speech, where discourse itself is intertwined with interpersonal communication”. [Arutynova 1999, p. 43] In such an interpretation, the discourse appears as an expanded understanding of the text, as a text immersed in a specific communicative situation with knowledge about the participants in the communication and the conditions of the situation.

1.1.2 Typology of discourse

There is no doubt that defining the term discourse is not an easy task. But it’s even harder to imagine its typology.

A type of discourse might be characterized as a class of either written or spoken text, which is frequently casually specified, recognition of which aids its perception, and consequently production of potential response [Cook 1990, p.156].

One of the typologies, according to which the three types of discourse are distinguished, is based on the aspects of language that are highlighted in the text. In correspondance with this typology, the informative type of discourse is one in which the connection with the context prevails and it carries some knowledge. When a symptom aspect is emphasized, the fulfilled function is expression. Consequently, the discourse type is narrative. Not less important in this division is argumentative discourse which is characterized by the accent on the signal aspect.

Such a typology was harshly criticized, because it concerned written communication products more than oral ones, and thanks to such close attention to this issue, it was found that more functions are performed. Consequently, such a typology cannot be considered exhaustive, since there are more types of discourse. In this regard, the issue of classification was given more attention and meticulous work, as a result of which more detailed classifications of spoken texts were developed.

According to Steger's typology, who worked in the field of analysis of oral communication products, there are six types of discourse: presentation, message, report, public debate, conversation and interview. The criteria of this division include such factors as presence, or absence of interaction, number of speakers and their relation to each other (their rights, or as Steger names it 'rank'), flexibility of topic along with selection and attitude of interlocutors towards the subject matter.

Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that oral discourse can alter its type. For instance, during the presentation of the lecture students start asking questions, then the type changes to an interview or even a conversation. Taking into account this classification, it is possible to anticipate the role of partakers as well as goals of particular acts of communication.

Today, attempts are still being made to classify discourse, because the aforementioned typologies do not cover all possible types. Moreover, more and more attention is paid to the similarities and differences between written and oral communication [Renkema 2004, p. 322].

Contrasting speech and writing, we see that there are some apparent discrepancies between them, for example, the fact that written communication includes some medium that records the transmitted message, while speech involves only air. However, there are other divergences that are less evident.

Speech develops in time in that the speaker says with speed that is suitable for *him*, even if it may not be appropriate for the listener and though a request for repetition is possible, it is difficult to imagine a conversation in which every sentence is to be rephrased.

What is more, since talking might be spontaneous and extemporaneous, it can also be accompanied by errors, repetitions, and not entirely coherent sentences where even grunts, stutters or pauses might be meaningful. As a rule, the speaker is familiar with the audience, or at least aware of the fact that they are listening, which makes it possible for him to adjust the register.

Since interlocutors interact most often face-to-face (unless using a phone), they use such extralinguistic signals as grimaces, gesticulation, expressions such as 'here', 'now', or 'this'. Oral discourse is also characterized by the use of nonsense vocabulary, slang and contracted forms (we're, you've). Among other significant features of speech there are rhythm, intonation, speed of uttering and, what is more important, inability to conceal mistakes made while speaking [Gee 1999, p. 20].

In contrast, writing develops in space in that it needs a means to carry the information. The writer cannot predict who will read his text, so it is impossible for him to adapt to the specific expectations of readers. A distinctive feature of writing is consistency, since the syntax can be quite complex. This is because the author can review and correct the content of his work for an almost unlimited time. Accurate organization of messages, paragraphing, and layout play a very important role in facilitating reading and understanding of the material, because the reader may not immediately respond to the text and ask for clarification. Moreover, referring to the fact that readers can familiarize themselves with the text at different times and in different places, the use of ambiguous expressions like “now” and “here” is reduced to zero, since the context is absent [McCarthy 1991, p. 65].

Needless to say that this differentiation is quite uncomplicated and straightforward, but it is worth noting that writing and talking can also be combined. An example is the situation when a teacher prepares for a lecture, making written notes to be read out in front of students, or explains material based on what is written on the board. What is more, some of the abovementioned features may not stand out so clearly in formal, sophisticated speech or friendly correspondence.

Since the concept of discourse is very controversial today, it is a matter of debate. Anyway, there is a wide range of permanent associations that arise when we want to explain this process:

- 1) all methods of communication in society (communicative, verbal, non-verbal, silence, etc.);
- 2) communication within certain channels (normal, sound, tactile);
- 3) rules of communication, types of presentation and implementation of the speaker's pragmatic goals (etiquette, didactic, normative, etc.);
- 4) transfer of different types of information in communication: rational (objective, subjective, true, false), spiritual (ceremonial, religious, philosophical, methodological);
- 5) subject of various scientific researches (sociological, political science, philological);
- 6) manifestation of cultural communication (cultural, modernist, postmodern);
- 7) ethno-cultural features of communication (intercultural, ethno-cultural);
- 8) cultural and historical features of communication (discourse of the Middle Ages, classical, modern, etc.);
- 9) taking into account the age, gender characteristics of the speakers and their social status (political, youthful, feminist);
- 10) by types and forms of speech, principles of constructing a message, its rhetoric (monologic, dialogical, narrative, rhetorical, ironic, etc.);
- 11) characteristics of an individual or group of individuals (individual, unique, authoritative, etc.);
- 12) any unit beyond the mere phrase, in the broad sense of the word, studying the grammar of texts.

There are various approaches to classifying discourse based on different criteria. Some scholars tend to distinguish between oral and written discourse. This kind of distinction is associated with the method of communicative transaction: the acoustic channel – the oral discourse, the visual channel – the written discourse [Chafe 1982, p. 33].

O. Pocheptsov [Почепцов 1974, p. 55] identified a variety of types of discourse: television and radio discourse, newspaper, cinema discourse, political, informal, false, offensive, folk, theatrical, literary (poetic), entertaining, totalitarian, religious, ritual ceremonial and mythological.

E. Cook [Cook 1994, p. 10] suggested to divide the discourse into three main types: enhancement of the scheme, its preservation and reproduction. The schema theory leads us to the problem of communication, in other words how texts form a unity of meaning for their recipients. In this complicated theory we are dealing with artificial intelligence (AI). AI is working on the understanding of texts and is what inspired the creation of schema theory, but, in addition, the discourse of analysis and theory of interpretation was elaborated.

R. Wodak determines four types of context:

- Inter- texts and inter-discourses relations between speeches, texts, genre and discourses;
- Extra-linguistic, social/sociological types;
- History and archaeology of texts and organizations;
- In one form or another

Regarding the above-mentioned types, R. Wodak suggests: "...in so doing, we can study how discourses, genres and texts change depending on the social-political context..." [Wodak 2009, p. 345].

The lack of consensus among linguists on the definition of discourse raises the problem of creating a typology. The selection of a particular principle of discourse classification depends on its relevance to the modern linguistic paradigm and direction of research. Formal, functional, meaningful criteria can be the basis for distinguishing relevant types of discourse. The appearance of new types and subtypes leads to updating of the classification.

In our opinion, all typologies are very good, but the typology presented by O. Pocheptsov is more appropriate for our master's thesis.

1.2 Political discourse and its manipulative intent

In modern linguistics, there is no single approach to defining the strategies and tactics of language manipulation. Consider the main ones. Some scholars do not differentiate between the terms “strategy” and “tactics” and use them as identical. We support this view, which is why the article focuses on the analysis of the manipulative strategies.

1.2.1 The interpretation of political discourse in linguistic sources

Discourse from the standpoint of sociolinguistics is a communication of people, which is considered from their belonging to a certain social group or a certain typical speech behavioral situations, for example, political discourse.

Over the last decades many researchers have been studying political discourse since this notion is regarded as the type of discourse which affects society to a greater extent.

As it was mentioned before, discourse in general and political discourse in particular are studied in detail by a number of humanities, and these notions may be characterized in multifaceted and contradictory way.

In this paper, we assume that there are at least three perspectives that are worth discussing. First, political discourse can be viewed in terms of physiology as any other text, but in this case the academic would also take into account context and ideologies. Another important approach to political discourse is sociopsychology, when researchers seek to evaluate the effectiveness of discourse and the degree to which it achieves its goals. And the last point of view is to analyze the personal justification or intentions and / or addressee in a particular context. The foregoing suggests that the study of political discourse is indeed interconnected with a number of fields of inquiry and is aimed at analyzing the forms, intentions and content of discourse used in a particular context [Bell 1997, p. 46].

Political discourse is considered specific because it has a number of peculiar features or characteristics. Politicians use specific terms and concepts in their speech, which means that their vocabulary is professional, but at the same time common words and phrases, when used in a political context, may have a different meaning than their usual one. The structure of political discourse is also peculiar in that it consists of specific speech strategies specific to political discourse.

Political discourse has as its main goal to make recipients believe in the necessity of politically correct actions or evaluations. So, it is not to describe but to persuade, so that the recipient would have some intentions, beliefs and need for certain actions. When it comes to discussing the effectiveness of political discourse, the researchers would analyze it in accordance with the main aim of political discourse. From this we can conclude that the key role in the effectiveness of discourse belongs to the ability to convince.

As Rathmayr put it, politicians in their speech operate with certain symbols, it is successful depending on the extent to which these symbols correlate with public consciousness. A politician should be capable of finding the best way to address his audience taking into consideration their opinions, beliefs and so on [Rathmayr 1995, p. 211].

The analysis of the political text, as well as the study of its elements, involves the study of the level of influence on the political text, its perception by the addressee of various linguistic, social, cultural, economic, political, national and other factors affecting understanding of discourse.

Political discourse is a multicomponent phenomenon that can be seen as a system of interrelated features, functional features and specifics of their implementation. It is characterized by the presence of a broad toolkit of functions and genre incarnation through which the main purpose is achieved – to obtain political power and to exercise political interests by the participants of the political process.

Discourse also has several features, the research and definition of which studies of foreign and Russian scientists are devoted.

R. Wodak states that the complex relationship between society and discourse cannot be adequately described without a combination of sociological and linguistic approaches [Wodak 2009, p. 181].

According to A. N. Baranov, “political discourse includes all speech acts of political discussions and the rules of public politics, having specific conventions”. [Баранов 1990, p. 140]. Provided that political communication is well supported, it is easier to reach shared opinion and universal acceptance. That is why so much attention is focused on political discourse.

Political discourse must be considered from at least 3 perspectives [Басирова 2012, p. 116]:

- an individually hermeneutic position, allowing to establish personal meanings of the interpreter and/or author of the political discourse in specific circumstances;
- sociopsycholinguistic position used to assess the effectiveness of achieving the political goals of the speaker;
- a purely physiological position considering political discourse, like any other text, but using a political and ideological background.

This approach explains why political discourse analysis is at the intersection of different disciplines. It requires content analysis, tasks and forms of discourse, which are realized in certain situations of the political sphere.

The most relevant approach to analyzing the structure of political discourse considered a field approach that allows you to determine the scope of its contact with other varieties of non-institutional (domestic and artistic) and institutional discourse (scientific, religious, pedagogical, military, legal, sports, advertising, etc.) [Sheigal 2004, p. 33]. In essence, it is a thematic substantive principle that is based on character text reference. Highlighting the special role of the media in the implementation of the political discourse, with the help of which it becomes addressed to a wide audience, public, scientists talk about the tendency to merge media discourse and political discourse [Перельгут 2013, p. 3].

The functional specificity of the discourse of political communication in relation to other types of discourse is presented in its main function – application as an instrument of political power, realized in mastering power, the struggle for it, the preservation of power, the implementation, stabilization and redistribution of power. This provides an opportunity to highlight the key functions of the discourse of political communication, which are considered aspects of the manifestation of the analyzed function: the integration of group political agents and differentiation functions, functions of atonality and harmonization, interpretation and orientation, action and information function, control function and motivations [Халатян 2010, p. 53].

In addition to the institutional nature discussed above, the system-forming features of political discourse include information content, semantic uncertainty, phantom, fideism, esotericism, dynamism, the factor of mass media, distance, authoritarianism and theatricality. One more feature of political discourse is its oratorical nature, including recitation, propaganda, triumphant style, ideologies, abstract concepts, references to science and logic, criticism, bumper-sticker rhetoric, and assertions about the undeniable truth. All these features make the political speech sound theatrical and aggressive. The intention of the politicians in this case would be to abandon their opponents and impose their ideas and beliefs on the audience.

All these signs have a certain specificity, due to the intentional component of the discourse in the field of political communication.

1.2.2 Impact of the political discourse on public opinion

Today, particular interest in the problem of political manipulation is associated with the emergence of the information society, the increase of democratic freedoms and the development of the civil society institution. The proliferation of highly productive systems of information transmission and processing in the modern

social life has led to dramatic changes in political manipulation technologies, as previous means of influence have begun to lose their effectiveness and have been replaced by new techniques.

The problem of political manipulation has become especially acute lately, as it is an extremely effective tool for political influence. Manipulation in one form or another is present in any society, has varied and ambiguous characteristics, and therefore must be reckoned with.

Manipulation is a psychological weapon that gives a person great advantage over other people. With this weapon, we can attack and capture, defend and assert our interests. It helps to survive and succeed. A good manipulator, that is, a person who skillfully owns hidden psychological techniques, is much stronger than a person armed to the teeth, since he can encourage a variety of people to the actions he needs and thus solve any problems and tasks, achieve any targets and aims. And what problems and tasks can a person armed with a weapon usual in our understanding be able to solve? Only a few. The strength of a weapon has its limitations. But manipulation have no borders.

All people without exceptions succumb to manipulative influence, both the most ordinary and the most powerful and strong. The only limitation is our own abilities. The more perfect manipulation skills are, the more people a person can manipulate.

It should be noted that manipulation is both positive and negative, although it is difficult to determine the boundary where the positive impact of political manipulation ends. Usually, political manipulation is negative.

First of all, it is related to the short-term political goals of the manipulator, which are primarily focused on the tactical issues of achieving personal goals, rather than the long-term strategy of social development, which can lead to social destabilization and instability of the political process in the state. During political manipulation, the interests of society are replaced by the interests of individuals, groups, which leads to increased social tensions in society, alienation of the people from power. In addition, real political processes occurring in society are disturbed

and distorted, which has a negative impact on its governance, as the system of exchange of information and signals between the authorities and society is disrupted. Accordingly, political risks are increasing and the level of political instability and uncertainty in society is increasing.

Manipulation is a hidden psychological device with which you can force any person to perform the actions you need against his will and interests. But this is the standard definition of manipulation. Our first priority is to find out what speech manipulation is. Numerous studies on this subject give various definitions. Let us give this notion a broader and more practical definition.

“Manipulation is negative social psychological phenomenon exercising destructive effect upon an individual and the society as a whole” [Bolinger 1980, p. 43]. In order to illustrate the correlation of broad and narrow understandings of linguistic manipulation, it should be noted that the need for verbal communication between people arises in case if subsequently they must somehow interact with each other.

G. Orwell, who was the first in drawing attention to the manipulative feature of political discourse states that: “political speech and writing are largely the defense of indefensible” [Orwell 1969, p. 225]. Politicians try to avoid straightforward presentation of facts.

J. Aitchison believes that “when human beings try to understand the world around them, they try to build “mental models”. Those mental models are the primes upon which human beings depend in making sense of the abstract things in this world like the concept of week consisting of seven days. Nothing in the outer world forces this view point. These are only subconsciously inherited models. The role of politicians comes when they try to deliberately insert mental models across human conceptualization of the life like the concept of democracy. This process is called “representation” [Aitchison 1992, p. 91]. J. Wilson defines representation as “the issue of how language is employed in different ways to represent what we can know, believe, and perhaps think” [Wilson 2001, p. 401].

Van Dijk was one of the researchers most interested in the concept of ‘manipulation’, and he proposes in 2006 a “triangulated approach: a form of social power abuse, cognitive mind control and discursive interaction”. From a social point of view, manipulation can be defined as “illegitimate domination confirming social inequality”. Cognitively, manipulation represents a mind control and “involves the interference with processes of understanding, the formation of biased mental models and social representations such as knowledge and ideologies”. Discursively, this concept “generally involves the usual forms and formats of ideological discourse, such as emphasizing Our good things, and emphasizing Their bad things” [Dijk 2006, p. 359]. Although the author says that the three aspects should not be separated, in this article we will deal only with the third part of this approach, namely with the discursive aspect of manipulation.

The manipulation of human consciousness can be carried out due to various means, including language. Linguistic means of manipulation is one of the subjects of research in cognitive linguistics.

Speech manipulation has become a separate subject of linguistics not so long ago, therefore, despite the fact that this topic is quite acute today, its apparatus is not yet fully developed.

In a broad sense, speech impact is understood as speech communication, taken in the aspect of its focus and motivational conditioning. V.E. Chernyavskaya states that “speech manipulation is a speech effect aimed at the implicit, latent motivation of the addressee to perform certain actions” [Чернявская 2017, p. 87]. Each type of language manipulation can make it easier to regulate the interlocutor's activity and change his or her behavior.

All in all, we can conclude that language manipulation is an influence exerted by one person on another or a group of people by linguistic and non-verbal means aimed at achieving a specific goal, which is to change the behavior and perception of the addressee in the course of communicative interaction; as a hidden influence on person's mind, point of view, attitudes serving the interests of the sender of the

message, which do not necessarily coincide with the interests of the manipulated person (addressee).

The purpose of speech manipulation is to persuade the addressee to accept certain statements as true without taking into account all the arguments. As S.A. Megentesov suggests, any speech utterance is “inextricably linked to an aspect influences” [Мегентесов 1997, p. 18].

However, taking into account this definition, we want to emphasize that a person does not live in a vacuum and practically every minute receives any information that, of course, has a certain effect. For the study, those cases where the interests of the addressee do not coincide with the interests of the manipulator are relevant, therefore, the speaker has one way or another effect on the recipient of information.

According to S.N. Litunov, “language manipulation is the selection and use of such language tools with which you can influence the addressee of speech” [Литунув 2017]. O.N. Bykova defines speech manipulation as “type of speech exposure used for covert implementation in the psyche of the recipient of goals, desires, intentions or attitudes that do not coincide with those that the recipient currently has” [Быкова 1999, p. 100].

Speech manipulation is based on psycholinguistic mechanisms that force the addressee to perceive the speech message uncritically, contribute to the emergence of certain illusions or delusions in his mind, provoke a person to commit actions profitable for the manipulator. As a rule, speech manipulation involves such an effect on the addressee that he does not realize and perceives as part of objective information.

In modern society, speech manipulation is used in almost all areas of language use, but especially actively – in election campaigns, ideological propaganda, print and television media, advertising, training, psychotherapy.

In general, in these areas speech manipulation is aimed at the formation of a wide audience of certain preferences, tastes, needs, prejudices, stereotypes beneficial to the manipulator.

Thus, considering speech manipulation, we do not mean an objective description of reality but options of its subjective interpretation. G. Schiller, describing the myth of neutrality, says that “to achieve the greatest success manipulation should remain invisible. Success of manipulation is guaranteed when the manipulator believes that everything that happens is natural and inevitable. In short, manipulation requires a fake reality in which its presence is not felt” [Schiller 1997, p. 129].

To sum up, language manipulation is an influence exerted by one person on another or a group of people by means of linguistic and non-verbal means aimed at achieving a specific goal, which is to change the behavior and perception of the addressee in the course of communicative interaction. From the above definitions we can conclude that speech manipulation involves a hidden effect on the participants of communication through a special speech manipulation, with which manipulator achieves a hidden, unconscious by the addressee impact.

Conclusions to Chapter 1

Many terms that are used in the research field are characterized in multifaceted and contradictory way. The question of the dynamism of the term “discourse” in terms of its semantic variation is quite logical and justified, since in recent decades it has been widely used in the linguistic field.

Discourse in general is a rather complex and ambivalent phenomenon, and that’s why it’s difficult to define this term unambiguously.

Summarizing the abovementioned definitions of the concept of “discourse”, it can be argued that this term, as it is understood in modern linguistics, is close in meaning to the concept of “text”, but it emphasizes the dynamic, time-unfolding nature of language communication; in contrast, the text is conceived primarily as a static object, the result of linguistic activity. Some researchers interpret the discourse as a notion which includes two components at the same time: the dynamic process of linguistic activity, inscribed in its social context, and its result (that is, the text); it is this understanding that is preferred.

In our work we adhere to the definition of the discourse of N. D. Arutynova, according to which “discourse is a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic – pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors; this is an event-based text; it is a speech that is seen as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes). Discourse is an “immersed in life” speech, where discourse itself is intertwined with interpersonal communication. In such an interpretation, the discourse appears as an expanded understanding of the text, as a text immersed in a specific communicative situation with knowledge about the participants in the communication and the conditions of the situation.

What is more, lack of consensus among linguists on the definition of discourse raises the problem of creating a typology. There are various approaches to classifying discourse based on different criteria. The selection of a particular principle of discourse

classification depends on its relevance to the modern linguistic paradigm and direction of research.

In our opinion, all typologies are worth attention, but the typology presented by O. Pocheptsov is more appropriate for our master's thesis. O. Pocheptsov identified a variety of types of discourse: television and radio discourse, newspaper, cinema discourse, political, informal, false, offensive, folk, theatrical, literary (poetic), entertaining, totalitarian, religious, ritual ceremonial and mythological.

Discourse in general and political discourse in particular are studied in detail by a number of humanities. Over the last decades many researchers have been studying political discourse since this notion is regarded as the type of discourse which affects society to a greater extent.

Political discourse is considered specific because it has a number of peculiar features or characteristics. The fundamental feature of political discourse is manipulateness, that is, the ability of political discourse to exert a latent impact through speech means on the audience in order to control the perception of reality. It covers all types of interaction between people and society and reveals a way how cultural values and social order are imposed in different societies. This type of discourse covers a variety of political debates in society, including discussions with politicians and officials and public rhetoric.

It should be emphasized that the key goal of political communication is not informing the public or transmitting any information, but the formation of a given attitude of the audience to a specific person, event or idea.

In our work political discourse is seen as a type of discourse that has great manipulative potential. Language manipulation is an influence exerted by one person on another or a group of people by means of linguistic and non-verbal means aimed at achieving a specific goal, which is to change the behavior and perception of the addressee in the course of communicative interaction. Each type of language manipulation can make it easier to regulate the interlocutor's activity and change his or her behavior.

Taking everything abovementioned into account, the bottom line is that speech manipulation is used in almost all areas of language use, but especially actively – in election campaigns, ideological propaganda, print and television media, advertising, training, psychotherapy.

All this leads to the conclusion that political discourse is a multicomponent phenomenon that can be seen as a system of interrelated features and specifics of their implementation. It is characterized by the presence of a broad toolkit of functions and genre incarnation through which the main purpose is achieved – to obtain political power and to exercise political interests by the participants of the political process.

2. MANIPULATION AS A FUNDAMENTAL TOOL OF POLITICAL POWER

2.1 Manipulation of public opinion

Perhaps, every person has ever thought about whether he makes decisions on his own or whether he is “pushed” to make any decisions. At the moment, manipulative communication techniques are widely used in different areas of our lives, because we live in a society where processes of mutual manipulation are constantly happening between people. This phenomenon manifests itself most vividly in the political sphere.

Politics is truly a social phenomenon, because it does not exist outside of human activity and the communication processes that regulate and link socio-political life. It should be emphasized that the key goal of political communication is not informing the public or transmitting any information, but the formation of a given attitude of the audience to a specific person, event or idea.

Manipulation can be identified with control over the behavior of people introducing thoughts and ideas into their mind. All means of political manipulation are based on the creation and introduction of social myths into the consciousness of society.

In order to successfully achieve their goals politicians use the following tools:

- legal and illegal rules;
- direct and latent;
- agitation, economic, administrative and provocative;
- advertising and anti-advertising;
- inter-individual, group and large-scale;
- printed, electronic and external.

2.1.1 Essence and general characteristics of the concept of “manipulation”

Manipulation is linguistic term with great creative potential that is first and foremost topical in the framework of the theory of linguistic manipulation. The wide and somewhat blurred semantic field of the notion “manipulation” includes such key elements as “negative” intention of the speaker and not evident for the listener character of influence.

Manipulative functions of discourse create covert, masked layer of linguistic data that is not easily separated from purely informational content. Depending on the character of utterance (its orientation towards past or future), more importance is attached to either confirmation with objective reality (if the topic of interaction touches upon something that has already happened) or to the pragmatic factor (frankness of the speaker whose speech is associated with the future) [Москаленко, 2007, p. 47].

At the same time, consideration of linguistic means typical for manipulative texts is 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 and covert influential character of the utterance, conditions of communication (social context). Language offers to speakers a whole arsenal of means to realize manipulative aims.

Linguistic manipulation is marked by language signs of different levels that help interpret the speaker’s intentions. Manipulative influence refers to problems of linguistic legal framework. Estimation of legal force of linguistic phenomena, which is the object of a new complex discipline called legal linguistics, has to be extended to the concept of manipulation. Until recently methods of manipulation (in political discourse, advertisements or horoscopes published in the media) help avoid exposure and appliance of legal sanctions [Акопова 2013, p. 403].

Manipulation is realized when the listener cannot see the speaker’s hidden intentions behind what is actually being said. It is one of the key parameters of a manipulative utterance is specific intentionality, to discriminate against manipulation, it

is necessary to analyze parameters such as the goal of verbal communication, communicative intention, reason and motive.

Manipulation is a pragmatic aspect that achieves its goals without an obvious identification of communicative intent: the speaker wittily chooses this form of expression, has no direct signals about his intentional state. By increasing the level of inadequate perception of the information field, manipulation expands the illusory subjective reality. Manipulation is a negative socio-psychological phenomenon, it has a destructive effect on a person and society as a whole.

Important characteristics of any manipulation are closeness, illusion, invisible mechanism, consciousness psychological influence used to form certain beliefs and preferences. If the manipulation object believes that everything that happens is natural and inevitable, the success of manipulation is guaranteed [Ковешникова, 2014, p. 387].

The art of manipulation is not about making people do what you want them to do but rather getting them to want to do what you want them to do.

According to R. Blakar [Blakar 1987, p. 144], the choice of a word or phrase (expression) is the result of manipulation. Moreover, he emphasizes that the creation of words with a positive connotation is especially characteristic of the field of advertising and ideology.

Verbal or oral manipulations can be extended over time, presenting a complex, multi-stage, stage-by-stage procedure (as in the case of companies engaged in information propaganda and project promotion), or it can be a simple, relatively simple act of influencing the recipient during the course of interpersonal communication.

The vicarious nature of manipulation predetermines the leadership of such linguistic units and categories as foreign (without an internal form) words, euphemisms, speech figures of various contents and composition. At the same time, the correct linguistic characteristics of the identity of manipulative discourse are difficult to determine, since in general they do not go beyond the scope of ordinary speech practice. The active use of the manipulative discourse of certain grammatical forms and syntactic constructions does not create a specific “manipulative grammar” [Budaev 2009, p. 269], since the same linguistic tools are used to perform different functions.

At the same time, the consideration of linguistic means characteristic of manipulative texts is important for revealing the fact of manipulation. Discourse becomes manipulative not due to the use of certain lexical or grammatical units, but, first of all, due to the connection with the speaker's intentions, the obscure influential nature of the statement, the conditions of communication (social context). The language offers carriers a whole arsenal of tools for the implementation of manipulative goals. Linguistic manipulations are marked with linguistic signs of different levels, which help to interpret the speaker's intentions.

“Manipulative influence refers to problems of linguistic legal framework. Estimation of legal force of linguistic phenomena, which is the object of a new complex discipline called legal linguistics, has to be extended to the concept of manipulation. Until recently methods of manipulation (in political discourse, advertisements or horoscopes published in the media) help avoid exposure and appliance of legal sanctions” [Akopova 2013, p. 102].

Legal settlement of conflicts is hindered due to unexploited and unsystematic character of manipulative side of the language, absence of specialized vocabulary that would describe manipulative techniques, as well as legal mechanisms, that would take into account both spontaneous patterns of a natural language and the system of legal regulations. Similar to diagnosis of direct lie opposed to ontological truth, one can diagnose manipulation opposing epistemological truth. As semantic destruction as a method of manipulation impairs participants of election campaign, and unprincipled advertisement harms product consumers, this can and should become subject of legal linguistics.

The lexicographic genre, being a special means of understanding of linguistic phenomena, is able to accumulate such a thing as manipulation. The dictionary of manipulative techniques should contain an analysis of the distribution of the term “manipulation”, a description of the concepts updated through manipulation strategies, and a list of manipulative techniques with a detailed presentation of multilevel language means for their implementation.

Presumably, the exclusion of the manipulative component from modern political practices will help establish a truly democratic political culture. Cooperation, dialogue and liberal communication, based on the absolute disclosure of intentions and arguments, can become the antipode of manipulative influence. In the context of a democratized society, the mechanisms of manipulative influence exercised by the media should be clear and transparent by developing criteria that could be used to distinguish between appropriate methods of suggestion.

Linguistic manipulation in the broad sense is any verbal interaction considered from the point of view of its motivation and realized by the subject (speaker) and object (listener) of communication. The subject of communication regulates the behavior of interlocutor through speech, prompting him to start, change or perform an action whenever a need arises. The speaker can either stimulate the correct verbal or non-verbal response, or have an indirect effect to form the specific emotions and perceptions required by the speaker. Ultimately, it is assumed that these perceptions organize such behavior on the part of the listener, to which the speaker sought. By influencing a person, we strive to shape his behavior in accordance with our needs.

Many units of political language mean complexes of ideas far removed from direct human experience. Taking into account the Sternin's classification, the following groups of ideas (intentions) were identified during the study:

1) silencing the facts:

- *“I say we will rise together or we will fall together as one nation, indivisible. And I want to be perfectly clear: I'm not talking about unity for the sake of unity. Hear me out. I'm not talking about unity for the sake of unity”* [KHKOPCIO].

With a fraction of the future *will*, K. Harris has succeeded in creating some intrigue that is quite a popular reception among the political figures, “leaving the fog” to the public. In our opinion, the aforementioned technique is an element of manipulation, because in this way she forced the recipient to wait, to guess what would happen next.

2) soothing the audience:

- *“But I still believe in America and I always will. And if you do, then we must accept this result and then look to the future.”* [HCCS]

- *“The country must be run by professionals.”* [DTIWT]

Using the modal verb *must*, which expresses the imperative, the politician-speaker indicates the inevitable implementation of the aforementioned action, and therefore, it seems to reassure the public.

3) exhortations:

Speech manipulation is a complex phenomenon, the effectiveness of which depends on the politician’s persuasiveness and confidence in his own words. Being able to correctly and clearly express your thoughts is important not only in order to be properly understood. It is a key factor in the manipulation of the audience. Modal verb ‘*can*’ creates an impression that all goals can be easily achieved. this is illustrated in the following example:

- *“We can achieve the dreams of our parents and grandparents. We can heal our nation. We can give our children the future they deserve. We can reclaim the American Dream for every single person in our country. We can restore America’s moral leadership on this planet”* [KHKOPCIO].

4) persuasion:

- *“Change may happen”*. [IA]

- *“Because, you know -- you know, I believe we are stronger together and we will go forward together. And you should never, ever regret fighting for that”*. [HCCS]

In general, a modal verb ‘*should*’ is used if the speaker wants to influence the public, give advice and convince listeners to do something. This is demonstrated in the last example.

Verbal presentation of information is an important aspect of linguistic influence. In the case of written text, it is easier for the reader to notice the attachment, since the text is always at hand and can be reviewed and checked. This is not possible when dealing with oral information. To understand the meaning of each word in context and to think while listening to the sequence of oral messages, it often takes a short time. Thus, if

individual words are deliberately emphasized and if the speech is structured for a specific purpose, oral information may have a greater impact than written text.

To sum up, we can conclude that language manipulation is an influence exerted by one person on another or a group of people by linguistic and non-verbal means aimed at achieving a specific goal, which is to change the behavior, perception and attitudes of the addressee in the course of communicative interaction.

2.1.2 Approaches to the classification of different types of manipulation

Manipulation of consciousness and behavior implies the existence of the subject and object of manipulation, influence on the motivational sphere of the listener. These and other factors form the basis for the main classification types of language manipulation covered in works in the field of linguistics and psychology.

Depending on the area of mental activity that is involved and dominates the communication process, language manipulation is divided into rational and emotional. In order to influence the interlocutor's behavior, the speaker may influence his or her rational sphere. To do this, he uses compelling facts and arguments that affect people's minds. The purpose of emotional manipulation is to express speaker's emotions and to obtain from the listener a sensitive emotional reaction that will lead to changes in his behavior.

There are two types of emotional manipulation:

1) direct – realized through original appeal towards the rational side of the listener:

- *“Let's make America great again!”* [RRPC] – this slogan that has become so popular in the context of the recent US election was used by Ronald Reagan in 1980 long before Donald Trump.

2) indirect – realized through creation of figurativeness, various fault in logical thinking:

- *“Jobs are booming, incomes are soaring, factories are returning, poverty is plummeting, confidence is surging, and we have completely rebuilt the awesome power of the United States’ military. Our country is stronger than ever before”* [DTCSQR].

According to the character of subject-object interaction, manipulation can be:

- 1) direct – the subject is openly presenting his demands to the object of manipulation:

- *“All those other polls you all cite also show I’m the most person – I’m the person most likely to be Trump”* [JBOFTN].

- 2) indirect – manipulation directed at the environment rather than at the object:

- *“The coronavirus does not have a political affiliation. It will infect Republicans, independents and Democrats alike and will not discriminate based on national origin, race, gender or zip code”* [FVPJBATCP].

The direct method of linguistic manipulation involves such forms of the linguistic system that are associated with a specific meaning that directly expresses the corresponding illusion, that is, the communicative purpose of the speaker. For example, declarative and interrogative statements are conditionally related to the illusory forces of the message. An indirect way of expressing communicative intent involves the use of linguistic forms to express the power of illocution not related to their direct linguistic meaning. Indirect forms do not openly express the speaker's intentions.

According to awareness of linguistic actions, manipulation can be:

- 1) intentional:

- *“So those of you who are listening, if you want to be part of this campaign, pick up your phones. Pick up your phones. Now. Send a text to the word "United" to the number 30330. OK? That's "United" 30330. Or 303330, but you got it. It's on the back there”* [JBOFTN].

- 2) non-intentional:

- *“We can and must put the everyday lives of Americans who have been overlooked for so long back at the center of our politics and every story that became part of this campaign helped show us why and how we do just that.”* [JBOLCFP].

In the case of intentional linguistic manipulation, the subject is directed to a specific result by the object of manipulation. Non-intentional linguistic manipulation is involuntary because the subject is not aimed at achieving a result from the listener.

Depending on the type of linguistic action, manipulation can be classified into the following types:

1) social – social non-informational speech acts with clichés in the form of greetings, oaths, prayers:

- *“We are here because the American Dream and our American democracy are under attack and on the line like never before.” [GWSB]*

2) volitional – speech acts of following the speaker’s will in the form of orders, requests, refusals, advise, etc.:

- *“But as we work to improve Americans’ healthcare, there are those who want to take away your healthcare, take away your doctor, and abolish private insurance entirely” [TSOTUS].*

3) informational and estimative – speech acts setting public moral, legal, interpersonal emotional relations in the form of reprobation, praise, accusation, insult, threat:

- *“Ronald Reagan tried to get it approved, everybody tried to get it approved. Nobody got it approved. I got it approved. They are starting ANWR shortly. I got ANWR approved. It’s as big as Saudi Arabian they say, in Alaskan. I got it approved. Nobody else got it approved. Ronald Reagan tried, couldn’t do it. Bush tried. Everybody. Presidents, even Democratic presidents tried. They couldn’t get it approved. I got it approved” [DTIWT].*

One of Bill Clinton’s three slogans as part of the 1992 presidential campaign, reflecting his three campaign promises: to ensure peace and stability, improve the economy, and improve healthcare. The phrase *“It’s the economy, stupid”* has become incredibly popular not only in US political circles, but also in popular culture. In the British satirical program *“The Thick of Events”* this slogan was played out differently at least five times.

Perlocutionary criterion (addressee's reaction) presents basis for discrimination of the following types of linguistic manipulation:

- 1) evaluative – changing of the subject-object relation, connotative meaning of the object for the subject;
- 2) emotional – formation of general emotional mood;
- 3) rational – reconstruction of categorical structure of individual conscience, introduction of new categories.

Depending on the orientation towards the interlocutor, manipulation can be:

- 1) person-oriented;
- 2) society-oriented [Issers 1996, p. 72].

Personally-oriented speech manipulation is directed at the listener by the speaker who constructs the image of his interlocutor in order to achieve an objective.

When the speaker resort to socially oriented manipulation, he does not construct the image of the individual listener, but creates a generalized image of the group as a whole.

Each type of language manipulation can make it easier to regulate the interlocutor's activity and change his or her behavior.

The process of constructing the theory of language manipulation involves the differentiation of manipulative and actual manipulation on the one hand, and productive and non-productive manipulation on the other. Such differentiation of the means of manipulation in the context of communication takes the form of a hierarchy, reflecting different levels of communicative proficiency in language use. Unproductive manipulation is represented as the bottom of the hierarchy, and the actualization of the broadcast is at the top.

In psychology the term “manipulation” is defined as “type of psychological affection, which in case of skillful realization leads to implicit provocation of another person's intentions that do not correspond to his actual wishes and his stimulation towards commitment of actions required by the manipulator” [Issers 1996, p. 72].

Linguistic manipulation is based on mechanisms that force the listener to uncritically perceive verbal messages and to create illusions and misconceptions that affect the addressee's emotions and cause him to do profitable actions for the speaker.

The unproductive form of manipulative attachment is related to the desire to conceal the interlocutor's consciousness for the purpose of frustration, that is, to provide psychological discomfort. In other words, unproductive manipulation is a linguistic action aimed at manifesting the superiority of the interlocutor by demonstrating its imperfection, inferiority, which leads to submission to the demands of the speaker.

The purpose of productive manipulation is to gain a communicative partner and manipulate his behavior by exploiting his weaknesses. In this case, the initiator of communication is a voluntary donor, who positions his interlocutor in a situation of social well-being, status preference. The simplest means of manipulation are compliments and flattery.

Both productive and non-productive manipulation of the addressee's behavior implies an influence on his or her emotional sphere, unlike other forms of empowerment that appeal to the rational sphere.

The highest form of language interaction and manipulation is communication at the level of cooperation, which is the optimal alternative to effective communication. The main parameter of the actualization agent's behavior is compliance with the interlocutor's identity, fundamental equality and openness of manipulation methods. Updating communication is based on the desire to elicit sympathy.

It should be noted that mastering the actualization of communication is not an easy task. Thus, manipulative forms predominate in everyday life.

2.2 Manipulation as a form of speech exposure

The problem of manipulation of consciousness as a kind of socio-psychological influence is considered within the social sciences. Manipulation is not a linguistic phenomenon. This phenomenon is universal and therefore has many definitions in

different fields of knowledge. But it is undeniable that the manipulation is based on lingual structures and is implemented in speech activity.

Speech (language) manipulation is a kind of manipulative influence that is exercised through the skillful use of certain language resources for the purpose of covertly influencing the cognitive and behavioral activities of the addressee. This study analyzed the most common linguistic manipulations addressed by US politicians in their speeches.

2.2.1 Survey of general receptions of a political manipulation

In the process of text creation, the authors of manipulation discourse often choose the most neutral word from the semantic field, although even a neutral word in some sense can act as an influence, because unlike a word with a clear negative connotation, it conveys a positive evaluation of the issue in a hidden form, rejecting the position of the whole ideological system, and conversely, when describing events that are criticized by this system, emotional words with a negative connotation are selected.

It has been found that politicians often use black PR in pre-election speeches, that is, discrediting their opponents and former authorities. Black PR as a technology is most often used as a method of waging information warfare. Black PR activities are most often used to undermine the image of competitors, thereby achieving their own advantage in a particular area. The following example clearly demonstrates the following position:

- *“I know how to win. She does not know how to win.”* [HCCS]
- *“That's not Donald Trump's story. His cynicism is unbounded. His lack of empathy and compassion can be summed up in the phrase I suspect he's most proud of having made famous, “You're fired.””* [JBDNCS]
- *“No major party, no major party nominee in the history of this nation has ever known less or has been less prepared to deal with our national security”.* [VPBCS]

The famous fragment of the election speech of Abraham Lincoln in 1864 in Baltimore became an aphorism. Despite the fact that the phrase *“Don't change horses in the middle of a stream”* was not a slogan per se, it became an important tool for political

rhetoric. The call for stability since the crisis of feudal Europe has been one of the main ones in the election campaign.

Statements by incumbent President Donald Trump during the presidential election campaign show that politicians often resort to the use of “harassment” tactics. Psychological impact often occurs at the level of human feelings, primarily primitive (fear, anger, hatred). There are threats to certain words, and as a component of the expression of influence, the word may be a pragma – a unit in which the semantics is fixed by targeting. A pragma, within the framework of a statement that aims to influence another person, performs the function of manipulating one's consciousness. Most notorious are his statements about further political relations between countries, for example:

- *“I also promised our citizens that I would impose tariffs to confront China’s massive theft of American jobs. Our strategy worked. Days ago, we signed the groundbreaking new agreement with China that will defend our workers, protect our intellectual property, bring billions of dollars into our treasury, and open vast new markets for products made and grown right here in the United States of America”* [TSOTUS].

- *“Trump promised not to let Muslims into the country, to replace China, and at the same time, the US allies in NATO. He also opposed the free trade agreement, which, in his opinion, is detrimental to America”*. [THWKH]

Touching on the topic of external threats to internal security, candidates could not ignore law enforcement. Here we can observe the use of ‘seduction’ tactics. This tactic is used to get the affection of certain circles of people, in this case law enforcement.

For example, Bernie Sanders magnifies the military and the police, their role in society, and emphasizes that thanks to these power structures, Americans are protected:

- *“I would respect what they are doing so that you don’t get shot in the back of the head, but I would also be very mindful of the fact that as a nation, we have got to hold police officers accountable for the actions that they commit”* [BSSSPJF].

One of the most important manipulation strategies is the identification strategy, that is, the identification of the politician with the people. Using this strategy, in their speeches, politicians turn to the subject of cultural and moral values of society.

Analyzing the use of this strategy in Donald Trump's text messages, it should be noted that for American society, law and freedom is an extremely important issue. Society is a strong advocate of freedom of expression, democracy, equality of citizens, the right to choose and the right to individuality. Citizens of the United States closely monitor the preservation of their values and the implementation of the laws of the country's constitution.

While isolating the social needs of citizens, the current American leader is trying to win sympathy among voters, pointing out that the justified demands of the people that do not contradict the constitution and the values of the people must be met by the heads of state, for example:

- *“The people are the heart of our country, their dreams are the soul of our country, and their love is what powers and sustains our country. We must always remember that our job is to put America first!”* [TSOTUS].

In their speeches, candidates for the presidency emphasize the equality of all citizens of the country, for example:

- *“After all that we've achieved together”.* [BOVS]
- *“And I still believe as deeply as I ever have that if we stand together and work together with respect for our differences, strength in our convictions and love for this nation, our best days are still ahead of us”.* [HCCS]

It is important to note that, according to social studies, the United States is one of the most religious countries in the developed world. In the speeches, Donald Trump and Barack Obama also addresses religious motives, such as:

- *“And together, with your help and God's grace, we will continue our journey forward and remind the world just why it is that we live in the greatest nation on Earth. Thank you, America. God bless you. God bless these United States.”* [PBODNCS]
- *“And most importantly, we will be protected by God!”* [DTCSCR].

- *“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’. We must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity. When America is united, America is totally unstoppable” [DTIWT].*

The identification strategy is implemented through the use of the pronouns “We”, “our” instead of “I”, “my”. As an example of the use of this technique we can use the following expression in J. Biden's speech:

- *“I know why we have held together. I know why we are united” . [JBOFTN].*
- *“We never bow. We never bend. We never break when confronted with crisis. No, we endure. We overcome. And we always, always, always move forward” . [JBOFTN].*

The candidates pay much attention to the unity of the nation and society. Patriot manipulation tactics are widely used by politicians not only during election campaigns.

The issue of love for the homeland is extremely important for any country, it helps to unite society, promote the economic and cultural development of the country. The main components of this principle are the protection of language, cultural and family traditions, the ideology of society, state symbols. Unification of voters, suggesting the desire to choose a certain candidate is the main goal of election campaigns. Often, politicians try to achieve the goal of stating that the welfare of the country, the defense of their values is possible only by selecting certain candidates. This tactic was also present in the speeches of the current US President, for example:

- *“Together we will elect a Republican Congress to create a fair, safe, sane, and lawful system finally of immigration. We will continue to enact new trade deals that result in more products proudly stamped with beautiful phrase, “Made in the USA.” We will achieve new breakthroughs in science and medicine, finding new cures for childhood cancer, infectious diseases like we’re working on right now, and ending the AIDS epidemic” [DTCSCR].*

Joe Biden uses not only calls for the unification of the motherland, but also trying to prove that his party seeks only the welfare of the country, for example:

- *“The responsibility I have is to protect America's national self-interest and not put our women and men in harm's way to try to solve every single problem in the world by use of force. That's my responsibility as President. And that's what I'll do as president”* [JBOFTN].

The US President assured that his presidency would help improve the work of administrative and governmental agencies, such as:

- *“So to all Americans in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, from ocean to ocean, hear these words – you will never be ignored again”* [JBOFTN].

In addition, it should be noted that Donald Trump has positioned himself as a strong leader who is ready for decisive action, such as:

- *“We will no longer accept politicians who are all talk and no action, constantly complaining but never doing anything about it”* [PTIO].

Along with bold sayings, calls are also frequently used, such as:

- *“And this, the United States of America, is your country. Now comes the hour of action!”* [PTIO].

- *“You’ve got to get up and stand up and don’t give up the fight!”* [KHKOPCO]

In the speeches of many politicians it is emphasized that the presidential candidate does not pursue his or her personal goals, acts only in the interests of the people, one of these examples is:

- *“But we are transferring power from Washington, D.C., and giving it back to you, the people”*. [PTIO]

In particular, this position works well together with promises to positively resolve the problematic issue, because everyone needs a government official who cares not only about the country, the needy population. Donald Trump, for example:

- *“Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities, rusted out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation, an education*

system flush with cash but leaving our young and beautiful students deprived of all knowledge” [PTIO].

Again, appealing to primitive human feelings (fear, anger, hatred), politicians resort to the "belief in a better future" tactic during their election campaign. Tactics are not only popular but also effective. Everyone understands the importance of developing the whole of society, finding ways to overcome incurable diseases, preserving nature and securing a better future for future generations. For example, in his speeches, Donald Trump is trying to inspire voters to “go forward”, reach new achievements, not abandon plans and dreams, such as:

- *“Don't let anyone tell you that it can't be done. No challenge can match the heart and fight and spirit of America. We will not fail” [TSOTUS].*

This technique helps to evoke positive emotions for voters, politics draws closer to the people, because the supporter automatically subconsciously becomes a friend because only loved ones can support or help. The implementation of this method helps to gain voter confidence as quickly as possible and produces good results in the form of votes.

Some of the speeches of the politicians had common features of the future, that is, they try to visualize the future of all mankind, for example:

- *“If you attack innocent Americans, we will follow you to the end of the Earth”. [OCRANACIGV]*

- *“If the president doesn't act, if he doesn't act immediately, there won't be any industry left to save”. [THWKH]*

Of course, the topic of the future of the country as a whole has also become popular and actively used by the politicians, since each citizen is primarily interested in their own well-being and the well-being of their homeland, for example:

- *“I also promised our citizens that I would impose tariffs to confront China's massive theft of American jobs. Our strategy worked. Days ago, we signed the groundbreaking new agreement with China that will defend our workers, protect our intellectual property, bring billions of dollars into our treasury, and open vast new*

markets for products made and grown right here in the United States of America” [TSOTUS].

Today's volatility in the world requires numerous international interpretations, and as a result, there is growing interest in learning about verbal manipulation. Language means of influence have always been an integral part of political discourse, as politicians seek to pursue their intentions by any means. In today's world, manipulation is a universal phenomenon, it can be detected in all socially significant areas of human activity.

Examining the text messages of the candidates for the presidency, it was found that they use some of the same linguistic tactics of influence, such as: strategies of “identification”, “one-stranger”, “discrediting the authorities”, “mystification of problems of society” and others.

The main difference between leaders' speeches is emotional coloring. Politicians often concentrate on negative events, trying to blacken even the achievements of his predecessors.

Therefore, we can conclude that candidates have a sufficient stock of linguistic manipulation techniques in their arsenal. The above-mentioned tactics are most often found in their speeches, but the enormous variability of methods and ways of their implementation, make it difficult to study in detail not only speeches, but also political manipulations in general, which confirms the relevance of further research on the selected issues.

2.2.2 General signs of manipulative influence

One of the most important rules of mind manipulation is to ensure totalitarian influence, that is, to provide information taken from fully controlled sources. To provide the illusion of pluralism, some information messages are created as if from different types of organizations, but they create unified stereotypes. “Unnecessary” information is suppressed. The flow of advertising detaches the full perception of information. There is an inability to analyze and concentrate on serious events. The flow of worthless information complicates the search for meaning.

Being a type of latent influence on the addressee and a specific way of managing it, manipulation is characterized by the spontaneity of actions and intentions of the manipulator, which contradicts the will of the addressee and harms him. We have accepted the research by I. Zimniaia, so in our opinion, the main features of manipulation are the following:

1) spiritual and psychological influence without any physical abuse (in this case the purpose of manipulation is the mental structures of people) in the form of a certain psychological power or play on the weaknesses of the addressee;

2) orienting the manipulator in such a way that its ultimate purpose and fact of influence will be an unnoticed object of manipulation that will still have the illusion of its independent decision making and action – that is, hidden influence;

3) influence that requires certain knowledge and considerable skills;

4) handling of objects of manipulation not as to people, but as to things - means of achievement of the manipulator's own goals;

5) the desire to win a one-sided prize;

6) motivation;

7) manipulator skills in the implementation of their manipulative actions [Zimniaia 2006, p. 56].

Signs of political communication should be considered in terms of their relevance:

1) Informative.

Attention should be paid to the superiority in this discourse of values over facts, of evaluative influence over information:

- *“If you go back to Election Day and then move back five years, so five years before Election Day, soybeans dropped 50 percent in price. I wasn't even here, so now we're going to open up markets, We' re going to do it the way it should be” [PTIO].*

Criteria for informativeness are carelessness, relevance, adequacy in the submission of information. Political discourse is multifaceted and, depending on the situation, can be oriented both to information, which is different with novelty of information, and to a matter of fact, for which not the content but the form of submission

is important. In political communication, what matters is not factual information, but a coincidence of interests and expectations of the public.

2) Semantic uncertainty.

Despite the desire for political communication to conceptual certainty, there is a tendency for the semantic inaccuracy of political discourse, which is due to some factors, which include: semantic – the use of words with abstract or complex meaning, the blurring of semantic boundaries and relativity of designation; pragmatic – provoking the intended response of the addressee, manipulating the addressee's consciousness, avoiding conflict, and striving to conceal poor quality and educational attainment:

- *“We repealed the core of Obamacare. The individual mandate is gone. You know, the individual mandate. That's a beauty. Only the past administration could have come up with this. That's where you pay a lot of money for the privilege of not paying in order to have poor health care. Other than that, it's a wonderful thing” [PTIO].*

3) Dynamics.

It is expressed in the variability of the most relevant used part of political vocabulary. This is due to the temporary (changing) nature of political values realized in the concentration of political communication on contemporary issues. In the language of politics, it is possible to distinguish three levels of lexical elements according to the degree of their stability of existence in political discourse: “evaluative-neutral basic political terminology; evaluation-labeled basic policy terms with a variable connotative zone; topical vocabulary of today, keywords of the moment or chrono facts”. This group refers to the most moving layer and are words that are related to political initiatives and events, slogans, names of current politicians, etc.:

- *“This campaign is just getting started. And I promise you this, no one, no one is going to work longer, no one is going to campaign harder to win your hearts, your trust, and your support than the son of Catherine Eugenia Finnegan from Scranton, Pennsylvania, and Joseph R. Biden from Delaware” [JBOLCFP].*

4) Fideistic.

It is related to phantom, manifests itself in the irrationality of political language, and relies on the subconscious. Addressees, receiving political information through group

and mass communication, take for granted the so-called fantasies conveyed by communicative mediators, to which either the politicians themselves or the journalist-reviewers belong. Fantasy is understood as interpreting information presented in such a way that the subject of the interpretation believes in its authenticity, does not verify it. This points to the particular role of the addressee, which represents the political terms that influence the formation of the political consciousness of the addressees:

- *“You've watched the president now for three years. Look at what he's doing. Instilling fear. I mean, not joking, instilling fear, sowing division, stoking racial division, undercutting every institution that was designed to check the abuse of power by the president or anyone else. All this for what reason? All of this in order to solidify his base and expand his power”* [JBOLCFP].

However, it should be noted that political speech is characterized by a number of additional features specific to this particular type of political discourse, since the discourse of political speeches is focused not only on the addressee, but also on the authors themselves, who are important to speak about this or that political event, that is, also an important principle of reflection.

2.2.3 Verbal countermanipulation as the response action to manipulation

Widely used mass manipulations influence the trends of language development, more precisely, many books are written on how to learn the science of manipulation by others. In this regard, some linguists emphasize that in our time it is very important to develop anti-manipulation strategies, since “language changes (or changes in language behaviour) can also trigger social changes” [Wodak 2009, p. 350].

To defend oneself from the manipulation effect the communicator can use a number of countermanipulative strategies and tactics serving as the means for his defence. The notion of a strategy is defined by linguists as “a property of a “plan”, that is, a (cognitive) representation of an action sequence that will be executed. It is that property of a plan that guarantees that the action sequence is carried out effectively and

optimally, given the (known or assumed) circumstances of the action context” [Wodak 2009, p. 351].

Consequently, the strategy includes a number of actions. They are aimed at reaching the certain communicative aim.

Tactics should be considered as one or more verbal actions that contribute to the implementation of the strategy. Thus, the strategy may contain a number of tactics. Some psychologists describe a number of strategies and tactics of counter-manipulation, using their own terms and names, but without sufficient explanation as to why they chose a particular term or name.

Sometimes the names of tactics are ill-conceived. The name of the “*ignoireren und weitermachen*” tactic (ignore and continue) does not match its description. The authors say that the communicator should not attempt to manipulate and ignore the comments addressed to him, but then they add that as part of this tactic you can use pauses in conversation and constructive suggestions. In other cases, the authors give different names to the same phenomenon.

For example, the tactics of disclosing manipulation techniques are called “*disable manipulation*” and “*aus der Situation treten*” (output). Therefore, there is no terminology in the terminology of antitrust. In this paper, we have made efforts to clarify and explain the names of the two strategies and four tactics of counteracting language manipulation based on political speeches:

1. A frank resistance strategy. The strategy of open resistance is often used in the public sphere. The purpose of this strategy is to protect yourself from the manipulator control by using direct methods of resisting manipulation when there is no need to save a good relationship with the manipulator.

1) Tactics of detecting manipulation techniques.

The mechanism of this tactic is to let the manipulator know that his manipulation is uncovered. It is implemented verbally by using words or phrases that indicate an attempt at manipulation. For example, on CNN-Univision Democratic debate J. Biden and B. Sanders were speaking about medical system of the USA, both of them were used

manipulative technique, but program leader, J. Tapper used countermanipulation, which effectively reveals the manipulative technique:

- “*Senator Sanders, on that note, and both of you have addressed this, but obviously another major health concern right now for officials is the potential surge in patients all at once, overburdening hospitals, the healthcare system*” [CUDD].

2) Flat rejection tactics.

This tactic is used in both public and private spheres. The purpose is to show the manipulator that his partner completely denies his control. Its linguistic characteristics are the negative part of ‘no’ and the token ‘no’ in the function of determinant and exclamation:

- “– *B. Sanders: Time and time again talking about the necessity, with pride, about cutting Social Security, cutting Medicare, cutting veterans programs.*
– *J. Biden: No.*
– *B. Sanders: You never said that?*
– *J. Biden: No*” [CUDD].

3) The strategy of latent resistance.

Hidden resistance is veiled so that the manipulator cannot immediately understand that his conversation partner is opposed to his manipulation. Therefore, it may take longer to force the manipulator to leave its manipulative attempt to get something from you. As a rule, the strategy of hidden resistance does not seem so categorical and flat, because of the need to remain in good relations with the manipulator. Hidden resistance tactics are more inventive and rotating, so they can take more time and effort, as they often need to be repeated several times for effect.

4) Violated recording tactics.

The mechanism of this tactic has been described by a number of scientists. By repeating the same word, phrase, or sentence with the same intonation, the communicator counteracts and counteracts the manipulator's efforts to profit from it. We have found example of such tactic:

- – “*J. Biden: No, it's not true.*”

- *B. Sanders: That is not true?*
- *J. Biden: That is not true. What is true is, in terms of the negotiations that are taking place, how to deal with the deficit... Everything was on the table. I did not support any of those cuts, and Social Security or in veterans benefits.*
- *B. Sanders: Whoa. Whoa. Whoa. Everything was on the table. All right, you're right. You just said it. Including in your judgment, cuts to Social Security and veterans" [CUDD].*

5) Clarification tactic.

The aim of this tactic is to get more information from the manipulator about his intentions. The usual form of the tactic is a question:

- – *"J. Biden: I never voted... Well, look. I voted to protect it. Just go look at the debate with Paul Ryan for the vice presidency. Look at what I did. And Bernie, will you acknowledge your campaign took out of context, that whole exchange between Paul Ryan? Are you saying PolitiFact is wrong? Are you saying?"*
- *B. Sanders: Yeah. Well, believe me, the Washington Post, PolitiFact is wrong a whole lot of times.*
- *J. Biden: Are they wrong on that, Bernie? Are they wrong on that, Bernie?"*
[CUDD].

We analyzed two strategies (explicit and hidden) and four tactics of counter-manipulation using discourse analysis.

An open-ended strategy is to protect oneself from the influence of the manipulator by using direct means of resisting manipulation. Within this strategy we have described two tactics:

- 1) a tactic for detecting manipulation techniques orally by using words or phrases to indicate manipulation in the form of an expression or question;
- 2) flat rejection tactics, the linguistic characteristic of which is a negative proportion of "no" and a lexeme of "no", which can function as a determinant or as an exclamation mark.

The hidden strategy is veiled so that it is not clear to the manipulator that his communicator is against his control. The means of this strategy are not so categorical and equal as the previous ones. Two tactics that can be used within this strategy are:

- 1) tactics of the broken record – the condition for its effective implementation is the repetition of the same word, phrase or sentence with the same intonation;
- 2) refinement tactics commonly used in the question form to get more information from the manipulator about his intentions.

The list of counter-manipulative strategies and tactics remains open to expansion. Counter-manipulation strategies and tactics need to be further explored at a deeper lexical and syntactic level with the analysis of more examples from different types of discourse.

Conclusions to Chapter 2

At the moment, manipulative communication techniques are widely used in different areas of our lives, because we live in a society where processes of mutual manipulation are constantly happening between people. This phenomenon manifests itself most vividly in the political sphere.

Politics is truly a social phenomenon, because it does not exist outside of human activity and the communication processes that regulate and link socio-political life. It should be emphasized that the key goal of political communication is not informing the public or transmitting any information, but the formation of a given attitude of the audience to a specific person, event or idea.

Manipulation can be identified with control over the behavior of people introducing thoughts and ideas into their mind. All means of political manipulation are based on the creation and introduction of social myths into the consciousness of society.

The problem of manipulation of consciousness as a kind of socio-psychological influence is considered within the social sciences. Manipulation is not a linguistic phenomenon. This phenomenon is universal and therefore has many definitions in different fields of knowledge. But it is undeniable that the manipulation is based on lingual structures and is implemented in speech activity.

Today's volatility in the world requires numerous international interpretations, and as a result, there is growing interest in learning about verbal manipulation. Language means of influence have always been an integral part of political discourse, as politicians seek to pursue their intentions by any means. In today's world, manipulation is a universal phenomenon, it can be detected in all socially significant areas of human activity.

Speech (language) manipulation is a kind of manipulative influence that is exercised through the skillful use of certain language resources for the purpose of covertly influencing the cognitive and behavioral activities of the addressee. This study analyzed the most common linguistic manipulations addressed by US politicians in their speeches.

Linguistic manipulation is the influence exerted by one person on another or a group of people through linguistic and non-verbal means aimed at achieving a specific goal, which is to change the behavior, perception and intentions of the addressee in the process of communicative interaction. Manipulation of consciousness and behavior implies the existence of the subject and object of manipulation, influence on the motivational sphere of the listener. These and other factors form the basis for the main classification types of language manipulation covered in works in the field of linguistics and psychology.

Manipulation of consciousness and behavior implies the existence of the subject and object of manipulation, influence on the motivational sphere of the listener. These and other factors form the basis for the main classification types of language manipulation covered in works in the field of linguistics and psychology.

Depending on the area of mental activity that is involved and dominates the communication process, language manipulation is divided into rational and emotional. In attempts to influence the interlocutor's behavior, the speaker may influence his rational sphere. To do this, he uses compelling facts and arguments that affect people's minds. The purpose of emotional manipulation is to express the emotion of the speaker and to obtain from the listener a sensitive emotional reaction that will lead to changes in his behavior.

We have analyzed that there are two types of emotional manipulation – direct and indirect. According to the awareness of language actions, manipulation can be intentional and unintentional. By type of linguistic action, manipulation can be: social, volitional, informative and evaluative.

The perlocution criterion (addressee's reaction) is the basis for the discrimination of the following types of language manipulation: evaluative, emotional and rational. According to the interlocutor orientation, the manipulation can be oriented towards the individual and the society.

Each type of language manipulation can make it easier to regulate the interlocutor's activity and change his or her behavior.

Therefore, we can conclude that candidates have a sufficient stock of linguistic manipulation techniques in their arsenal. The above-mentioned tactics are most often found in their speeches, but the enormous variability of methods and ways of their implementation, make it difficult to study in detail not only speeches, but also political manipulations in general, which confirms the relevance of further research on the selected issues.

3. MANIPULATION AS PART OF POWER TECHNOLOGY

3.1 Analysis of manipulation at different levels of language

The increasing role of political influence in society, as a symptom of the transition from totalitarian forms of government to democratic ones, predetermines interest in the mechanisms of influence. In this regard, political parties play an important role as the main means of communication between society and government.

In the process of text creation, the authors of manipulation discourse often choose the most neutral word from the semantic field, although even a neutral word in a certain context can act as an influence, because unlike a word with an expressive negative connotation, it conveys a positive evaluation of the issue in a hidden form, reflecting the position of the whole ideological system, and conversely, when describing events that are criticized by this system, emotional words with a negative connotation are selected.

The hidden nature of the use of symbolic power and its utility to certain social groups allow us to draw parallels between symbolic power and manipulation, which a professor of discourse studies T. van Dijk defines as “communicative and interactive practices in which the manipulator controls other people, usually against their will or against their interests” [Dijk 2006, p. 361]. Based on this interpretation, we propose to define manipulation as the exercise of symbolic power.

Language is known to consist of three components: phonological, syntactic and semantic. Manipulation, beginning at the phonological level, reaches its apogee at the semantic level, since it is the most “unstable” linguistic level, because, as K. Sornig states, the meaning, that is, the semantic volume of a word, is constantly changing: its volume expands or narrows, the intensity of the value increases or decreases, and all these changes take place to meet the demands of the particular situation [Sornig 1989, p. 98]. The success of the manipulation, as well as the symbolic power, is facilitated by its hidden nature and thus invisibility to the addressee.

3.1.1 Manipulation on the morphological level

According to the results of morphological analysis of factual material, the most commonly used explicit language expressions of expression in manipulative replicas are adjectives (17 %), nouns (12 %), verbs (12 %), adverbs (6 %), rarely pronouns (3 %), numerals (2 %), exclamations (2 %) and their conjugations (46 %). Modal verbs and modal words (possibly, probably, sure) (38 %), some connectives (but) (5 %) and particles (not, even, yet, still, though, etc.) (26 %), unspecified pronouns (27 %) have implicit potentials. For example:

- “Whatever **action** is required, whenever **action** is necessary, **I** will defend the **freedom and security** of the American **people**” [GWBSUS] – nouns and pronouns.
- “I will always be **grateful** to the **creative, talented, dedicated** men and women at our headquarters in Brooklyn”. [HCCS] – adjectives.
- “**Some** habits and traditions get **nearly noiselessly** accepted in society, but we also see that **less pleasant and sometimes even** negative ways of changes cause friction and tension in society”. [GWSB] – adverbs.
- “And we have not confronted forcefully enough the **intolerance, sectarianism, and hopelessness** that feeds violent **extremism** in too many **parts** of the **globe**”. [BOSUNGA] – nouns.

In general, all of the above-mentioned means, as parts of language, do not have an influence function, but in the specific combination of lexical-semantic meaning that they reflect, and according to the intentions of the speakers, morphological means acquire pervasive potential:

- “I think we should only have troops there to make **sure** that it's impossible for the Taliban and excuse me for ISIS or al-Qaeda to reestablish a foothold there, to be able to go from Afghanistan to the United States to attack the United States” [JBOFTN].
- “I want everybody coming out from behind that and make **sure** your voices are heard going forward”. [HCCS]

At the morphological level, first of all, it should be noted the representation of subjective modality through the widespread use of personal pronouns “I, we”. H. Clinton and B. Obama uses such pronouns in his speeches quite often, as demonstrated by examples below:

- “*We have picked ourselves up, we have fought our way back, and we know in our hearts that for the United States of America, the best is yet to come*”. [PBODNCS]

- “*Finally, I am so grateful for our country and for all it has given to me. I count my blessings every single day that I am an American. And I still believe as deeply as I ever have that if we stand together and work together with respect for our differences, strength in our convictions and love for this nation, our best days are still ahead of us*”. [HCCS]

The tactic of promise is actualized with the help of lexical formatives with the future form (I am going, we will):

- “*We're on a mission to move this nation forward, a mission I guarantee I will complete — a mission we will complete*”. [VPBCS]

- “*Which is why I will defend this nation against all threats to our cybersecurity. We will secure our elections and our critical infrastructure to protect our democracy. And we will honor our service members and veterans*”. [KHKOPCO]

- “*The 21st century is going to be the American century*”. [JBDNCS]

- “*I'm going to fight for you, the American people. I'm going to be your champion. I am going to be America's champion*”. [DTCSCR]

Trump does not avoid sounding proud and praises himself (I'm very proud, I'm very honored) and in this way defends his good name. Self-praise serves to establish his identity in front of the voters:

- “*To expand equal opportunity, I am very proud that we achieved record and permanent funding for our Nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities*”. [TSOTUS]

- *“As we support America’s moms and dads, I was recently proud to sign the law providing new parents in the Federal workforce paid family leave, serving as a model for the rest of the country”*. [TSOTUS]

The deictics “we, us, our”, especially in the speech of the media person, are used to appeal to the reader, turning him into a kind of co-author who shares the point of view of the speaker:

- *“Ordinary people like **us** who do extraordinary things”*. [JBDNCS]
- *“And I still believe as deeply as I ever have that if **we** stand together and work together with respect for **our** differences, strength in **our** convictions and love for this nation, **our** best days are still ahead of **us**”*. [HCCS]

Representation of someone’s position as the majority’s opinion allows transforming the subjective position of the author into an objective, nationwide. A similar task is performed by appeal to the listener through the pronouns “you, your, we, us” in the following example:

- *“But all of **you** are family. No matter what **you** do or where **you** go from here, **you** will carry the memory of the history **we** made together”*. [BOVS]
- *“Because if **you** understood that America's heart had to be healed, **you** would have done exactly what the president did and **you** would move heaven and earth to hunt him down and to bring him to justice”*. [VPBCS]

At the morphological-syntactic level, subjective modality is also represented through modal verbs, and so on. Modal words, phrases and constructions – in our definition, modal lexical units and modal structures with the semantics of confidence, credibility / necessity, probability / evidence, possibility / presumption and doubtfulness / uncertainty:

- *“We **must** accept this result and then look to the future”*. [HCCS]
- *“But that common bond is where we **must** begin”*. [BOVS]
- *“Folks, we never — we **must** never, ever forget their sacrifice and always keep them in our care and in our prayers”*. [VPBCS]

The largest number of units under investigation is found in those sections of the text where versions of the causes of the tragedy are put forward. The degree of the author's confidence and uncertainty in the truth of the message always affects the degree of reader's effectiveness of creating a certain opinion about the event being covered – therefore, journalists have at their disposal a whole arsenal of language tools that can be positioned on a scale from categorical confidence to categorical doubt (due to the ambiguity of language units, the distribution inside subcategories is conditional illustrative).

The common use of a number of modal tokens and structures within the same statement: *there is strong reason to believe; it appeared increasingly likely; we know with confidence (to a certainty)*, etc .

- “***We certainly know*** we still have more to do”. [JBDNCS]
- “***It is a fact that*** the acceptance of this religion is complicated”.

[KHKOPCO]

Other methods of manipulation, implemented at the morphological-syntactic level, are associated with different options for silence / omission of agents and are represented by the frequent use of passive constructions, as well as vague (with *one, you, they*) – *one can clearly see; one should notice*, etc.; and impersonal sentences (*It*):

- “***It is said*** they were dividing the sexes and disturbing the peace”.

[KHKOPCO]

- “***They keep going.*** That's the unbreakable spirit of the people of America”.

[JBDNCS]

It can be concluded that indefinitely personal and generalized personal, as well as impersonal sentences are used for intentional omission in the speech of the subject of action; to enlist the support of the recipient; as well as for the transfer of unverified and not even reliable information that the addressee is inclined to perceive as reliable.

3.1.2 Manipulation on the lexical level

The use of lexical means of language is presented as one of the most used methods of language manipulation. This is due to a number of factors: firstly, lexical tools have an emotive character; secondly, lexical means include various forms of expression inherent in the colloquial style of speech used most often in interpersonal communication.

Hyperbole is one of the most commonly used linguistic means since ancient times and is still evidence of its effectiveness. In the following example, D. Trump, J. Biden and B. Obama use hyperbole and appeal to the patriotism of Americans, claiming that their country is the most powerful in the world:

- “We have **the greatest mess anyone has ever seen**. You look at the Middle East. It's a total mess — under your direction to a large extent”. [TSOTUS]
- “And together, with your help and God's grace, we will continue our journey forward and remind the world just why it is that we live in **the greatest nation on Earth**. Thank you, America.” [PBODNCS]
- “U.S. is **the only advanced country on Earth** that doesn't guarantee paid sick leave”. [BOVS]

Hyperbole can be realized through comparison:

- “Nobody's gone through and nobody has been treated **as unfairly as Donald Trump**” [DTIWT].
- “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. We must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity. When America disunited, America is totally **unstoppable**” [DTIWT].

The President wants to stress that unity is the key to success. The country must be one and only in this way will it become a strong state. The people and the authorities must work towards common goals. The hyperbole “unstoppable” enhances expressiveness and testifies to the grandeur and scale of the president's plans.

The president's use of hyperbolizing is aimed at providing an emotional impact on the audience, affects the patriotic feelings of Americans and makes them feel proud of their own nation:

- *“But what is a problem is that the **United States** takes care of the world, and the world doesn't take care of the world. The world doesn't want to take care of itself” [DTIWT].*

Hyperbole acts as a characteristic tool for interviewing calls. A technique based on excessive exaggeration uses D. Trump to emphasize the uniqueness of the American nation and the role of the United States in world:

- *“We stand on the shoulders of American Patriots who have crossed the oceans, blazed the trails, settled the continent, tamed the wilderness, dug out the Panama Canal, lay down the railroads, revolutionized industry, liberated millions from poverty, hunger and disease, won two world wars, defeated fascism and communism and made America the single greatest nation in the history of the world, and we are making it greater every single day” [DTCSCR].*

D. Trump gives a very gloomy description of the United States, saying that people are like animals in a trap, that infrastructure has fallen into decay:

- *“We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs” [DTCSCR].*

A metaphor is a figure of speech that describes an object or action in a way that isn't literally true, but helps explain an idea or make a comparison. Features of the metaphor make it possible to use it as a universal means of manipulation.

The majority of politicians actively use metaphors and personifications in describing problems of the recent past:

- *“For decades, Democrat politicians betrayed African-Americans. They forced their children into failing schools. They shipped their jobs to foreign countries. They pushed their unfair sentencing policies” [DTC].*

The metaphor of construction and reconstruction is often found in their interviews:

- *“Look, I'm **building** a wall despite the fact that the Democrats don't want a wall built. They have fought every – we just won a lawsuit on the wall” [DTIWT].*

- “America, I believe we can **build** on the progress we've made and continue to fight for new jobs and new opportunities”. [BOVS]
- “Our responsibility as citizens is to keep doing our part to **build** that better, stronger, fairer America we seek”. [HCCS]

Thus metaphors make a comparison between the two terms without using the words “as” or “as”, as is done in similarity. The terms focus and frame are indicative of two concepts that are metaphorically compared by a writer or speaker. The focus is on the most important term and the topic in question.

Politicians often use metaphor in their speeches for the limits of the individual and the general. On the one hand, their vocabulary is political, legal, economic, rich in terminology, and on the other, they use expressive vocabulary and texts designed for a wide audience. Metaphors make political expressions more emotional and colorful:

- “I want to be a President for all Americans. And **along the way** I'll just let you in on this little secret. I won't get everything right.” [HCCS] – a metaphor for a presidency as a journey.
- “This American **carnage** doesn't stop.” [DTCSKR] – a metaphor for a decaying American economy and society.
- “We want to generate more **pathways** into the middle class”. [HCCS] – a metaphor for a social scale as a journey.

Another example of the use of metaphor in D. Trump's political discourse is one of the most important rhetorical tools that becomes an instrument of agitation:

- “Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves. These are the just and reasonable demands of a righteous public. But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children **trapped in poverty** in our inner cities; and the crime and gangs **and drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country** of so much unrealized potential” [DTCSKR].

In the example given, D. Trump, using the metaphor of “trapped in poverty”, tries to explain that many disadvantaged urban families live in poverty and are on the verge

of survival. In doing so, he wants to emphasize the indifferent attitude of the previous authorities to the problems in society.

The metaphor of “the crime and gangs and drugs that have stolen too many livens” and “robbed our country” conveys a negative evaluation. With this statement, D. Trump wants to point out the high crime rate, its negative impact on society. President emphasizes the devastating impact of the drug industry and crime on society.

Irony manifests a manipulative power because it reflects the opposition “good – bad”, creating tragicomic effects. Conceptual metaphor, metonymy create a shift in sign typing and therefore have greater manipulative power:

- *“The coronavirus does not have a political affiliation. It will infect Republicans, independents and Democrats alike and will not discriminate based on national origin, race, gender or zip code”* [FVPJBATCP].

- *“I have never been prouder to watch **the rest of America** fall in love with you”*. [BOVS]

- *“They don’t want their tax money wasted by **a welfare agency or the Pentagon**”*. [ROPBO]

The intrinsic form of the metaphor is a testimony to the development of associative communication and artistic imagination in speakers of different languages, and functions as a mediator between the human mind and culture. The intrinsic form of nationally-labeled metaphors is anthropometric in nature, capable of reproducing the national identity of the language collective.

Its power is manifested in the comparison of metaphors of different languages, resulting in the detection of a considerable number of lacunae, white spots in the semantics of one of the languages that arise as a result of the lack of a verbal equivalent word from another language. These are cases where the internal form of the metaphor otherwise depicts the processes of linguistic consciousness of different languages. Their study is given particular attention.

Tropes play a creative role in the renewal of thought, the birth of a new idea, showing a potential opportunity to manipulate public consciousness. The manipulative properties of figures and tropes differ in strength – the figures are inferior to the tropes.

The iconism of a figure is its semiotic property, serving as a syntactic diagram of the flow of feelings.

The value of politicians' language is created by antithesis, oxymoron, irony. These figures are regarded as their favorite, as they are used in his speeches very often. The antithesis can be implemented at the level of expression or at the level of the whole text, acting as a compositional technique. The manipulative potency of antithesis is based on the use of opposition to cognitive categories:

- *To be sure we've **won** and we've **lost**, but we've never stopped fighting.*

[KHKOPCO]

- *The church contains in full the **kindness** and **cruelty**, the fierce **intelligence** and the shocking **ignorance**, the **struggles** and **successes**, the **love** and yes, the **bitterness** and **bias**.* [PBODNCS]

- *I will be a president for those who **vote** for me and those who **don't**.* [HCCS]

- *Politicians **prospered**, but the jobs **left**, and the factories **closed**.*

[DTCSKR]

The irregularity and paradox of Biden's political style are supported by the use of metaphor, metonymy, epithet, oxymoron, zeugma and pun. For example:

- *"This is kind of a **bittersweet moment** for Jill and me and our family".*

[JBDNCS] – epithet.

- *"These are the **people** who **are the heart and soul** of this country".* [JBDNCS] – metaphor.

- *"And folks, because of the decisions he has made, and the incredible strength of the American people, **America** has turned a corner".* [VPBCS] – metonymy.

The use of epithets in this passage makes the speech emotional, exciting. Obama calls freedom and equality precious, noble concepts, linking their importance to the Scriptures and divine teachings, emphasizing that all people have the same right to them.

- *"But we ought not – we will not – travel down that **hellish** path blindly"*

[SATI].

Metaphor and epithet work at deeper levels of human consciousness, and pun, oxymoron, and zeugma influence irrational perception without requiring excessive mental effort from the recipient. These linguistic tools are designed for elliptical reading, which is typical of an “average” audience.

Therefore, we can speak of their hedonistic and subordinated tactics of solidarity. Because of its logical nature, zeugma is a tool for making fun of, creating fun, and due to its suddenness, it becomes a lever for correcting emotional tension.

Emotional and expressive vocabulary are predominantly presented as lexical-semantic means of evaluation: stylistic figures (23 %) (antithesis, oxymoron, etc.) and tropes (77%) (hyperbole, metaphor, irony, epithet, etc.). Expression of vibrancy, originality, make the interlocutor uncritically accept the facts desired for the manipulator.

3.1.3 Manipulation on the syntactic level

At the syntactic level, the manipulative effect is achieved by using foregrounding, namely its transitive means of communication, alternation of active and passive states, elements of modality, nominalization, increasing the value of the first word of expression. with the use of banal phrases before submitting manipulative information, logical statements, complex subcontracts, emphatic constructions, etc. In terms of realizing the manipulative potential, considerable attention is paid to:

- 1) stylistic figures (36 %);
- 2) tropes (64 %).

They give the text more dynamic, more expressive, enhance its expressiveness and persuasive potential. Significant role in manipulative speech influence is played by indicators of subjectivity of judgment (believe me, trust me, you know, repetition of pronoun I, etc.), which create the effect of unobtrusiveness, but at the same time, make the recipient perceive manipulative information without rationalizing it.

Among the expressive means at the syntactic level in political speeches are the ellipse, apopiopesis, and emphatic constructions. The ellipse broadens the invariance of the content, causes completion, deliberation, but in the path laid by the

addressee. The ellipse simplifies the construction of the sentence, minimizes the amount of information and speeds it up with the recipient:

- “**Whether** you voted for the very first time or waited in line for a very long time, **whether** you pounded the pavement or picked up the phone, **whether** you held an Obama sign or a Romney sign, you made your voice heard and you made a difference” [PBODNCS]

- “**Everybody knows she's smart, everybody knows she's tough. But I know** what she's passionate about, **I know Hillary**”. [JBDNCS]

- “**It moves forward because of you. It moves forward because you reaffirmed the spirit that has triumphed over war and depression**”. [BOVS]

It is the secularity of the linguistic norm regarding the obligatory presence of the auxiliary verb, as well as the verb conjunction, that makes it possible to use such sentences without losing the efficiency of information transmission. The omission of the value element of a preposition, that is, the transmission of the meaning of the whole structure only by means of a modal or auxiliary verb, or the infinitive part to, is regarded as a representation, a phenomenon “intermediate between the ellipse and the substitution”. Using full sentences would be excessive.

Aposiopesis is a technique of suppressing information that in a certain context performs a manipulative function. Aposiopesis sudden abruptness of content and form creates a situation where the producer forces the recipient to switch from entertaining mode to rational perception, to create the illusion of the addressee's self-decision, to draw the necessary conclusion:

- “**It is ... it is worth it**”. [BCCS]

- “**And tonight— and tonight — tonight I want to acknowledge — I want to acknowledge, as we should every night, the incredible debt we owe to the families of those 6,473 fallen angels and those 49,746 wounded**”. [BSSSPJE]

The stylistic figures are based on techniques such as polysyndeton, rhetorical question, lexical repetition, anadiplosis, syntactic parallelism, modal structures, chiasmus ellipse, parenchyma, etc.

- 1) Polysindetone:

- “We - thank you for your graceful, determined leadership that has meant so much to so many Americans **and** people across the world. **And** to Bill and Chelsea, Mark, Charlotte, Aidan, our brothers **and** our entire family. **And** to the millions of volunteers, community leaders, activists **and** union organizers”. [HCCS]

- “This country has more wealth than any nation, **but** that's not what makes us rich. We have the most powerful military in history, **but** that's not what makes us strong. Our university, our culture are all the envy of the world, **but** that's not what keeps the world coming to our shores”. [BOVS]

2) Rhetorical questions:

- “What if I get breast cancer or he has a heart attack? I will lose everything. What will we do then?” [JBDNCS]

- “How is this going to affect the average American? How is this going to affect people's lives?” [VPBCS]

Rhetorical questions give the text a special expression, emotionality, increase the tension of speech, convey the emotion of the speaker, make empathize, reflect. The speaker pushes the listener to give himself an answer to the question, and at the same time convinces him that this is the only correct answer.

From the point of view of oratory, the whether particle introducing an indirect question makes it weaker, because after the question is asked the supposed pause does not follow, as it happens when the classical question is posed. Barack Obama says:

- “What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people” [ROPBO].

On the one hand, he partially achieves his goal – the public is sincerely convinced of the strengthening of democracy. On the other hand, Obama does not even try to answer this question and does not give such an opportunity to the audience, regardless of whether this answer is voiced verbally or nonverbally. Consequently, we can talk about the unsuccessful use of the rhetorical issue in the speech of the former US President.

Rhetorical questions differ from ordinary questions in that they are essentially affirmations, and questions only in form. It is this change of sentence type that enables us to refer such questions to this group of stylistic means:

- “*Saudi Arabia, nothing but money. We protect Saudi Arabia. Why aren't they paying?*” [ROPBO].
- “*How stupid are our leaders?*” [ROPBO].

The use of rhetorical questions helps politicians create a problematic situation, thereby causing a psychological pause during which the public can think about the whole significance of the problem.

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

Barack Obama uses a rhetorical question to enhance speech:

- “*What change will they see? What progress will we have made?*” [PBOFIS].

3) Stylistic intensifiers:

Taking into consideration examples above, we see that words such as *really*, *absolutely*, *definitely*, *exactly*, *quite*, *rather* and others are used in political speeches in order to give even more significance to what has been said. These phrases have an amplifying effect:

- “*I've had successes and I've had setbacks. Sometimes, **really** painful ones*”. [HCCS]
- “*I don't think he's a bad guy. I'm **absolutely** sure he grew up loving cars as much as I did*”. [VPBCS]
- “*It proved that Americans **really** are hungry for a new kind of politics, rooted in the values that we share*”. [PBSTOER]

4) Repetitions.

Repetitions acquire various functions. It should be emphasized that the primary function of using repetitions is a logical emphasis. This is done in order to draw the attention of the listener to key information, to focus on the statement.

- “**Politics is not about** the horse race, not about the debate stage, or a precinct count in a spreadsheet. **Politics is about** real people’s lives. **Politics is about** our paychecks, our families, our futures”. [PBSTOER]

- “This is not the outcome **we** wanted or **we** worked so hard for and I'm sorry that **we** did not win this election for the values **we** share and the vision **we** hold for our country”. [HCCS]

- “But you know what, **we** talk about, **we** think about the countless thousands of other people who suffered so much more than **we** have”. [JBDNCS]

By emphasizing the repetition of the pronoun ‘we’ the speaker equates himself with the listeners, creates the effect of collective identity and parity, and also shares responsibility with the audience.

Repetitions also play a significant role in creating an accent or some rhythm, as they can both create it and disturb it. In any case, this will affect the general mood and atmosphere of speech. By repeating certain sounds, words, expressions, we emphasize the main information, as well as convey the emotional state of the speaker.

- “Think of **how proud** of our time **we could be** if we really did act to make it so that no one has to take to the streets in America for a decent wage. Imagine **how proud we would be** to be the generation that saw the day when your race has no bearing on your health, or your wealth”. [PBSTOER]

When we speak about a stylistic device that consists in repeating some sounds, words or phrases at the beginning of a sentence, we deal with anaphora. This tool is quite often used to enhance the emotional part of speech, to create an elevated tone or to highlight the most important, according to the author, pieces of text.

In the following examples from the Pete Buttigieg’s speech, the speaker uses the anaphoric beginning of sentences to emphasize the need for specific actions and the results of their implementation.

- “**We need** leadership to heal a divided nation, not drive us further apart. **We need** a broad based agenda that can truly deliver for the American people, not one that gets lost in ideology. **We need** an approach strong enough not only to

win the White House, but to hold the House, win the Senate, and send Mitch McConnell into retirement”. [PBSTOER]

In the following example, Barack Obama emphasizes that in order to achieve the set goals, diligent and persistent efforts are needed, thereby sharing his responsibility with the audience.

- *“If you want more justice in the justice system, then we’ve all got to vote – not just for a President, but for mayors, and sheriffs, and state’s attorneys, and state legislators. If you want to fight climate change, we’ve got to engage not only young people on college campuses, we’ve got to reach out to the coal miner who’s worried about taking care of his family, the single mom worried about gas prices. If you want to protect our kids and our cops from gun violence, we’ve got to get the vast majority of Americans, including gun owners, who agree on background checks to be just as vocal and just as determined as the gun lobby that blocks change through every funeral that we hold”*. [BOVS]

Along with the use of the pronoun ‘we’ is the use of the word ‘our’. Such a repetition not only connects the sentence with the previous one, it also brings the speaker closer to the people, creating the effect of unity. The pronoun ‘our’ emphasizes inclusiveness established by the pronoun we.

- *“And in the coming weeks and months, I am looking forward to reaching out and working with leaders of both parties to meet the challenges we can only solve together – reducing **our** deficit, reforming **our** tax code, fixing **our** immigration system, freeing ourselves from foreign oil. We’ve got more work to do”*. [BOVS]

- *“**Our** goal has always been to help unify Americans to defeat Donald Trump and to win the era for **our** values. And so we must recognize that at this point in the race, the best way to keep faith with those goals and ideals is to step aside and help bring **our** party and **our** country together”*. [PBSTOER]

Speculating on the topic of unity, Barack Obama uses the persuasive potential of anaphora in his speech, discussing the success of Americans in the world arena, and repeatedly repeats the pronoun ‘our’:

- *“**Our** workers are no less productive than when this crisis began. **Our** minds are no less inventive, **our** goods and services no less needed than they were last week or last month or last year. **Our** capacity remains undiminished” [IA].*

- Either declaring his plans to improve the situation in the country, he repeatedly uses the ‘we will’ construction:

- *“**We will** build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our commerce and bind us together. **We will** restore science to its rightful place, and wield technology's wonders to raise health care's quality and lower its cost. **We will** harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories” [IA].*

As we see, use of the pronoun ‘we’ is an integral feature of most politicians’ speeches. Thus, the speaker compares himself with society, forming a sense of value for each of the listeners. Repeating the phrase ‘we will’ in the examples below, Kamala Harris emphasizes that in the process of future changes and the transformation of America, it is important for each of the citizens of the country to participate.

- *“**We will** deliver that right with Medicare for All! **We will** guarantee that right with universal pre-k and debt free college! **We will** deliver the largest working and middle-class tax cut in a generation”.* [KHKOPCO]

- *“**We will** secure our elections and our critical infrastructure to protect our democracy. And **we will** honor our service members and veterans – so no one who has served this country has to wait in line for weeks and months to get what they are owed when they return home on first day”.* [KHKOPCO]

On the basis of collected media texts of J. Biden’s, H. Clinton’s, B. Obama’s, D. Trump’s, K. Hariss’ political discourse and on the basis of our research, we propose our classification of linguistic methods and techniques of manipulation. Within one article, it is impossible to give a complete and exhaustive description of the functioning of the linguistic elements used for explicating illicit means of speech behavior and speech influence.

Language, as a system that is subject to constant functional reorientations, clearly manifests itself within the framework of equally mobile political discourse, and this requires constant analysis both from the standpoint of language and from the standpoint of socio-political aspects.

3.1.4 Manipulation on the supersyntactic level

Supersyntactic level is the textual level. In our work we have represented some means of manipulation on this level, too. Many units of political language mean complexes of ideas far removed from direct human experience. Taking into account the Sternum's classification, the following groups of ideas (intentions) were identified during the study:

1) silencing the facts:

- *“Those who are responsible for your misfortunes, the warmongers guilty of the defeat, you know them.” [RRPC]*

The speaker makes reference to a specific person or group of people who, in his opinion, are atrocious and indecent. But he talks about them without using any keywords and without directly indicating the names of these people or the facts of their misdeeds.

Thus, each listener is able to determine for himself who this nameless enemy is. Moreover, in order to clearly understand who it is about, the audience must be well-versed in the political field and recent history.

2) soothing the audience:

It's no secret that the success of a politician depends on the trust of citizens and faith in his words. In order to win their support, it is crucial for a successful politician to be able to gain public's favor and reassure people. That is why Biden at the beginning of the next example praises the audience for what they have done for the country, making them believe in their significance for the fate of the whole country. Using the auxiliary verb 'will', which indicates the future tense, the politician assures the public that they will be rewarded for their faith and deeds:

- *You didn't lose faith. You fought back. You didn't give up; you got up. (Cheers, applause.) You're the ones, the American people, you're the ones. You're the reason why we are still better-positioned than any country in the world to lead the 21st century. (Cheers, applause.) You never quit on America. And you deserve a president who will never quit on you. [VPBCS]*

- *I firmly believe that in these years, in our time, we can and will make American life and politics more like what it could be, not just more wise and more prosperous, but more equitable, and more just, and more decent. [PBSTOER]*

The situation is exactly the same in the example above: Buttigieg makes the public believe in the bright future of the country.

3) exhortations:

- *"I've had successes and I've had setbacks. Sometimes, really painful ones. Many of you are at the beginning of your professional public and political careers. You will have successes and setbacks, too". [HCCS].*

The key to success of a politician is his ability to convince and influence the public. It is important to bear in mind that people can understand much more complex things when they read, but not when they listen. That is why it is important to state thoughts clearly and accurately, to formulate short and intelligible sentences, which is illustrated in the abovementioned example.

4) persuasion:

To make up a convincing speech, politicians often use the 'problem-solution' structure, which is based on statements like "This is the problem, why everything is bad. But what we can do to solve it". Hillary Clinton resorts to strong and loud expressions to show the seriousness of her intentions and understanding of the issue.

- *"The country is at a crossroads. But I still believe as deeply as I ever have that if we stand together and work together with respect for our differences, strength in our convictions and love for this nation, our best days are still ahead of us". [HCCS]*

In order to gain the trust of the audience, many politicians turn to people's emotions and feelings, referring to people close to their hearts. Indeed, in order to

convince and prove that something is true, it is ineffective to refer to dry facts or statistics. Many politicians influence the public by betting on emotionally compelling stories.

- *It's about saving the mom and the dad from the indignity of having to look at their talented child and say, sonny, honey, I'm so sorry, the bank wouldn't lend me the money, I can't help you to get to school.* [JBDNCS]

- *I've been made strong at the broken places by my love, Jill, by my heart, my son, Hunter, and the love of my life, my Ashley.* [JBDNCS]

5) self-justification:

The need for self-justification can be underpinned by the need to improve one's self-esteem or maintain beliefs, since the image of a politician plays a key role in his persuasiveness and success.

This is the process of justifying oneself, one's actions or choices, which is based on various reasons, explanations, justifications and so on, which is demonstrated in the following cases:

- *"We may have battled fiercely, but it's only because we love this country deeply and we care so strongly about its future".* [BOVS]

- *"I was wrong. Because if I understood that America's heart had to be healed, I would have done exactly what the president did".* [JBDNCS]

6) substantiation:

- *"They are not for any of them. Why? Because they're not prepared to do anything about the debt if it contained even one dollar — I'm not exaggerating — even one dollar or one cent in new taxes for millionaires".* [VPBCS]

- *"We have to because every time this President brings partisan politics into the management of a deadly serious pandemic, or purges officials who honored their oaths of office by telling the truth, or cloaks in religious language an administration whose actions harm the least among us, the sick and the poor, the outcast and the stranger, we are reminded just how urgent it is that we change who is in the White House".* [PBSTOER]

Analyzing political speeches, one can also distinguish such groups of intentions as:

1) Promises:

- *“But as we work to improve Americans’ healthcare, there are those who want to take away your healthcare, take away your doctor, and abolish private insurance entirely” [TSOTUS].*

This intention implies a change in attitude and opinion of the listeners, because usually after successful promises, the speaker becomes affectionate.

- *“I will not be running for President in 2020, but I guarantee I will stay in the fight for the hardworking folks across this country who have gotten the short end of the stick over and over” [EWODOOPR].*

The words “intend, improve, reach, certain” as well as a modal verb expressing intention, determination, and promise, will testify to the “spirit” of the promise:

- *“If you want to fight climate change, we’ve got to engage not only young people on college campuses, we’ve got to **reach** to the coal miner who’s worried about taking care of his family, the single mom worried about gas prices”. [PBODNCS]*

- *“And I know for **certain** — I know for certain that my dad, were he here today, he’d be fighting like heck for the president, because the president fought to save the jobs of those people my dad cared so much about”. [VPBCS]*

2) Criticism:

- *“His lack of empathy and compassion can be summed up in the phrase I suspect he’s most proud of having made famous, ‘You’re fired’. I mean, really, I’m not joking, think about that. How can there be pleasure in saying you’re fired? He’s trying to tell us he cares about the middle class? Give me a break. That’s a bunch of malarkey”. [BSSSPJF]*

To provide manipulative influence on the addressee, the addressee uses references to the values of American society, such as democracy, unity, freedom, liberty, security, safety, protection, wealth, prosperity, faith and some others, and positively colored vocabulary is also used: hope, dream, love, goodness, strength, guidance, friends, respect, unify, help, win, fantastic, great, etc.:

- *“But tyranny will be smashed and broken. Here this evening is a man who carries with him the hopes, dreams, and aspirations of all Venezuelans. Joining us in the gallery is the true and legitimate President of Venezuela, Juan Gueridon. Thank you, Mr. President. Great honor. Thank you very much”* (TSUS).

To strengthen the manipulative influence in the political discourse of D. Trump, parallel constructions and lexicon-syntactic repetition are used, which is understood as a construct that reproduces the formal or semantic structure of the previous sentence. In the analyzed cases, anaphora and parallel constructions are often used, for example:

- *“Thank you, Mr. President. Great honor. Thank you very much. Please take this message back that all Americans are united with the Venezuelan people in their righteous struggle for freedom! Socialism destroys nations. But always remember, freedom unifies the soul”* [TSUS].

The adjectives used in D. Trump’s political discourse give speech a colloquial character and increase its expressiveness. The most frequent adjectives in the analyzed public appeals, expressing an assessment: great, unbelievable, fantastic, special, incredible, amazing. For example:

- *“The next step forward in building an inclusive society is making sure that every young American gets a great education and the opportunity to achieve the American Dream. Yet, for too long, countless American children have been trapped in failing government schools”* [TSUS].

As a result of the analysis of political discourse, certain discursive means can be distinguished that help to increase the argumentativeness of the presentation. These include transferring the circumstances of time and place to the starting position in a sentence, especially to the beginning of a paragraph. The value of the temporal localization of the action acts as the actualization category of the statement, which provides the information focus. The same function is performed by the transfer to the initial position additions, for example:

- *“So, to all Americans, in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, and from ocean to ocean, hear these words: You will never be ignored again”* [TSUS].

In the given example, the theatrical strategy was used, namely, promises of a better future for the entire population of the country, regardless of place of residence, are made.

It should be noted that in the mass consciousness of every nation there is a certain ideal image-stereotype of a political leader with a number of traits adequate in every political situation. Such an ideal standard is formed in sharp social groups and reflects habits, priorities, needs, and, ultimately, determines the group choice of one or another politician. The ideal standard can be conditionally divided into some important (in a certain social group) traits, which will become the main components of the choice. A political leader whose image fits this list of qualities has a great chance of becoming known.

Conclusions to Chapter 3

We have analyzed manipulation as part of power technology on the different levels: morphological, lexical, syntactic and super syntactic. Manipulation, beginning at the phonological level, reaches its apogee at the semantic level, since it is the most “unstable” linguistic level. The success of the manipulation, as well as the symbolic power, is facilitated by its hidden nature and thus invisibility to the addressee. And we can conclude that:

According to the results of morphological analysis of factual material, the most commonly used explicit language expressions of expression in manipulative replicas are adjectives (17 %), nouns (12 %), verbs (12 %), adverbs (6 %), rarely pronouns (3 %), numerals (2 %), exclamations (2 %) and their conjugations (46 %). Modal verbs and modal words (possibly, probably, sure) (38 %), some connectives (but) (5 %) and particles (not, even, yet, still, though, etc.) (26 %), unspecified pronouns (27 %) have implicit potentials, etc.

Emotional and expressive vocabulary are predominantly presented as lexical-semantic means of evaluation: stylistic figures (23 %) (antithesis, oxymoron, etc.) and tropes (77%) (hyperbole, metaphor, irony, epithet, etc.). Expression of vibrancy, originality make the interlocutor uncritically accept the facts desired for the manipulator.

At the syntactic level, the manipulative effect is achieved by using foregrounding, namely its transitive means of communication, alternation of active and passive states, elements of modality, nominalization, increasing the value of the first word of expression. with the use of banal phrases before submitting manipulative information, logical statements, complex subcontracts, emphatic constructions, etc. In terms of realizing the manipulative potential, considerable attention is paid to: stylistic figures (36 %) and tropes (64 %). They give the text more dynamic, more expressive, enhance its expressiveness and persuasive potential, create the effect of unobtrusiveness, but at the same time, make the recipient perceive manipulative information without rationalizing it..

Supersyntactic level is the highest level of language and it has text as its level unit. In this paper we have represented the following groups of manipulative intentions: silencing the facts, soothing the audience, exhortations, persuasion, self-justification, substantiation, promises and criticism.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Political discourse reveals the way cultural values and social order are imposed in different societies. This type of discourse includes a variety of political discussions in the society, including ones with the politicians and officials and public rhetoric. The lack of consensus among linguists on the definition of discourse raises the problem of creating a typology.

The selection of a particular principle of discourse classification depends on its relevance to the modern linguistic paradigm and direction of research. Formal, functional, meaningful criteria can be the basis for distinguishing relevant types of discourse. The appearance of new types and subtypes leads to updating of the classification.

Political discourse is considered specific since it possesses a number of peculiar features or characteristics. In their speech, politicians use particular terms and notions, which means that their vocabulary is professional, at the same time common words and phrases when used in political content might possess a different meaning opposed to their usual one. The structure of political discourse is also specific, as it is comprised of particular speech strategies typical of political discourse.

Today's volatility in the world requires numerous international interpretations, and as a result, there is growing interest in learning about verbal manipulation. Language means of influence have always been an integral part of political discourse, as politicians try to pursue their intentions by any means. In today's world, manipulation is a universal phenomenon, it can be detected in all socially significant areas of human activity.

Scientists believe that there is a divergence between the concepts of tactics and strategy. In our work, we hold the opinions of the majority and understand the terms as identical. Analysis of theoretical sources showed that there are many classifications of manipulative techniques. Exploring the selected issues it was found that the most

exhaustive, in our opinion, is the classification proposed by the scientist N. D. Arutyunova, it became the main for the classification of the given examples in the work.

The main difference between leaders' speeches is emotional coloring. For instance, Donald Trump concentrates on negative events, trying to blacken even the achievements of his predecessors. In turn, J. Biden tries to profitably deliver unsatisfactory results, calling them useful experiences.

Linguistic manipulation is influence exercised by one person upon another or a group of people through speech and non-verbal means oriented toward achieving a certain goal that consists in changing of the addressee's behavior, perceptions and intentions in the course of communicative interaction.

We have analyzed that there are two types of emotional manipulation – direct and indirect. According to awareness of linguistic actions, manipulation can be intentional and non-intentional. According to the type of linguistic action, manipulation can be: social, volitional, informational and estimative. Perlocutionary criterion (addressee's reaction) presents basis for discrimination of the following types of linguistic manipulation: evaluative, emotional and rational. According to orientation towards the interlocutor, manipulation can be person-oriented and society-oriented. Every type of linguistic manipulation can facilitate regulation of interlocutor's activity and change his behavior.

We have analyzed manipulation as part of power technology on the different levels: morphological, lexical, syntactic and super syntactic. And we can conclude that according to the results of morphological analysis of factual material, the most commonly used explicit language expressions in manipulative replicas are adjectives, nouns, verbs, adverbs, pronouns, exclamations and their conjugations. Modal verbs and modal words, unspecified pronouns, some connectives and particles have implicit potentials. Emotional and expressive vocabulary are predominantly presented as lexical-semantic means of evaluation: stylistic figures (23 %) and tropes (77%).

At the syntactic level, the manipulative effect is achieved by using foregrounding, namely its transitive means of communication, alternation of active and passive states, elements of modality, nominalization, increasing the value of the first word of expression

with the use of banal phrases before submitting manipulative information, logical statements, complex subcontracts, emphatic constructions, etc. In terms of realizing the manipulative potential, considerable attention is paid to stylistic figures (36 %) and tropes (64 %).

Supersyntactic level is the highest level of language and it has text as its level unit. In this paper we have represented the following groups of manipulative intentions: silencing the facts, soothing the audience, exhortations, persuasion, self-justification, substantiation, promises and criticism.

SUMMARY

Many terms that are used in the research field are characterized in multifaceted and contradictory way. The question of the dynamism of the term “discourse” in terms of its semantic variation is quite logical and justified, since in recent decades it has been widely used in the linguistic field. Perhaps this was facilitated by the fact that there is still no clear and universally accepted definition of this concept, which would describe all its versatility and cover all possible cases of use.

In our work we adhere to the definition of the discourse of N. D. Arutynova, according to which “discourse is a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic – pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors; this is an event-based text; it is a speech that is seen as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes). Discourse is an “immersed in life” speech, where discourse itself is intertwined with interpersonal communication. In such an interpretation, the discourse appears as an expanded understanding of the text, as a text immersed in a specific communicative situation with knowledge about the participants in the communication and the conditions of the situation.

What is more, lack of consensus among linguists on the definition of discourse raises the problem of creating a typology. The selection of a particular principle of discourse classification depends on its relevance to the modern linguistic paradigm and direction of research. In our opinion, all typologies are worth attention, but the typology presented by O. Pocheptsov is more appropriate for our master’s thesis.

In this paper, we have investigated the manipulation in political discourse, particularly in pre-election speeches. This is a complex problem, and to simplify it required a meticulous and rigorous study of the many manipulative techniques that are widely used by politicians in their appeals to the people.

Politics is truly a social phenomenon, because it does not exist outside of human activity and the communication processes that regulate and link socio-political life. It should be emphasized that the key goal of political communication

is not informing the public or transmitting any information, but the formation of a given attitude of the audience to a specific person, event or idea.

The problems associated with the use of language in the framework of political discourse are a frequent topic of discussion in the media and the scientific community. The people's interest in politics is growing, and the need for a more detailed examination of such a phenomenon as manipulation in political discourse is growing as well.

The speech behavior of the subject of political discourse should be understood as a multifaceted and complex phenomenon, which is determined by the intentions of the communicant. Politicians in the struggle for power use all possible means, and authors of political texts carefully select manipulative tactics and strategies for implementing political discourse.

The fundamental feature of political discourse is manipulateness, that is, the ability of political discourse to exert a latent impact through speech means on the audience in order to control the perception of reality.

Manipulation can be identified with control over the behavior of people introducing ideas, thoughts and ideas into the mind with the help of massive dissemination of information deliberately prepared in a certain form and content. The success of the manipulation, as well as the symbolic power, is facilitated by its hidden nature and thus invisibility to the addressee.

In order to convince the public to do one way or another, politicians resort to the use of both emotional beliefs that focus on the personality value system or the vulnerable sides of human nature, their preferences and beliefs, and logical ones that are evidence-based and refer to certain facts. Moreover, in order to have control over a person's behavior and deprive him of freedom of choice, politicians can use language clichés, archetypical images, labels in their appeals to citizens, address the weaknesses of a person's psyche - his passions or fears, and also intentionally distort reality, hush up some facts and emphasize others.

Manipulation of consciousness and behavior implies the existence of the subject and object of manipulation, influence on the motivational sphere of the listener. These

and other factors form the basis for the main classification types of language manipulation covered in works in the field of linguistics and psychology.

Depending on the area of mental activity that is involved and dominates the communication process, language manipulation is divided into rational and emotional. In his attempts to influence the interlocutor's behavior, the speaker may influence his rational sphere. To do this, he uses compelling facts and arguments that affect people's minds. The purpose of emotional manipulation is to express the emotion of the speaker and to obtain from the listener a sensitive emotional reaction that will lead to changes in his behavior.

We have analyzed that there are two types of emotional manipulation – direct and indirect. According to the awareness of language actions, manipulation can be intentional and unintentional. By type of linguistic action, manipulation can be: social, volitional, informative and evaluative. The perlocution criterion (addressee's reaction) is the basis for the discrimination of the following types of language manipulation: evaluative, emotional and rational. According to the interlocutor orientation, the manipulation can be oriented towards the individual and the society. Each type of language manipulation can make it easier to regulate the interlocutor's activity and change his or her behavior.

Language is known to consist of three components: phonological, syntactic and semantic. Manipulation, beginning at the phonological level, reaches its apogee at the semantic level, since it is the most “unstable” linguistic level

According to the results of morphological analysis of factual material, the most commonly used explicit language expressions of expression in manipulative replicas are adjectives (17 %), nouns (12 %), verbs (12 %), adverbs (6 %), rarely pronouns (3 %), numerals (2 %), exclamations (2 %) and their conjugations (46 %). Modal verbs and modal words (possibly, probably, sure) (38 %), some connectives (but) (5 %) and particles (not, even, yet, still, though, etc.) (26 %), unspecified pronouns (27 %) have implicit potentials.

In general, all of the above-mentioned means, as parts of language, do not have an influence function, but in the specific combination of lexical-semantic

meaning that they reflect, and according to the intentions of the speakers, morphological means acquire pervasive potential.

The use of lexical means of language is presented as one of the most used methods of language manipulation. This is due to a number of factors: firstly, lexical tools have an emotive character; secondly, lexical means include various forms of expression inherent in the colloquial style of speech used most often in interpersonal communication.

Emotional and expressive vocabulary are predominantly presented as lexical-semantic means of evaluation: stylistic figures (23 %) (antithesis, oxymoron, etc.) and tropes (77%) (hyperbole, metaphor, irony, epithet, etc.). Expression of vibrancy, originality, make the interlocutor uncritically accept the facts desired for the manipulator.

Supersyntactic level is the highest level of language and it has text as its level unit. In this paper we have represented the following groups of manipulative intentions: silencing the facts, soothing the audience, exhortations, persuasion, self-justification, substantiation, promises and criticism.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

1. Акопова Д. Р. Стратегии и тактики политического дискурса / Д. Р. Акопова. // Вестник. – 2013. – С. 403–405.
2. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека / Н.Д. Арутюнова. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999. 896 с.
3. Баранов А.Н., Паршин П.Б. К построению словаря терминов когнитивной науки / А.Н. Баранов. Когнитивные исследования за рубежом: Методы искусственного интеллекта. М., 1990. 139-149 с.
4. Басирова К. В. Современные лингвистические теории. Проблемы слова, предложения, текста / К. В. Басирова. Иркутск : Иркутский государственный лингвистический университет, 2012. - 209 с.
5. Бахтин М.М. Проблема речевых жанров // Бахтин М.М. Собрание сочинений. — М. : Русские словари, 1996. — Т. 5. — С. 159–206.
6. Белова А.Д. Лингвистические аспекты аргументации/ Белова Алла Дмитриевна – Киев, 1997. – 300с.
7. Білодід І. К. Словник української мови / І. К. Білодід. Київ : Наукова думка, 1970. С. 284.
8. Бобровская Г. В. Газетный дис курс в проблемном поле коммуникативно-прагматической лингвистики [Электронный ресурс] / Г. В. Бобровская // Грани познания. 2011. Режим доступа : <http://grani.vspu.ru/files/publics/1325146149.pdf>.
9. Быкова О. Н. Языковое манипулирование / О. Н. Быкова. – Краснодар: Офсет, 1999. – 103 с.
10. Варламова Е. В. Отличительные особенности политического дискурса / Гуманитарные исследования. М., 2011. № 2 (38). 45-50 с.
11. Воїнов В.В. Соціально-оціночні номінації у контексті культури США. – К.: Либідь, 1994. – 144 с. – С. 8-14.

12. Демьянов В.З. Англо-русские термины по прикладной лингвистике и автоматической переработке текста. Методы английского текста. / В.З. Демьянов. Вып. 2: Тетради новых терминов. М: ВПТС, 1982. 90 с.
13. Ковешникова М. Н. Речевая манипуляция и приемы речевого манипулирования / М. Н. Ковешникова. – 2014. – С. 387–394.
14. Колегаева И. М. Хронотоп газетного дискурсу [Электронный ресурс] / И. М. Колегаева. Режим доступа : <http://liber.onu.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/123456789/4585/1/107-113.pdf>
15. Колегаева И. М. Хронотоп газетного дискурсу [Электронный ресурс] / И. М. Колегаева. Режим доступа: <http://liber.onu.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/123456789/4585/1/107->
16. Косериу Е. Современное положение в лингвистике / Е. Косериу // Известия АН СССР. Серия литературы и языка, 1977. № 6. С. 45–47.
17. Кубрякова Е.С. Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения / Е.С. Кубрякова. М.: Ин-т языкознания РАН, 1997. 237 с.
18. Литунов С. Н. Речевое воздействие в текстах [Электронный ресурс] / С. Н. Литунов. – 2017. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <http://www.ipnpou.ru/article.php?idarticle=003157>.
19. Макаров М. Л. Интерпретативный анализ дискурса в малой группе / М. Л. Макаров. Тверь : Изд-во Твер. гос. ун-та, 1998. 200 с.
20. Мегентесов С. А. Лингвистические аспекты психологического воздействия и премов манипуляции / С. А. Мегентесов. – Краснодар, 1997. – 111 с.
21. Москаленко В.В. Психологія соціального впливу. Навч. Пос. К. Центр учбової літератури, 2007. 448 с.
22. Орлов Г. А. Современная английская речь / Г. А. Орлов. - М. : Высшая школа, 1991. - 240 с.
23. Перельгут Н. М. О структуре понятия «дискурс» / Н. М. Перельгут, Е. Б. Сухоцкая. – 2013. – С. 6.

24. Почепцов Г.Г. Язык и юмор / Г.Г. Почепцов. Киев: Вища школа, 1974. 320 с.
25. Степанов Ю. С. Между системой и текстом – дискурс / Ю. С. Степанов // Язык и метод. К современной философии языка. М. : Языки русской культуры, 1998. С. 655–688.
26. Таценко Н. В. Реалізація емпатії в сучасному англomовному дискурсі: когнітивно-синергетичний аспект / Н. В. Таценко. Суми : Сумський державний університет, 2017.
27. Фоменко О. С. Лінгвістичний аналіз сучасного політичного дискурсу США (90-ті роки ХХ століття) : автореферат дис. на здобуття наук.ступеня канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04 – германські мови / О. С. Фоменко. – К., 1998. – 20 с.
28. Халатян А. Б. К проблеме изучения дискурса / А. Б. Халатян. // Научная мысль Кавказа. – 2010. – С. 128.
29. Чернявская В. Е. Речевое воздействие в политическом, рекламном и интернет-дискурсе / В. Е. Чернявская. – Москва: ЛЕНАНД, 2017. – 321 с.
30. Чудинов А.П. Россия в метафорическом зеркале: когнитивное исследование метафоры (1991-2000): [монография] / А.П. Чудинов. Екатеринбург: Урал. гос.пед. инст., 2001. 238 с.
31. Шейгал Е. И. Пространство политического дискурса // Полит. дискурс в России. 1999. № 3. С. 42.
32. Aitchison, J. Linguistics / J. Aitchison. London: NTS Publishing Group, 1992. 240 p.
33. Akopova A. Linguistic manipulation: definition and types / A. Akopova. Rostov-on-Don: (IJCRSEE) International Journal of Cognitive Research in science, engineering and education Vol. 1, No.2, 2013. P. 96–114.
34. Bakhtin, M. The problem of speech genres / In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds). Speech genres and other late essays. Austin: University of Austin Press, 1986. P. 60 –102.

35. Ball, W.J. Colloquial Idiom. London / W.J. Ball. – Toronto: Longmans, 1958. – 258 p.
36. Beard, A. The Language of Politics / A. Beard. London: Routledge, 2000. P. 21-76.
37. Bell D. M. Innuendo. Journal of Pragmatics / D.M. Bell. 1997. Vol. 27, № 1. P. 35–59.
38. Blakar R. Language as a means of social power. / Blakar. // Mouton. – 1987. – C. 131—169.
39. Bolinger D. Language – the Loaded Weapon: the Use and Abuse of Language Today. – N.Y.: Longman, 1980. – 224 p.
40. Borisenko V. A., Mkrtchyan T. Y. Language means in political discourse // Molodoy ucheny, 2015. № 23. P. 1076-1079.
41. Briscoe, D. How He Did It: The Inside Story of Campaign 2008 / D. Briscoe, E. Clift, K. Connolly, P. Goldman, D. Stone, N. Summers. – Newsweek, 2008. – P. 38–121.
42. Budaev E. Political Metaphors and Cultural Frames: An Example of the US and Russia / E. Budaev. Language, Gender and Politics. 2009. P. 265-274
43. Cap, P, Okulska U. Analyzing genres in political communication / P. Cap, U. Okulska. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2013. 426 p.
44. Chafe W. Integration and involvement in speaking, writing and oral literature. In D.Tannen (Ed.), Spoken and written language. Exploring orality and literacy. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1982. P. 33-53.
45. Clatworthy M. A., Jones M.J. Differential patterns of textual characteristics and company performance in the chairman's statement // Auditing and Accountability Journal. 2006. Vol. 19. No. 4. – P. 493-511.
46. Cook G. Discourse / G. Cook. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. 314 p.
47. Cook G. Discourse and Literature / G. Cook. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994. 285 p.

48. Deleuze, G., Foucault, M. / Translated from French by Semina E.V. Prolusion of Ilin I.P. Moscow: Humanitarian Literature Publ., 2006. 172 p.
49. Demiankov, V.Z. Effectiveness of Argumentation As Linguistic Manipulation // Problems of the Effectiveness of Speech Communication. Collection of scientific and analytical reviews. Moscow: INIONANUSSR, 1989. P. 13–40.
50. Dijk T. A. van. Ideology : A Multidisciplinary Approach / T. A. van Dijk. London : Sage, 1998. 147 p.
51. Dijk, T.A., Kinch, V. The Strategies of Understanding of Connected Text // New in Foreign Linguistics: 23rd ed. Moscow, 2008. P. 153–211.
52. Dikon, T.U. Modern Development of Language and Brain // Problems of General Linguistics. 1st ed.: Language Sign. Consciousness. Learning. Chrestomathy under the editorship of Mikhalev A.B. Publ. PGLU: Pyatigorsk, 2002. P. 224–231.
53. Dotcenko, E.L. Psychology of Manipulation: Phenomena, Mechanisms and Protection. Moscow: CheRo, 2003. 344 p.
54. Ermolaev, B.A. Goal Formation in Communication // Optimization of Linguistic Manipulation. Moscow: Nauka, 2007. 455 p.
55. Fairclough N. Genres in Political Discourse / N. Fairclough // Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics. Oxford : Elsevier Science Ltd., 2009. P. 293-298.
56. Fetzer A., Lauerbach G.E. Political discourse in the media: Crosscultural perspectives // Political discourse in the media: Cross-cultural perspectives / Edited by A. Fetzer, G.E. Lauerbach. – Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007. – P. 3-31.
57. Fontana D. The Secret Language of Symbols: A Visual Key to Symbols and Their Meaning. – San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1993. – 192 p.
58. Foucauet, M. The Archaeology of Knowledge. – London: Routledge, 1972. — 108 p.
59. Freedman, A., Medway P. Genre and the New Rhetoric. London: Taylor and Francis, 1995. 254 p.

60. Galperin, P.I. Introduction to Psychology/ P.I. Galperin. Moscow, 2007. 455 p.
61. Gee J. P. An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method / J.P. Gee. London: Routledge, 1999. 248 p.
62. Goikhman, O.I., Nadeina, T.M. Fundamentals of Linguistic Communication. Moscow: Ihfra-M, 2005. 269 p.
63. Goldin, V.E., Dubrovskaja, O.N. Genre Organization in the Aspect of Social Interactions // Speech Genres: Collection of scientific articles. 3rd ed., Saratov: Publ. GosUNTC "College", 2007. 318 p.
64. Gorelov, I.N., Sedov, K.F. Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics: Study Guide. Moscow: Labirint, 2005. 224 p.
65. Greenwood, J. The truth history of a little ragamuffin / J. Greenwood. – N.Y.: Harper & Bros, 1954. – 349 p.
66. Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – 367p.
67. Henderson, B.L.K. A Dictionary of English Idioms / B.L.K. Henderson. – London: J. Blackwood, 1954. – 759 p.
68. Henry, Frances, and Carol Tator. Discourses of Domination: Racial Bias in the Canadian English-Language Press. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2002 34 p.
69. Hinkel, Eli, and Sandra Fotos, editors. New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms. Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001 P. 233-260.
70. Hoey, M. Textual interaction: An introduction to written discourse analysis / M. Hoey. New York: Routledge, 2001. 125 p.
71. Issers O.S. What are politicians speak to the people to be pleasant / O. S. Issers. Bulletin of Omsk university. 1996. P. 71-74.
72. Lee, K.-K. Korea, Northeast Asian Economic Hub Country. Institute of International Relations and Area Studies, Ritsumeikan University / K.-K. Lee //International Affairs Journal. – 2004. – №2. – P. 1–25.

73. Liptak K. Obama's Exit Interview: I Could Have Won Again" CNN Politics [электронный ресурс] / К. Liptak// Режим доступа: <<http://edition.cnn.com/2016/12/26/politics/axe-files-president-obama/>>.
74. Little M. Discourse Communities and the Discourse of Experience [electronic resource] / Miles Jordens Little, Emma – Jane Sayers. – Australia: Centre for Values, Ethics and the Law in Medicine, University of Sydney, 2003. – Mode of access: <http://hea.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/7/1/73>.
75. Lyell Th. R. G. Slang, Phrase and idiom in Colloquial English and their use / Th. R. G. Lyell. – Tokyo, the Hokuseido press, 1931. – 818 p.
76. Malmkjaer K. The linguistics encyclopedia / К. Malmkjaer. – N.Y.: Routledge, 1996. – 304 p.
77. Martemianov, I.S. Speech Implicatures and Their Transformational Development // Implicitness in Language and Speech / Executive editor Borisova, E.G., Martemianov, I.S. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture, 2006. P. 187–192.
78. Mayr, A. Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse / Mayr A. – London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2008. – 204 p.
79. McCarthy M. Discourse analysis for language teachers / M. McCarthy. Cambridge: CUP, 1991. 222 p.
80. Megentesov, S.A. Linguistic Aspects of Psychic Influence and Methods of Manipulation. Krasnodar, 2008. 111 p.
81. Mills Sara Discourse / Sara Mills. Routledge, 1997. 177
82. Myers, G. The discourse of blogs and wikis / G. Myers. London: Continuum, 2010. 180 p.
83. Orwell, G. Politics and the English language / W. F. Bolton and D. Crystal, The English Language Vol. 2: Essays by Linguists and Men of Letters, 1858–1964. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. P. 217-230.
84. Potter, J. Discourse analysis / M. Hardy and A. Bryman (Eds.), Handbook of data analysis. London: Sage, 2004. P. 607–624.

85. Rathmayr R. Neue Elemente im russischen politischen Diskurs seit Gorbatschtow. Totalitare Sprache – langue de bois-language of dictatorship. Wien: Passagen, 1995. P. 195–214.
86. Renkema J. Introduction to discourse studies. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004. 363 p.
87. Richards A. Phylosophy of rithorics // Theory of metaphor / edited by Arutiunova N. and Zhurinskaya M. A. M., 1990. P. 44–67.
88. Safire W. The New Language of Politics / W. Safire. – N.Y., 1968. – 524 p.
89. Schiffrin D. Approaches to Discourse. Oxford / D.Schiffrin. Cambridge, Mass. : Basil Blackwell, 1994. 195 p.
90. Smith C. A. Candidate strategies in the 2004 presidential campaign: instrumental choices faced by the incumbent and his challengers / C. A. Smith // The 2004 presidential campaign: a communication perspective. – Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2005. – P. 131 – 151.
91. Sornig. K. Some remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion // Language, power and ideology. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1989. P. 95-113.
92. Talbot M. Media Discourse: Representation and Interaction (Media Topics) / M. Talbot. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007. – p. 198.
93. Trent Judith S. Political Campaign Communication Principles and Practices / Judith S. Trent, Robert V. Friendenberg. – Praeger, 1991.
94. van Dijk, T. A. Discourse and manipulation / T.A. van Dijk. Discourse and Sociaty. London: SAGE Publications, 2006. Vol. 17 (2). P. 359–383.
95. van Dijk, T. A. Discourse and racism / D. Goldberg & J. Solomos (Eds). The Blackwell companion to racial and ethnic studies. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. P. 145–159.
96. VanDijk T. A. What is Political Discourse Analysis / T.A. van Dijk. Belgian Journal of Linguistics. 1997. No 11. P. 11-52.

97. Wilson, J. *Political Discourse* / Schiffrin, D., D. Tannen, and H. E. Hamilton. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2001. P. 398 – 415.
98. Wodak R. *The Discourse of Politics in Action. Politics as Usual* / R. Wodak. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, p. 345
99. Zimniaia I.A. *Speech Mechanism In the Scheme of Speech Production // Psychological and Psycholinguistic Problems of Language Proficiency and Acquisition*. Moscow, 2006. 360 p.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

101. [BKAOEB] – Buttigieg, Klobuchar, and O’Rourke Endorse Biden in Dallas Rally. URL: <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/transcript-buttigieg-klobuchar-and-orourke-endorse-biden-in-dallas-rally>
102. [BOSUNGA] – Barack Obama's Speech to the UN General Assembly. URL: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/barackobama/11119048/Full-text-of-Barack-Obamas-speech-to-the-UN-General-Assembly.html>
103. [BOVS] – Barack Obama's Victory Speech. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/nov/07/barack-obama-speech-full-text>
104. [BSSSPJF] – Bernie Sanders: Second Step Presidential Justice Forum. URL: <https://www.cbsnews.com/video/bernie-sanders-discusses-fight-against-corporate-greed/>
105. [CUDD] – CNN-UNIVISION DEMOCRATIC DEBATE (6 VIDEOS). URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/videos/politics/2020/03/16/part-1-entire-cnn-univision-debate-washington-dc-sot-vpx.cnn/video/playlists/full-cnn-univision-democratic-debate-march-15-2020/>
106. [DTCSCR] – Donald Trump Charleston, South Carolina Rally. URL: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?469663-1/president-trump-campaign-event-north-charleston-south-carolina>.
107. [DTIWT] – Donald Trump's Interview With TIME on 2020. URL: <https://time.com/5611476/donald-trump-transcript-time-interview/>
108. [DTSIG] Donald’s Trump Speech in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania – Part 7. URL: <http://www.whatthefolly.com/2016/10/26/transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-gettysburg-pennsylvania-part-7/>
109. [EWODOOPR] – Elizabeth Warren on Dropping Out of Presidential Race. URL: <https://www.news.com.au/finance/work/leaders/elizabeth-warren-drops-out-of-the-us-presidential-race/news-story/4e426370a84e7c026668f0bbe622bb00>

110. [FVPJBATCP] – Former Vice President Joe Biden addresses the coronavirus pandemic. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2QOidd8FGUM>
111. [GWBSUS] – George W. Bush: State of the Union Speech. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/20/iraq.georgebush>
112. [GWSB] – Geert Wilders’ Speech in Bonn. URL: https://www.parlementairemonitor.nl/9353000/1/j9vvij5epmj1ey0/vj6xcz568lxd?ctx=vg09llkg6xvb&start_tab0=20
113. [HCCS] – Hillary Clinton's Concession Speech. URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/11/09/politics/hillary-clinton-concession-speech/index.html>
114. [IA] – Obama B.H. Inaugural Address. URL: <http://obamaspeeches.com/PObama-Inaugural-Speech-Inauguration.htm>
115. [ISBOAS] – Illinois Sen. Barack Obama’s Announcement Speech. URL: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2007/02/10/AR2007021000879.html>
116. [JBDNCS] – Joe Biden's Democratic National Convention Speech. URL: <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/full-text-joe-bidens-2016-democratic-national-convention/story?id=40945371>
117. [JBOFTN] – Joe Biden on “Face the Nation”. URL: <https://www.cbsnews.com/video/biden-says-u-s-intel-agencies-should-brief-campaigns-about-russian-interference/>
118. [JBOLCFP] – Joe Biden Officially Launches Campaign for President. URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FaN-Pf_LW1Q
119. [JBSIP] – Joe Biden Speech in Philadelphia. URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/video/us/elections/100000007024136/joe-biden-march-10-live.html>
120. [KHKOPCO] – Kamala Harris Kicks off Presidential Campaign in Oakland. URL: <https://www.ktvu.com/news/transcript-kamala-harris-kicks-off-presidential-campaign-in-oakland>

121. [OBTOPOENS] – Obama, B. Transcript of President Obama's Election Night Speech / B.Obama. URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/>

122. [OCRANACIGV] – Hillary Clinton: 'Of Course' Republicans and NRA Are Complicit in Gun Violence. URL: <http://time.com/4966501/hillary-clinton-gun-violence-nrarepublicans/>

123. [PBODNCS] – President Barack Obama's 2016 Democratic National Convention Speech. URL: <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/full-text-president-barack-obamas-2016-democratic-national/story?id=40949231>

124. [PBOFIS] – President Barack Obama's Full Inauguration Speech 2009. The New York Times. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-1ljmtaibC4>

125. [PBSTOEPR] – Pete Buttigieg Speech on Ending Presidential Run. URL: <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/pete-buttigieg-speech-transcript-on-ending-presidential-run>

126. [PBSTOER] – Pete Buttigieg Speech Transcript on Ending Presidential Run. URL: <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/pete-buttigieg-speech-transcript-on-ending-presidential-run>

127. [PTIO] – President Trump in Orlando. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nij3bsI7MAc>.

128. [RBTPOANB] – Obama B. Remarks by the President on a new beginning. URL: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-cairo-university-6-04-09>

129. [ROPBO] – *Remarks of President Barack Obama*. URL: https://www.google.ru/search?q=Remarks+of+President+Barack+Obama,+Hradcany+Square,+Prague,+Czech+Republic,+April+5,+2009&newwindow=1&sxsrf=ALeKk03f6b22zYZKi9x9RrpFBkOtZQJ0AA:1586895264241&source=lnms&tbn=vid&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjC_5TE3ejoAhWHzKQKHe2fBvEQ_AUoA3oECAsQBQ&biw=1488&bih=754

130. [RRPC] – Ronald Reagan 1980 Presidential Campaign. URL: <http://www.4president.org/ocmi1984.htm>

131. [SATI] – Obama B.H. Speech Against the Iraq. URL:
<http://obamaspeeches.com/001-2002-Speech-Against-the-Iraq-War-Obama-Speech.htm>

132. [THWKH] – Town Hall with Kamala Harris. URL:
<http://www.msnbc.com/transcripts/the-last-word/2019-05-28>

133. [TSOTUS] – Trump’s State of the Union speech. URL:
<https://www.vox.com/2020/2/4/21123394/state-of-the-union-full-transcript-trump>.

134. [VPBCS] – Vice President Biden's Convention Speech. URL:
<https://www.npr.org/2012/09/06/160713378/transcript-vice-president-bidens-convention-speech?t=1588690986055>