

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

**“Margaret Thatcher VS Theresa May:
image, language profile, individual style”**

Master’s thesis
written by the 2nd year student,
2nd English group
of master’s program
“Modern English Communication,
Translation, two Western
European languages”
Field of science – 03 “Humanities”
Specialty – 035 “Philology”
Ukrainets Oksana

Supervised by:
Alla D. Belova,
Doctor of Sciences (Linguistics),
Full Professor

Reviewed by:

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології
та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 8 від 18.04.2023

Завідувач кафедри _____ проф. Белова А.Д.

KYIV – 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
1. THE LINGUISTIC DOMAINS OF PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSE IN GREAT BRITAIN	9
1.1. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AS A TOOL FOR UNVEILING THE COMPLEXITIES OF COMMUNICATION.....	12
1.1.1. CONSENT-SEEKING AND VERBAL DUELING IN BRITISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE	17
1.1.2. STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING SEMANTIC INTENSITY IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	21
1.1.3. HUMOR IN SPEECHES OF BRITISH POLITICIANS	25
1.1.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF RITUALS IN BRITISH POLITICAL PROCESSES	27
1.2. GENDERED LANGUAGE IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM	29
1.2.1. THE INTERSECTION OF GENDER AND COMMUNICATION	29
1.2.2. GENDERED COMMUNICATION IN PUBLIC SETTINGS: WOMEN’S EXPERIENCES AND CHALLENGES	31
1.2.3. MECHANICAL VS. STRATEGIC USE OF LINGUISTIC PATTERNS IN GENDERED POLITICAL COMMUNICATION	32
1.2.4. WOMEN’S PORTRAYAL IN BRITISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE	34
CONCLUSION	38
2. MARGARET THATCHER’S TRANSFORMATIVE IMPACT ON 20 TH CENTURY BRITISH POLITICS.....	41
2.1. THE SYMBOLIC SIGNIFICANCE OF MOTIFS IN THE POLITICAL LANGUAGE OF MARGARET THATCHER.....	42
2.2. MARGARET THATCHER’S POLITICAL ORATORY STYLE.....	48

2.3. RHETORICAL STRATEGIES AND DEVICES IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF MARGARET THATCHER.....	54
CONCLUSION.....	63
3. THERESA MAY: LANGUAGE AND RHETORIC OF THE SECOND FEMALE PRIME MINISTER OF THE UK.....	67
3.1. CONSISTENT POLITICAL MOTIFS IN THE LANGUAGE STRUCTURES OF THERESA MAY’S DISCOURSE	67
3.2. THERESA MAY AS A POLITICAL ORATOR	76
3.3. RHETORIC AND LINGUISTIC DEVICES IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF THERESA MAY.....	80
CONCLUSION.....	89
CONCLUSIONS.....	92
REFERENCES.....	96
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103
SUMMARY	108

INTRODUCTION

Political relations evolve within any society during a certain period of development, giving rise to the formation of political parties and groups, as well as the presentation of various political theories and concepts. Politics is a unique area of human endeavor, characterized by the art of governing the state. The direction in which a state operates is determined by politics, as each state has a dominant political figure who is responsible for making and executing all political decisions and actions. In this sense, politics plays a crucial role in shaping the nature and direction of a society.

In the United Kingdom the Prime Minister is a focal point of politics. The Prime Minister is the head of government and the most senior political figure in the country, who is responsible for leading the government, setting policy agendas, and managing the day-to-day affairs of the state. As such, the Prime Minister wields significant power and influence over the political landscape of the United Kingdom, and is a key figure in shaping the country's political and social direction.

Throughout history women politicians faced linguistic challenges and had to adapt to the existing masculine norms in political discourse. They had to improve their skills to acquire what is known as the "deficit model" to be on equal footing with their male counterparts.

However, in recent decades, alternative views have emerged. Women with their own unique styles are now recognized for making significant contributions to the development of democratic political discourse. Through elegance and subtlety in their performance, women are seen as even better suited to the modern image of a political leader.

The United Kingdom has had three female Prime Ministers: Margaret Thatcher, who served from 1979 to 1990, Theresa May, who served from 2016 to 2019, and Liz Truss who served from September to October 2022. Margaret

Thatcher and Theresa May had a big impact on British politics during their premierships.

Margaret Thatcher was renowned for her firm leadership style, policies that attempted to advance free market capitalism and lessen the role of the state in the economy, and her status as the first female prime minister of the United Kingdom. Several significant national and worldwide occurrences, like as the Falklands War, the miners' strike, and the collapse of the Soviet Union, occurred during her term.

Theresa May served as the UK's second female prime minister and led the country through a challenging period, including the complex and contentious Brexit negotiations and ongoing political challenges within her own party. She made valiant efforts to reach an agreement for the UK's exit from the European Union and worked tirelessly to secure the necessary backing for her plan. While she was ultimately unable to do so, her dedication to serving the country and her efforts to navigate a difficult political climate are undeniable.

Both Prime Ministers, Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May, demonstrated their exceptional communication skills through their speeches and press conferences. They were able to effectively convey their message and influence public opinion on important issues. Margaret Thatcher's powerful and decisive speaking style was particularly notable, and she often used her communication skills to rally support for her policies and agenda. Theresa May, on the other hand, was known for her calm and measured approach, and was able to effectively communicate her vision for the country and navigate difficult political situations. Both Prime Ministers' ability to effectively communicate with the public played a significant role in their political success.

The political discourse of UK prime ministers has a profound impact not only on British citizens but also on leaders of other countries and ordinary individuals around the world. As such, it is imperative to conduct research on the language profiles of these leaders to identify the linguistic strategies that

enable them to project a positive and influential image both domestically and internationally. Through such research, we can gain valuable insights into the ways in which language is used in political discourse and the impact it can have on society at large.

The master's thesis is devoted to the analysis of image, language profile, and individual style of Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May. This analysis will be based on their speeches and responses during press conferences.

The **relevance** of this thesis topic lies in its contribution to the broader field of linguistic studies of political speeches and social media messages. Specifically, the analysis of the language profile and individual style of Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May can provide insights into the strategies used by successful female politicians in the UK.

The **aim** of the master's thesis is to investigate the image, language profile, and individual style of Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May. To achieve the aim, it is necessary to fulfil the following **tasks**:

- to determine the major concepts of the political discourse of the UK;
- to outline the strategies and communication methods of the British political discourse;
- to determine the linguistic patterns of the gendered language of British politics;
- to outline the communication strategies, motifs, oratory style peculiarities, linguistic and rhetorical devices used by Margaret Thatcher;
- to outline the communication strategies, motifs, oratory style peculiarities, linguistic and rhetorical devices used by Theresa May.

The **object** of the master's thesis is the linguistic and rhetorical devices and strategies, the communicative traits of the oratory style of female in the British political discourse.

The **subject** of the master's thesis is the linguistic means and rhetorical devices that constitute the language profile of Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May based on their speeches and responses during press conferences.

The **research material** consists of 20 speeches of Margaret Thatcher and 21 speeches of Theresa May, 59 pages of Margaret Thatcher's responses during press conferences, and 50 pages of Theresa May's responses during press conferences.

The **methods** of descriptive, interpretive, contextual and discourse analysis as well as the method of direct observation followed by the generalization of the findings were used as the main methods of analysis in accordance with the goals and purposes of the study.

The **practical value** of this work is determined by the fact that the approach to the analysis of the language profiles and individual styles may be used for further studies devoted to the investigation of the language profiles of the famous persons, to reveal underlying patterns and meanings of the political discourse in language use, and to shed light on the communicative strategies of public figures. This knowledge can be applied to the development of effective communication strategies for other politicians and leaders, as well as to the understanding of the impact of political discourse on society.

The master's thesis consists of three chapters. The first chapter is of theoretical value, the second one is focused on the analysis of the image, language profile, and individual style of Margaret Thatcher, the third one is devoted to the analysis of the image, language profile, and individual style of Theresa May basing on speeches and responses of the politicians in the press conferences.

The first chapter includes the theoretical background of the parliamentary discourse of the United Kingdom and gendered language in the political discourse in the UK.

In the second chapter the communication strategies, the motifs, the oratory style peculiarities, use of linguistic and rhetorical devices composing the language profile of Margaret Thatcher employed in her speeches and responses during press conferences.

The third chapter of this thesis examines the language profile of Theresa May, focusing on her communication strategies, use of motifs, oratory style, and linguistic and rhetorical devices in various contexts, including speeches and press conferences.

In conclusions, the results of the scientific investigations are summarized.

1. THE LINGUISTIC DOMAINS OF PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSE IN GREAT BRITAIN

Political language encompasses a variety of communication methods within the realm of politics, including political speeches, which represent a distinct sub-genre of political discourse. They constitute the most formal and institutionalized variety of language of politics.

The nature of political speech can vary depending on the context and the cultural background of the audience. Adversarial speeches, for example, are often used in parliamentary settings where political opponents challenge each other's views in front of the whole chamber. This type of speech tends to be more confrontational, argumentative, and focused on attacking the opposing party or individual [36, 156-174].

In contrast, speeches made in the corridors, during interviews or rallies, may be more focused on making promises, persuading voters, or threatening opponents. These speeches may be more emotional and directed towards specific audiences, rather than addressing the entire nation.

Furthermore, in committee settings, speeches may appear to be cooperative, as they are made in a smaller, more informal setting with the goal of finding common ground and reaching consensus. The tone of these speeches tends to be less confrontational and more focused on finding practical solutions to issues.

Overall, the nature of political speech is shaped by the context in which it is delivered, as well as the political culture and norms of the society in which it occurs. Political speeches reflect the political climate and the goals and values of the political actors delivering them [22, 56-74].

According to the constitutional framework, Great Britain is classified as a unitary state. At the same time, it gives quite a lot of autonomy to its local authorities. Moreover, with the process of devolutions it has introduced the element of regionalism into its constitutional framework. Needless to add, in the

United Kingdom, which is a constitutional monarchy, the power of dissolution is exercised by the head of government. Moreover, the single party controls most governments, which makes it possible for it to impose its will on parliaments.

Political language is indeed unique to each country and its political culture. The narratives and linguistic means used in political speeches are shaped by a variety of factors, including history, social norms, and political values. Therefore, it is important to understand the political culture of a country before analyzing the political speech of its politicians [20, 223-234].

For example, in the United States, political speeches often emphasize the values of individual liberty, democracy, and the American Dream. In contrast, in China, political speeches may focus on the values of harmony, stability, and national rejuvenation.

Similarly, the use of rhetoric and persuasive techniques in political speeches also varies across cultures. For instance, in the United Kingdom, politicians often use humor and irony to connect with their audience and convey their message. In contrast, in some Middle Eastern countries, political speeches may use hyperbole and religious references to persuade the audience.

The linguistic dimension of political discourse is strongly influenced by the cultural context in which it takes place. Political leaders from different cultures may use different rhetorical strategies, employ different rhetorical devices, and use language in different ways to convey their message and connect with their audience. Therefore, the questions discussed by politicians and the way they communicate their ideas can vary greatly depending on the cultural context.

Therefore, understanding the political culture of a country is crucial in analyzing political speeches and their impact on society [42, 204-212].

Throughout its history England has been a two-party system, dominated by governmental and oppositional alternation of two parties. Because of some

level of hegemony, when political orientations are rather similar, than torn apart, even though the House of Commons main aim is to oppose, the level of conflict is low. The rules and regulations still leave the House Commons dominated by the Government [21, 54-71].

The Parliament of Great Britain, that is the representative of the Westminster-system parliaments, the parliamentary committees and the members of parliament are managed by party discipline. The cooperation of government and opposition is under concern of government accountability [84, 78-83]. The prevailing system within the parliament is the one where debates in the plenary chamber carry out a more prominent role than debates in parliamentary committees. The House of Commons in the UK operate as a stage of lively adversarial debate and display of rhetorical skills with emphasis on political struggle with the government [2, 67-74].

The rhetorical patterns of parliamentary debates present the ideological visions, and political agendas of the parliament members, who are seen as representatives of social, gender, and professional backgrounds of citizens of the country. According to Steinmetz, the power of speaking in a parliament is the power of acting. This means that social and political consequences of the parliamentary debates present that “what is done” is above all the outcome of “what is said” within parliamentary debates [68, 84-90].

Political language is highly influenced by the culture and history of a nation, and this is reflected in the vocabulary used to discuss certain topics. Different cultures may have different words or phrases to describe the same concept, and these words can carry different connotations and emotional associations.

In politics, this is especially important, as language is used strategically to influence public opinion and shape policy decisions. Politicians may use highly lexicalized terms to convey a particular message or to appeal to a specific audience. They may also use language in a way that is deliberately vague or

ambiguous, to avoid making firm commitments or to leave room for interpretation [38, 74-89].

Overall, the language used in politics reflects the cultural and historical context in which it arises, and it plays a key role in shaping political discourse and policy outcomes.

1.1. Discourse Analysis as a Tool for Unveiling the Complexities of Communication

Political discourse is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that includes a variety of communication techniques intended to influence political decision-making and shape public opinion. It entails the dissemination of political ideas and messages to various audiences through the use of language and other modes of communication, such as nonverbal clues and gestures. Political discourse, which can take on a variety of formats, including public speeches, political debates, media reporting, and social media posts, is essential for influencing how people perceive and engage with politics.

Understanding how language is used to form political reality and influence public opinion is the goal of the crucial branch of research known as political discourse. Researchers can determine the linguistic patterns, rhetorical techniques, and other communicative tactics that are used to craft certain political messages and affect how various audiences respond to them through the examination of political speech.

The analysis of political discourse can help reveal the underlying ideologies and power structures that influence political discourse and define who has a voice in the political sphere. Furthermore, political discourse is intricately linked to power relations and social hierarchies. It can also illuminate the ways in which broader social and cultural norms and values are reflected and upheld in political discourse. Researchers can learn more about the

intricacies of political communication and its influence on political outcomes by looking at political discourse in all of its forms. [79,193–213]

Discourse analysis is a method used to analyze language use in context, in order to understand how meaning is generated and how power relations are reflected and reproduced through language. This method can be applied to political discourse in order to reveal the underlying ideologies, social hierarchies, and power structures that are embedded within it. [75, 249-283]

By analyzing political discourse, discourse analysis can help identify linguistic patterns and strategies that are used to create specific political messages, such as the use of certain words, metaphors, or rhetorical devices. It can also show how language is used to include or exclude various socioeconomic groups from political discourse, and how language reflects and reinforces power relations between different groups. [78, 79-98].

Discourse analysis is a valuable tool for comprehending the complex interactions between language, politics, and power, and for examining how political discourse both reflects and shapes social and cultural change.

A wide range of academic fields, including linguistics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, philosophy, and communication studies, are included in the study of discourse analysis. It focuses on the study of language use in social contexts, and seeks to understand how language is used to create and sustain social relations, identities, and power structures. [27, 200-225]

Many prominent academics who have made substantial contributions to the creation and improvement of this method may be found in the subject of discourse analysis. They include linguists like Norman Fairclough, who created a critical discourse analysis method that highlights the function of language in social change, and Teun van Dijk, who invented the study of discourse and power.

Ruth Wodak, who has made contributions to the study of discourse and identity, Michel Foucault, who highlighted the significance of discourse in determining knowledge and power relations, and Erving Goffman, who has investigated the ways in which language is used to construct social roles and perform identity, are other notable individuals in the field of discourse analysis.

Teun A. van Dijk acknowledges the significance of multimodal communication within discourse studies in his book “Discourse and Power”. It entails using a variety of communication techniques, including gestures, tone, and facial expressions. This larger view of communication enables a more nuanced comprehension of how individuals engage with one another and express meaning in varied circumstances. [75,249-283]

The author claims that because discourse studies are interdisciplinary, there is a wide range of research topics that have been explored, such as conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis, discourse and identity, language and power, and language neuroscience. The complex processes involved in language usage and communication are explored by researchers in this subject using a number of approaches and techniques, including corpus linguistics, ethnography, experimental research, and neuroimaging. [76, 217-228]

According to Teun A. van Dijk, discourse can be examined from a variety of perspectives, including how it affects communication, power dynamics, context, and social semiosis. Power-based approaches concentrate on how discourse can be used as a tool of resistance and dissent as well as a means of influencing the thoughts and behaviors of language users. Communication-based methods examine how language contributes to the cognitive structure of human societies and how it is used to express and transmit beliefs. [75,249-283]

Contextually placed approaches look at how discourse varies between cultures and time periods as well as how it is influenced by social circumstances and cultural contexts. In multimodal discourse, social semiotic techniques

examine how speech makes use of multiple semiotic systems outside of natural human language, such as sounds, images, gestures, and other embodied social activity. These various methods are connected to one another and offer a thorough understanding of the function of discourse in society. [77, 1-8]

The discipline of discourse studies is based on a number of fundamental ideas and theories. They include the ideas that speech is a social practice, environment is a crucial factor in determining meaning, and power relations always influence discourse. The significance of sequences and hierarchies in discourse structures, the difference between abstract structures and dynamic strategies, and the function of genres and varieties of discourse are further important ideas. [77, 1-8]

Teun A. van Dijk asserts that there are still numerous gaps in our knowledge of how language is used in social interactions despite the advancements made in the field of discourse studies over the previous several decades. For instance, we still don't fully comprehend how language users manage the intricate arrangements of suitable and meaningful text and conversation in real time or how discourse affects our social identities and relationships. The area of discourse studies also needs more interdisciplinary cooperation and a stronger emphasis on mixing qualitative and quantitative research techniques. [76, 217-228]

In his book "Discourse and Social Change" Norman Fairclough suggests a multifaceted method of discourse analysis that highlights the interaction between discursive and social change while considering the social dimensions of language use. The author contends that language practices are changing at a substantial rate, and that to comprehend these changes, we need a "social theory of discourse". The book provides in-depth analyses of discourse samples from diverse institutions and fields, with an emphasis on intertextuality and hegemony. The goal is to make discourse analysis a reader-friendly analytical method. [27, 200-225]

Norman Fairclough proposes a thorough approach to analyzing language, which combines methodologies from linguistics, discourse analysis, and social and political thought to study social and cultural change. The author criticizes previous attempts to link language studies with social theory for their lack of attention to power relations and struggles within discourse. Instead, the author advocates for a multidimensional concept of discourse that takes into account the social dimensions of language use, recognizing the importance of language practices in shaping social relations and identities. Norman Fairclough stresses the relationship between discursive and social change and recommends a critical, historical approach to discourse analysis that considers the complex causes and connections underlying discursive transformations. [27, 200-225]

Furthermore, Norman Fairclough proposes a multidimensional approach to discourse analysis, which views discursive events as text, discursive practice, and social practice at the same time. The author emphasizes that the term “text” should be understood linguistically to refer to any written or spoken product. In contrast to linguistically-oriented approaches, the author argues for a socially-oriented perspective on discourse that accounts for the crucial role of power relations and struggles. The author combines insights from Michel Foucault’s social perspectives and linguistics to suggest a “social theory of discourse”. Finally, the author provides examples of how language practices have a significant impact on social relations and identities in areas such as education, healthcare, and industry.

Overall, the author highlights the importance of using a critical, multidimensional approach to discourse analysis that considers the social, historical, and political contexts of language use. The author argues that language practices are significant in wider social and cultural changes, and discourse analysis can be a useful tool for examining these changes. The approach emphasizes the interplay between discursive and social change, the role of discourse in shaping knowledge, social relations, and identities, and the

processes involved in constructing texts and orders of discourse. The book provides examples of discourse analysis in various fields and institutions, as well as guidelines for conducting discourse analysis. [27, 200-225]

Ruth Wodak highlights several crucial areas of research in Discourse Analysis that require further investigation. These include the challenge of operationalizing theories and linking the linguistic and social dimensions, which is called the problem of mediation, the need for a clear and consistent application of linguistic theory, the ambiguity surrounding the notion of context and its impact on ideas, the potential for bias in discourse analysis and the validation of interpretations of texts. Another important area that requires further attention is the pursuit of inter- or transdisciplinarity as an essential aspect of text analysis. Addressing these issues will enable the field to advance and deepen our understanding of how language shapes our social world. [85, 1-14]

To sum up, Discourse Studies is an interdisciplinary discipline that investigates language in use with an emphasis on how meaning is constructed and how it affects power dynamics, identities, and social relationships. It can be used in a variety of contexts and with different text kinds, including written texts, media discourse, political discourse, and academic discourse. Many techniques and methodologies are used in this area, such as critical discourse analysis, conversation analysis, corpus linguistics, and ethnography. Discourse studies also acknowledge the limits of human behavior and the necessity of interdisciplinary cooperation.

1.1.1. Consent-Seeking and Verbal Dueling in British Political Discourse

The government negotiates political solutions aiming at reaching agreements and making decisions which will affect lives of people. In terms of rhetoric, political discourse is regarded as institutionalized modes of action for collective decision-making. The art of political discourse, according to Ilie, lies

in the ability of the politician to balance between logos and pathos aspects of speech (e.g., between logical reasoning and emotion eliciting force respectively) while enhancing ethos, by keeping political credibility and moral profile [45, 84-90].

The type of government accepted in the United Kingdom allows ministers to address parliament in both oral and written forms. The day-to-day affairs of the government are usually reported in the written ministerial statements, while the major incidents become the topics of oral statements. Oral statements are reserved for declaring new policies and providing crucial information on pressing political matters.

The choice of rhetorical appeals by politicians finds its roots in political traditions, such as levels of conflict tolerance, levels of competition, political control, ways of finding consensus, and openness of confrontation. The contrastive analysis performed by Ilie in 2004 indicates, that British parliamentary language is marked by pathos-oriented logos [43, 100-106].

One of the means that serves as emphasis of politicians' authoritativeness is the factual validity of mentioned statements. By quoting credible sources they achieve a high level of response to their speeches, so it is typical for political oratory at large [29, 72-78].

Quotations in political discourse serve as a tool for conveying information, opinions, and attitudes. The form of the quotation can vary, but it typically consists of the person making the quote, the source of the quote, a word indicating that it is a quote, and the actual words being quoted. Regardless of the form, the function of quotations remains the same - to express agreement or disagreement with political views and to participate in discourses [28, 89-100].

It is quite common for British politicians to use the direct quotations, which can take a form of one narrative embedded in another narrative or a repeated someone's statement in original wording. When the quotation comes

from authoritative source, this gives more credibility to the speaker and to the events mentioned by the speaker [29, 232-236].

For example, Edward Milliband, during the 2012 Prime Minister Questions, attempted to criticize the Chancellor's lack of measures for ensuring the safety of the United Kingdom by referencing a statement made by him, in which he claimed that the country was no longer at risk. Edward Milliband's exact words were, "Mr. Speaker, He was the person who said we were 'out of the danger zone'". [Hansard, 2012].

The point can be reached by proving the authoritative value of the source of the quotation. Later, it can be reinforced by the usage of such rhetorical strategy as repetition. When the facts mentioned turn out to be from openly cited resources, the truth of its contents is accepted with no or minimal doubts. On the contrary, when mentioned in confused and indeterminate way, the credibility of the source and of the speaker falls drastically [28, 89-100].

The aspect that leads to reduced trustworthiness is the usage of vague phrases, instead of referential subject. Same happens when lexemes are used in an inappropriate context, and when the speaker is imprecise and not persuasive.

Another distinctive feature of British parliamentary language is the use of interruptions. According to Ilie, interruptions can be classified into two main types: authorized and unauthorized. Authorized interruptions are initiated by the speaker, such as when the Speaker of the House of Commons interrupts a Member of Parliament during a debate [44, 415-429]. For example, during Hansard Debates in 2011, the Speaker stated that "it is not required for the Minister for Children to behave as a child". This type of interruption is seen as a strategic tool used by the speaker to control the flow of conversation and maintain order in the parliamentary proceedings.

The unauthorized interruption illustrates the token of approval or disapproval performed by the members of parliament. An example is chosen from Hansard Debates in 2013:

Hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is very discourteous of the House to issue a collection groan – notably on the Opposition Benches.

British political language has the peculiarity of creating a sense of group identity, which is achieved with inclusive language. One of the ways is the use of the pronoun *we* instead of the pronoun *they*. This way politicians polarize the positions and give different interpretations of roles and identities of those involved in the process. This linguistic strategy is about solidarity with the group represented as “us” and dissociation from the group represented as “them”. The contraposition achieved this way may lead to heated controversies [22, 24-31].

For example, Winston Churchill in his famous Speech to Commons in June 1940 mentions the constructions “we shall” when addressing British society over ten times the majority of which is used in the last paragraph to make British believe in liberation [18, 87-101].

The concept of derisive forms is a rich ground for studying interpersonal dynamics. It involves the unpredictable changes in the power balance and fallacies within verbal controversies.

Political speeches, particularly those given by high-ranking politicians, often include language that involves cultural and institutional constraints. Such language aims to suggest alternative solutions to counterarguments and to provide justifications for their policies and actions. While the emotional aspect of this language can take different forms and levels, it is generally viewed as negative and may include elements such as rudeness, hostility, animosity, belittling, and misinterpretation [31, 75-79].

Political speeches by English politicians often involve intense debates, which can escalate into verbal clashes between individuals. Such confrontations often arise due to conflicting political principles, social systems, and interests. As a result, emotions tend to run high, leading to interruptions, laughter and

shouting. Unlike the ideology of consensus prevalent in some other countries, the British rhetorical tradition allows for ridicule and sarcasm on contentious issues [49, 553-580]. Moreover, pathos-oriented strategies, such as hyperbolic rhetorical questions, are often employed by British politicians when attacking their opponents.

One of the examples is the address of Prime Minister Cameron to the Member of Parliament Milliband calling him “the nowhere man of politics” during Prime Minister Questions in 2010.

Another interesting aspect of British political speeches is the mix of contempt and respect voiced towards the interlocutors. Its usage involves both self-face and other-face saving acts [24, 95-102]. Since verbal attack is one of the most emotionally strong ingredients of speeches, it can significantly increase interlocutor’s vulnerability, making damage to their reputation and prestige. But when used with verbal tokens of respect, this strategy helps to find some balance while giving a speech [31, 82-87].

For the major tendencies of political language of Great Britain, they are more frequently focused on personality features, such as wit and intellectual capacities. British political speeches are highly motivated to be quick, humorous, and witty. Additionally, while conducting a speech or replying to a provocation besides notions of intelligence and wit will make their focus on political adversary’s education standards, and IQ level.

1.1.2. Strategies for enhancing semantic intensity in political discourse

A speaker’s understanding of the conventions and rules surrounding the occasion and venue of a speech, as well as the conditions of the argumentative exchange, can have a significant impact on the selection of the topic, audience framing, and style of the presentation.

One of the examples is the usage of quotation to attribute a commitment. The strategic choice of such a stylistic device can help the speaker reach his point, because quotation gives a high degree of credibility.

Besides that, institutional considerations and the resulting argumentative preconditions are to be considered. For example, during Question Time sessions, which are supposed to be devoted to the Government's performance, the disputes on the different topics can be put only in the indirect manner, as a background to the main topic [15, 30-46].

The technique of accusing someone of inconsistency is a common stylistic device used to express doubt and highlight differences of opinions. Additionally, it can be strategically employed to support one's own argument and perspective during a speech [48, 153-161].

It is of high importance to choose perspective, which is advantageous not only examining the argumentative move, but also for examining the effectiveness of the argumentative practice. In general, it is beneficial to examine political arguments from a perspective where arguing is instrumental to achieving the institutional goals associated with the context in which arguments occurs. This leads to balance between political quality of exchanges and their argumentative quality [50, 112-117]. Speaking about Question Time, the argumentative discussion of Government's actions and plans enables to analyze and follow its performance.

Since holding the Government to account was the leading reason to establish Question Time, if the argumentative reasonability fails, holding the Government to account will fail as well [60, 158-166].

To withstand the defensive argumentation, officeholders use various linguistic strategies and tactics. The strategies that help to ward off blame include denying, legitimation, framing, argumentation, and action representation [85, 276-291].

Argumentation helps to come to the point of the event and find the reasons of the outcomes, either positive or negative ones.

As an example, we can use the extract of the United Kingdom Cabinet Office news release in response to the blame on government overspending

published in *The Times* in January 2012. The Minister for the Cabinet Office states that their government had made a pledge to be relentless in finding and eliminating waste in Whitehall when they first took office and adds that “that is precisely what we have done”. The Minister uses the argumentative strategy of parading government’s qualities by claiming that the pledge has been fulfilled [37, 637-644].

Framing involves heroic self-representation, while presenting the opponent as a villain. This way the speaker tries to escape being assigned the role of the Villain by the blame-maker.

For example, in the same statement the Minister points out that so far, they “have done such a good work”, which cannot even be compared to the one done in “other countries, especially in troubled Europe”. This is a remarkable example of positive self-representation and negative others-representation. This way the speaker can also try to deflect the possible blame.

Denying specifies the rejecting agency and the loss in response to accusations. One of the brightest examples of denying is the apologies of Boris Johnson for misjudgments made at Downing Street. He also states that the rules were overstepped not intentionally. He highlights that they did not receive any indication that the event was in violation of any rules or regulations. Soon after that Johnson intensifies his claim, saying that he was not informed “that it is in breach of what we’re asking everybody else to do, it should not go ahead”.

Legitimation is about providing justifications of the actions with references to outer sources, such as authority, morality, or rationality. In the following example: “The government is disturbed to warrant the ethnic minorities to play their full part in contributing to the social spheres of ethnic minority” the government is presented as an authoritative leader, who facilitates the actions and takes measures for the good of “the ethnic minorities” [41, 3-24].

Action representation involves backgrounding and exclusion to shed light on possible victims or actors of harmful actions. The evidence of this strategy

may be found in excerpt from Question Time on November 18, 2015, when David Cameron challenged the representative of Labour Party to make uncomfortable declarations, saying: “If the hon. Lady is looking for someone to blame, she might want to blame the Labour Party”. To be more specific, he compares the UK and other countries: “the Labour Party which left the UK with the biggest budget deficit anywhere in the western world” [84, 331-336].

Besides that, the intensified meaning in British political discourse is usually associated with such notions as “threat” and “fear” [10, 25-40].

In the Parliamentary Debates on Europe at the House of Commons (1998-2015) corpora the noun threat is used more frequently than the verb form.

According to the Cambridge Dictionary, the noun form of “threat” refers to a warning of something unpleasant or violent that may happen, particularly if a certain action or order is not followed. The verb form of “threat” has multiple meanings. One meaning is to have the potential to cause harm or damage to someone or something. Another meaning is to warn of something undesirable. In the context of political speeches, institutional threatening involves the use of legitimate but severe actions. This can be conveyed through non-finite verbs or nominalization [10, 42-60].

In fact, threats during elections or resignations are highly used in British political speeches. According to CEC corpora (The Cambridge English Corpus is an extensive compilation of written and spoken English language information, which encompasses both British and American English and serves as a resource for corpus linguistics research), the terms such as resign, government and veto are among most frequently used collocates of threat not only in parliamentary, but also in general English [40, 135-150].

For the stylistic use, the noun threat usually collocates with the adjectives that can intensify its meaning, for example fundamental, serious, direct, grave, sinister, deepening, etc. With some of the mentioned adjectives, the speaker may switch to ironical meaning while making an argument (e.g., sinister threat).

For the semantic fields in which the term is used, we can mention the field of interests (e.g., “a threat to British interests”), prosperity (e.g., “a threat to British prosperity”), and stability. (e.g., “a threat to British way of life”). This way they express the interests of the nation [10, 42-60].

In terms of British Parliamentary language, the term fear is rather a result of a process of reasoning than the reaction to some threat or danger. It makes someone concerned of dangers than being frightened. Additionally, the speakers usually represent the “fears” as a generalized fact, rather than an individual and subjective notion.

For the stylistic use, fear as a noun tends to be used with antonyms and quasi-synonyms such as concerns, worries, beliefs, prejudices. Used with such collocations, the notion of fear represents the cognitive mental process.

For the semantic fields of usage of the notion fear, the most common ones are the semantic field of prosperity and the area of institutions (the EU institutions in particular) [40, 135-150].

To conclude, the notions of fear and threat are an inevitable part of British parliamentary language. They both are used in relation to “prosperity” and “stability” and rather to express the readiness to act in case of dangers posed toward Great Britain. The notions mentioned are signs of British power and influence.

1.1.3. Humor in speeches of British politicians

As regarded by Aristotle, humor serves as a good means to disarm the opponents, when used as a demonstration of intelligence to render opponents ridiculous and inspiring the audience to laugh at them [55, 26-41].

British society believes that the speaker who uses this intellectual weapon will be regarded as a more intelligent and verbose debater. The higher degree of wit is demonstrated, the higher are the chances to fulfill the aim of the person speaking.

Humor is a powerful tool in breaking down mental barriers and allowing messages to penetrate the minds of others. When the speaker uses humor in communication, they are perceived as positive and friendly, making others more receptive to their messages [67, 54-61].

The use of humor can also unconsciously open mental barriers, making others more likely to accept ideas they may not have otherwise agreed with. For politicians, the ability to use humor to convey messages and views is an effective means of influencing the opinions of others and changing their positions to align with.

The implementation of humor by politicians displays important human qualities such as creativity, critical thinking, adaptability, and the ability to handle difficulties with a humorous approach. These traits are highly desirable in modern politics, since they earn credibility and trust for politicians. A political leader with these traits projects confidence, positioning themselves as a trustworthy figure during challenging times [33, 101-120].

In case of British society humor serves not only to subjugate and mock others, but also to publicly ridicule the opponent to make the image of them look less competent. According to Ilie, humour is often used as a means of disguising an offensive remark, in part because wit is a highly prized quality, especially of politicians due to the cultural association with high intelligence [43, 107-115].

One of the widely used techniques in British English is the use of complains to create humor. It allows to reinterpret the troubles someone may have from a positive side [83, 64-66]. Overriding the unfortunate acts with the more positive feeling of eliciting laughter creates sense of solidarity and may consolidate people. Still, humor cannot be the basis of an entire political career even when being socially or psychologically appropriate within discourse [39, 477-494].

Besides that, humor can serve in the raise of awareness towards considerable issues in a palatable manner. This way the audience is engaged but the level of discomfort can be reduced due to the correctly chosen strategy.

As a result, in Britain there is several TV shows that mix up-to date issues and information with light emotional load. This way, humor serves as a tool to discuss current affairs in an approachable manner and to involve as many audiences in current issues as possible [6, 61-79].

However, when speaking of the use of humor, there is one issue which should be considered. When used as satire in political context, it can be misunderstood. There also exists the risk of the audience taking it as the truth or misinterpreting the idea hidden behind the veil of humour [65, 653-665].

On the contrary, humor can be used as a positive politeness strategy when based on the shared contextual knowledge and brings the participants together. Additionally, it can serve as a face-saving tool [14, 35-54].

Since verbal eloquence and wit are praised in the institutional settings of British politics, the instances of humor and irony are the hallmarks of parliamentary debates. Jokes and sarcastic statements reinforce in-group solidarity and in-group disagreement [43, 107-115].

1.1.4. Significance of Rituals in British Political Processes

The complexity of political rituals – both in their meanings and consequences cannot be disputed and is the result of many-layered nature of the institution. Besides being complex in terms of social hierarchies and political factions, it is under huge culture and political change due to the demands of time.

The rituals of debate convey the principle of equality and the sacred texts – the Standing Orders in particular – which enshrine the main principles. Through means of a complex symbolic performance, they propagate the rhetoric.

The rituals subtly encourage both participation and self-restraint among speakers and the principal beneficiary of this is the government, which needs time to get its legislation through.

The use of rituals helps members to improve their position and increase the impression of their power. When used properly, an enactment of the ritual becomes immanent with meaning. As mentioned by anthropologist Abeles, debates are not mere theatrical performance; they are a ritualized semiotic struggle over the meaning of texts (laws) in which the warring groups of members embody elements of civil society that are really fighting moral wars over, for example, state intervention. Generally, debates over legislation represent battles about how society should be ordered and governed, and what is deemed normal, natural, and morally desirable [1, 391-401].

Thus, the political significance of ritualized debate is not only found in rules that express equality but, more significantly, in the expression and resolution of moral conflict between clashing elements within society. The resolutions of conflict may be relevant to most, if not all, parliaments; and both these aspects encourage to participate and speak as individuals but to be restrained and vote with their own side as members of moral communities [61, 291-302].

Debates about reform of the rituals themselves become highly charged not only because social order is under discussion but because so also is their relationship with the public.

When opposition argued against the introduction of a register of interests, they were trying to protect the principles of trust and honour that should underlie the relationship within politicians as an ideal for the rest of society to aspire to [57, 56–72].

Politicians' complaints about transgressions, and their reiteration of the need for obedience to rules, are not only a bid to improve efficiency; they are an attempt to protect the institution's ethos, to regulate how to relate to each other,

to socialise newcomers into the Houses and to present a certain ideal of behaviour. It is the rituals and symbols that put people into proper relations [59, 108–132].

Rituals in the Houses are not a cultural sideshow; they are the real stuff that politics is made of. Not only do they define how to relate to each other, but they permit the resolution of conflicts. Parliamentary ritual does this so successfully that, as Kertzer points out, a good ritual creates the emotional state “that makes the message incontestable” since these rituals “shape emotions, making messages inherent to established procedures and unarguable” [12, 108–115].

1.2. GENDERED LANGUAGE IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

1.2.1. The Intersection of Gender and Communication

Women and men who behave in ways associated with the other gender are often judged harshly as a result. Different adjectives used to describe men and women have different, and sometimes completely distinguished connotations. For instance, when the word “aggressive” is applied for men, it is used as one of means to represent their power and abilities to achieve their goals. When applied to women, the adjective “aggressive” can denote the woman being not feminine enough, which leads to negative connotation [63, 89–101].

Speaking closer about women argumentation strategies, female politicians usually use insult in attacking, as well in counterattacking positions. For sure, the class and culture differences, individual differences should be considered. According to the research of sociologist Donna Eder, it is common among working-class women to playfully insult each other. This way women are believed to make clear what kinds of behavior are acceptable and which are not [26, 200–213].

It is said that the use of derogatory language makes it easy for women to display closeness, but at the same time there is a high risk of alienation other women, who have different viewpoints. Especially women may experience it when changing geographic region, where such patterns of behavior are unacceptable.

Generally, women can believe fighting is a sign of closeness, but many of them may experience troubles when using derogatory language in their speech. This is one of the examples when someone does not conform to expectations for their gender can meet negative responses. When disagreement, opposition and fighting appear in human relation, these are examples of breaking the existing standard rules of polite behavior, which can show a special relationship between people using these techniques [52, 60-66].

Here we can also mention the theory of agonism which is a social and political theory that accentuates the possible beneficial outcomes of certain types of conflicts. It seeks to show how individuals might accept the conflict. This theory does not claim that women avoid conflicts; it claims that they are less likely to enjoy fighting for its own sake. However, being sad about something, they are likely to fight about it. This is where we can meet the paradox when women often seek to confront problems in relationship, men seem eager to avoid confrontations [73, 56-72].

Speaking about attitude towards job, women usually get puzzled by the techniques used by men. One of the brightest examples is that men can argue with each other and after that continue communicating as if nothing happened. On the contrary, men are usually surprised that women can get deeply upset by verbal attacks. Females tend to personally take the things that were said by men just to get job done. Women rarely tease, playfully insult or play “devil’s advocate” at workplace. Additionally, they are more likely to avoid overt disagreement when they do disagree. [25, 123–174].

According to the research completed by Deborah Kolb (a foremost authority in the fields of negotiation, leadership, and gender) women are behind-the-scenes peacemakers, who take privately to the parties to a dispute to help settle it without an open dispute. These peculiarities have a close link to reactions the women may have to jobs that require their engagement in confrontations [53, 311-324].

1.2.2. Gendered Communication in Public Settings: Women's Experiences and Challenges

For a very long time talking in public has been exclusively male's domain. Almost till the 20th century the very thought of a woman facing the audience to speak was unthinkable. Even now we can notice situations when women are barred from speaking in public under some political or religious settings. According to Madeleine Kunin, who was the first woman governor of Vermont, the hardest thing for her to accomplish was learning to speak in public. She mentions that the idea that after speaking she will not be seen as "a good girl" is so deeply rooted, that every time she speaks, she is afraid of not being loved by the audience. The fears of the governor were about interweaving of two threads: the negative attitude saying that a good girl cannot speak up and the fear of agonistic response [54, 59-82].

According to governor Kunin, what motivated her the most was a deep commitment to what she intended to say. Kunin was surprised when "fired up by conviction", she discovered that she could speak spontaneously. Additionally, one of the most useful skills was to learn to deal with the conflict, since the controversy cannot be avoided no matter how politically skilled a person can be. As the governor mentions: "Speaking out always carries a price" [54, 94-115].

To sum up, the opposition and conflict styles that typify female are deeply rooted culture. These influences can never be pulled apart. What really matters is deciding the pattern which we can follow – to encourage the confrontations, to discourage them or to learn on how to deal with conflicts.

In 1970, when women started to secure professional positions in increasing numbers, there began accounts of communication as a historically gendered field. Women started joining male professional organizations and groups to reinforce the solution of numerous women's issues. It was slow to take gender as an analytic category, so the first achievements in the field happened in 1990s, when the gender analyses of media have gained a sustain position in communication [47, 136-148].

During the second wave of feminist movement in the 1960s and 1970s, scholars started investigating gender in organizations and occupations. They suggested that gender exists prior to and independent of work and it was a group identity to categorize people basing on their personal traits and habits.

Since then, gender differences were regarded as cultural-sociological and political. They were cultural-sociological, because of being shaped by communal patterns, such as educational socialization. They were seen as political due to being tied up with power, as marked by dynamics of male assertion and female deference in intellectual discussion. There was a growing interest in recovering the contributions of women who overcame the gender boundaries and participated in male-dominated fields [54, 59-82].

1.2.3. Mechanical vs. Strategic Use of Linguistic Patterns in Gendered Political Communication

Power interfaces with both gender and discourse. Depending on theoretical approach, the conceptualizations of power vary. Still, it is a key to critical understanding of discourse. For critical discourse analysis power is crucially institutional (considering its applications to feminist linguistics) [56, 116-120].

The more recent "post-structural discourse analysis", rejects the "grand narratives" of critical discourse analysis. It says that power is in a continual state of flux, variable and multiple, so that given participant in a given situation is positioned by and within a "nexus" of discourse. Both male and female can

be powerful in one way and powerless in another, so the concept of power cannot be associated with masculinity only [56, 1-28].

According to Deborah Cameron, choice resulted in the change of values. Additionally, it has “removed the option of political neutrality”. Even though non-sexist language campaign was believed to be limited and flawed, one of the main tasks was to make people talk about non-sexist language. Even though many found it peripheral and are dismissive towards it, still most English-language speakers cannot claim of being not aware of the issue. As a result, knowing about the actual use can tell us the reason of its use, how items are conceptualized, and what motivates a given usage at a particular moment [16, 323-347].

Another aspect that cannot be omitted when speaking about gender is context. The research by O’Barr and Atkins has shown what had been seen as “women’s language” was in large part “powerless language” [3, 202-217].

Mary Talbot has also pointed out that another thing worth mentioning is “interruption”, since “interruptions” of women by men played an important role in findings of the “male dominance” tradition [72, 121-128]. In gender and language study the mentioned “male dominance” tradition and context were significant to understand not only the meaning, but its origins as well. According to Deborah Tannen, the growing up largely in single-sex groups “entails different tendencies in adult male and female language use” [74, 76-88].

The above-mentioned claim can also be enhanced by research completed by Maltz and Borker, who proved that linguistic differenced and miscommunication between women and men come about because they “come from different linguistic subcultures”, meaning that they learn to use language in diverse ways during a conversation, and this learning occurs “when boys and girls interact primarily with members of their own sex”. So, the wrong interpreting of context by individuals may is the result of the wrong

interpretation of cues according to the own rules of the individuals and the conditions in which the individuals have grown up [58, 81-98].

Considering differences in class, age, ethnicity, and sex people belong to different communities of practice. These communities affect the development of linguistic patterns. Sociolinguists tend to see this process as acquisition of something relatively fixed, since the linguistic forms are acquired naturally and within a certain community the speaker learns and uses these forms mechanically or strategically [46, 136-148].

Although the identity of both the individual and the community to which this individual belongs is believed to be persistent, in fact they change constantly. Throughout life people transform their sociolinguistic identities, expanding forms of femininity, masculinity, and gender relations. By participation in different ways in various communities of practice, people discover new ways of thinking, being, relating, and doing. A way of speaking within the community constitutes a complex articulation of the individual's forms of participation in that community with participation in other communities that are salient at that time.

1.2.4. Women's Portrayal in British Political Discourse

Unlike men, women have been historically underrepresented not only in the public life of Great Britain, but also in politics. To be more precise, between 1918 and 2022 the number of women elected to the House of Commons is 559, the number of female Members of the House of Lords is 229 as of May 2022. Stereotypes create social expectations for both female and male to use the narratives prescribed by gendered communication styles [25, 123–174].

If these expectations are internalized by politicians, there is a high possibility of legislators behaving in gender-role-consistent manner. This may result in constant change of political styles of both female and male politicians [11, 75-97].

Female politicians' speeches are proved to be more emotional and less repetitive. (Dietrich, Hayes, and O'Brien 2019). Additionally, their speeches are less complex, less aggressive and their arguments are usually supported with different types of arguments [32, 580-606].

In recent years the validity of gender stereotypes has reduced, which has led to the changes to the social roles played by women in politics. As a result, some modifications of voters' reactions towards gender-incongruent have appeared. They are now estimated to be less judgmental and to sanction female less than in the past [80, 291-307].

The more powerful the roles of female politicians become, and the more increased prominence of female in Parliament is, the less women need to behave in a "feminized" way to cover the expectations of the voters. Thus, Parliament will conform to gender stereotypes less [34, 580-606].

Among the characteristics of speech style which are mostly associated with female we can admit that female have more emotionally colored language. Additionally, they make a great use of emotional language to affect audience. In their speeches they also rely on personal experience and analogies rather than on factual language. Moreover, women are more likely to express positive emotions in their speeches than men [23, 941 - 962].

However, it should be mentioned that over time the usage of communal styles by women becomes less frequent. By the latest years it has become more usual to express positive emotions in men's speeches. Women were believed to use less aggressive and complex language before 2010, but now the situation has changed. The differences become more and more significant over years [13, 242 - 250].

Even though, modern public is less likely to endorse traditional stereotypes, it is still difficult to estimate if this is the result of a decline in the responses that voters apply for gender-role-inconsistent behaviour. Still, we can

find examples, when women politicians are criticized for stereotype-incongruent behaviour, which can greatly affect voter actions.

There is a belief that due to general changes in audience attitudes regarding stereotypes, negative estimation of non-stereotypical politicians' behaviour is about to gradually decline. In addition, the internalization of the behavioral shifts can lead to decrease of the social penalties towards female politicians' stereotype-incongruent behaviour [32, 580-606].

Considering the uncivil and competitive style of speech prevailing in the political discourse, women were believed to be alienated by it, since the peculiarities of such style contradict female beliefs and attitudes towards speech style. It mainly opposes such peculiar traits of female speeches as seeking of consensus, striving for cooperation and conflict avoidance [85, 193-214].

In the past century women politicians faced the linguistic differences and were to adapt to the existing masculinity in their performances. They had to improve such skills to acquire the so-called "deficit model" (a perspective that views groups or individuals as lacking in some way, such as lacking knowledge, skills, or resources) to be on the equal footing with male. For instance, Margaret Thatcher had to change the voice quality (to make her voice lower) so that she could promote more confidence in her speeches [7, 34-41].

However, the recent decades the alternative views have appeared. Nowadays, women with their own unique styles are believed to make a significant contribution to the development of democratic political discourse. Through elegance and subtlety of their performance women suit even more to the modern image of political leader [64, 345-357].

The first changes in Great Britain started in 1997, when Tony Blair's Labour Party brought the record number of female members of Parliament to Westminster. This was the first turning point of the change of culture of the House of Commons.

The women recognized the importance of such movement as well. As mentioned by Julia Drown (the Member of Parliament for Swindon South, in south-west England, from 1997 until 2005): “women are more co-operative and interested in hearing different points of view” in the way they work. Additionally, “they are not so into scoring points”. Through making drastic changes, female kept proving that democracy is about consensus, not about imposing will. The only way of making positive influence is through less aggressive and combative style. That was about setting new standards.

In some means of media, for example, the right-wing Telegraph women are mentioned to make “thoughtful and measured contributions” that are described as the ones that had “brought a certain dignity to an occasion that could have descended into chaos and resentment”. (About 2015 general election campaign, when three of the parties contesting the UK general election were led by women). The women’s avoidance of interrupting and shouting was approvingly stated [69, 787-808].

Even though the women party did not win, still the female-led parties increased its representation at Westminster. Rated by commentators as a victory, the 2015 general election campaign enhanced the ideational triumph in the battle over discourse and language. That led to the propensity of framing the female’s style as superior to males. Being democratic, restrained, graceful and modern, female cherish the image of the politicians who can successfully lead their country through difficult times [71, 1-29].

Sylvia Shaw, who was conducting research on the UK legislative assemblies, proves that the differences between male and female use of adversarial tactics are not crucial. What is interesting, even though the interviewed women believe their speech styles to be more collaborative than those of men, they turn out to be more competitive when it comes to actual performance. So that their image of themselves can contradict the real

performance. Women use the speaking time at its most, but still, they intervene less [66, 34-41].

In language and gender discourse there exists the opinion that the influence of gender is of lower influence than the impact of context. Speech style is shaped by the obstacles and norms of the environment in which communication is produced. The change of the outer conditions does not automatically change the discourse norm. It takes time to converge towards the style expected in certain context.

So, women can deploy competitive and adversarial modes as well as men and underestimating their abilities or perceiving them as someone “different” from men is absolute misinterpretation.

Additionally, women, who blindly meet gendered expectations may avoid being sanctioned by public, but at the same time they may encounter the smaller share of the speaking time. Without interruptions and resistance of colliding interests, females are less likely to have influence in discussion or debate. The level of political effectiveness is likely to be low.

CONCLUSION

Political speeches in any country are shaped by the country’s political culture and constitutional framework. They reflect the ideologies and agendas of political actors that can have significant social and political consequences.

Great Britain operates under a unitary state with a constitutional monarchy, where the head of government has significant power. The Parliament operates under a Westminster-style system, with the key features of discipline and accountability. Debates are typically adversarial and highlight the ideological and political agendas of the members of parliament. Political discourse of the UK is institutionalized and focused on collective decision-making.

The art of political discourse is the ability of politicians to balance between logical reasoning (logos) and emotional appeals (pathos) while

enhancing their credibility and moral profile (ethos). The ministers report day-to-day affairs in written statements and major incidents in oral statements.

The choice of rhetorical appeals used by politicians is influenced by political traditions, such as levels of conflict tolerance, competition, control, consensus, and confrontation. The contrastive analysis performed by Ilie in 2004 found that British parliamentary language is marked by a pathos-oriented logos.

British politicians often use direct quotations as a means of emphasizing authority. The repetition of such statements reinforces the credibility of the contents of the speech. Another feature of British political language is the creation of a group identity. This polarizes positions and gives different interpretations of roles and identities, leading to heated controversies.

The mix of contempt and respect voiced towards interlocutors involves both self-face and other-face saving acts. When used with verbal tokens of respect, this strategy helps to find balance while giving a speech.

British political speeches are focused on personality features such as wit and intellectual capacities. They are motivated to be quick, humorous, and focus on the education standards and IQ level of political adversaries.

In Question Time sessions, the argumentative discussion of the government's actions enables the analysis of the government's performance, which is crucial for holding the government accountable. To withstand defensive argumentation, officeholders use such linguistic strategies and tactics as denying, legitimation, framing, and action representation. In British politics, threats and fear are common intensifiers to express the seriousness of a situation.

In British society, humor is seen as a tool of intelligence and wit in political discourse. It serves to disarm opponents, break down mental barriers, and make the speaker appear positive, friendly, and credible. Humor can also be used to convey political messages and influence the opinions of others.

Political rituals play a crucial role in shaping and defining relationships within the political institution. They convey principles of equality and serve as means of resolving moral conflicts between various elements of society. Political rituals, symbols and debates create an emotional state that makes the message incontestable and defines how politicians relate to each other and to the public.

Gender affects the way people behave and the way they are judged. In the 20th century, public speaking was traditionally a male-dominated field and the idea of women speaking in public was unthinkable. The representation of women in politics in the UK has historically been low. The first changes started in 1997, when Tony Blair's Party brought the record number of female members of Parliament. This was the first turning point of the change of political culture.

Female politicians are now believed to be more emotional and less repetitive in their speeches compared to their male counterparts. They also tend to rely on personal experiences and analogies, and are more likely to express positive emotions in their speeches.

While women politicians still face challenges in conforming to gender stereotypes, the trend towards acceptance of female political leaders and their unique styles of communication is on the rise. This shift is expected to continue, leading to a more diverse and representative political landscape.

2. MARGARET THATCHER'S TRANSFORMATIVE IMPACT ON 20TH CENTURY BRITISH POLITICS

The political style of Margaret Thatcher resulted in significant changes of political life of the United Kingdom. According to Gamble, it was her unwavering beliefs and refusal to make concessions that both enamored and incensed those around her. [30, 40-54].

The way Margaret Thatcher constructed arguments resulted into division of political opinion. That time compromise-driven politics was absolutely despised by the politician and later resulted in creation of a new style which would never be described as a consensus-seeking one.

The ideology established by Margaret Thatcher designates the volumes of influence of the politician both on the position of a leader of the Conservative Party and as a Prime Minister. After years of acting in political life of the United Kingdom the approach of the politician was transformed and advanced especially by the IMF crisis in 1976 and the Winter of Discontent in 1978–1979.

The significant influence of Margaret Thatcher on society and economic progress of the UK between 1979 and 1990 is unarguable. The progress achieved during Margaret Thatcher's leadership can be described by the rhetorical line of "rolling back the frontiers of the state" [4, 142-154].

At the same time the governance of Margaret Thatcher was not only about a new way of thinking and positioning towards economy, but it was also a complex body that included such concerns as maintenance of order and law, preservation of culture and tradition, basing family as one of the crucial sectors of social development and prosperity, and development and promotion of national identity and dignity.

The ideology of Thatcherism is interpreted as a composite of conservatism in the social sphere and neo-liberalism in the sphere of economics, but the more profound meanings can be found after finding out the motives and perspectives of the Prime Minister [5, 82-90].

Nevertheless, the politician designated herself as a political and social outsider. She paved the way of the politician who kept challenging post war consensus, battled against ingrained conventions, overturned institutional rules and as she put it was the “rebel head of an establishment government” [51, 449-453]. Margaret Thatcher’s discipline and order were the key driving forces of the total economic transformation which the main goal to reverse the decline of the economy of the United Kingdom.

2.1. The Symbolic Significance of Motifs in the Political Language of Margaret Thatcher

One of the rhetorical devices that heightens the importance of the speech is a motif. Besides that, it draws more attention to the ideas the politician promotes. This rhetorical device involves the repeated use of the concept. Motifs appear through the entire span of the politician life and make the ideas recognizable and memorable.

One of the motifs that appears in speeches of Margaret Thatcher is the motif of change. First, Margaret Thatcher supported the change of the national attitude of mind. According to Margaret Thatcher, this is one of the crucial points of progress and by keeping the path of developing this idea British nation can fulfil the role of the world’s leader in politics, economy, defense, and other critical aspects of life of the nation. In 1976 speech Margaret Thatcher states that the most challenging task of any British Government was “to change the national attitude of mind”. She admits that this challenge is “exhilarating”. She points out that she referred to the same challenge “last year” (in 1975), and she still sees it as the crucial one, especially before entering the second parliamentary year [28].

The next sub motif that Margaret Thatcher includes in the motif of change is the complete change of national policies. Change is a formidable task that requires a change in both politicians’ and citizens’ attitudes towards

innovative ideas and views. It is unattainable without shift in mindset. In 1976 the politician mentions that “a drastic change in policies and in attitudes” is the only way to repay the debts and to show the other nations that the UK can and will achieve this task. This purpose should be “openly proclaimed” and “followed” [28].

Additionally, Margaret Thatcher was strengthening her perspectives with the examples of other states, especially America or as Margaret Thatcher calls it “our traditional ally”. During Leader’s speech in Brighton in 1984 points out that Americans “welcomed change” and that was the right way for them to receive more jobs. To be more specific, Margaret Thatcher picked the example of a new railway engine, called “Stephenson’s Rocket”, the establishment of which made Margaret Thatcher think about the hope and prospects that were provided for a great number of people [39].

This way Margaret Thatcher promotes the main motif and puts efforts into dissemination of this idea towards the audience.

Another vivid motif of Margaret Thatcher’s speeches is unity. The speaker indicates collegiality and solidarity on several levels: on the level of family, leader’s team, on the level of British society, and on the level of Europe. Margaret Thatcher implies meanings of association and a sense of belonging when addressing Europe. The common aims are presented as ones that can unite and strengthen the position of the alliance.

According to Margaret Thatcher, Great Britain wants “to see Europe more united and with a greater sense of common purpose”. She also shows that the times of uncertainty and change can be overcome only if the Europe stays united and the union “resolve so that whatever may happen, our defence is sure”. Margaret Thatcher believes that Europe can play its full part in the world if it “looks outward not inward”, and if it “preserves the Atlantic community”, which is “the noblest inheritance and the greatest strength” [8, 113-116].

At the same time Margaret Thatcher rejects the blur of the borders between the countries within the European Union. The power to keep national identity, to keep the frontiers of the state preserving different traditions, parliamentary powers and sense of national pride are seen by the politician as the ones of the utmost importance. In The Bruges Speech in 1988 Margaret Thatcher mentions that the United Kingdom is not striving for “cosy, isolated existence on the fringes of the European Community”. The future of the United Kingdom is “in Europe, as part of the Community”. Soon after that she makes it clear, that even though the unity and cooperation are of utmost importance, still the UK has its own path, and sticking to this path is critical: As Margaret Thatcher states, the future of the UK “does not lie only in Europe”, and “the Community is not an end in itself” [9, 72-78], [40].

Margaret Thatcher sees centralized leadership as a step backwards and compares it to the system that was run in the Soviet Union, which is unlikely to bring considerable results: According to the politician, working together does not require “power to be centralised in Brussels or decisions to be taken by an appointed bureaucracy”. On the example of the Soviet Union Margaret Thatcher calls “running everything from the centre” ironic and continues with the statements that success is possible only in conditions of “dispersed power and decisions taken away from the center”.

On the level of the party Margaret Thatcher presents the importance of unity in her 1976 speech, mentioning that “we are a party united in purpose, strategy, and resolve. And we actually like one another”. Unity is the symbol of changes and development [28].

On the level of nation, the politician expresses her personal identification with the nation. She expresses affiliation, personal attachment to the people of the United Kingdom. The British citizen might probably feel the sense of belonging, personal attachment to the country. Margaret Thatcher, indicating that unity is the issue to be shared, stresses her solidarity with the audience.

Margaret Thatcher stresses the strong points of her country, saying that in terms of opening its markets to others “Britain has been in the lead”. She makes the statement stronger, saying that the City of London “is the biggest and most successful financial centre in Europe”. Soon after she compares the UK to other nations to present the superiority of the Great Britain: “We wish we could say the same of many other Community members”.

Margaret Thatcher stresses that unity is about creating the collaborative and collective attitude of every representative of the nation. Margaret Thatcher believes that unity is the solution not only for political issues, but for economic and social challenges as well. By mentioning the results of united actions of society (e.g., creating great learning, healing, and scientific institutions) Margaret Thatcher points out that unity is the key to prosperous future. If the actions are divided, it is unlikely to reach the expected outcomes. According to the politician, “a great nation is the voluntary creation of its people”. The politician also points out that the concept of a great nation works when individuals find a sense of pride in their abilities to contribute to a community and if they can take pride in being a part of this community [81, 215-240].

The next motif Margaret Thatcher mentions in her speeches is the motif of freedom. The speaker repeatedly puts Britain in the positions of the establisher and strong supporter of liberty, seeing it as one of the crucial points of country survival and its evolution. Besides that, Margaret Thatcher mentions historical facts and actions undertaken by the ancestors on their way to freedom. In the beginning of her career as a Leader of the Conservative Party, during the Leader’s Speech in 1975 Margaret Thatcher points out that the fight for freedom accompanies Great Britain throughout history: “Ours is one of the oldest democracies in the world. Our citizens have a passion for liberty. They have fought for it, and died for it” [27].

The same year in the “Britain Awake” speech Margaret Thatcher states, that being surrounded with the countries that also see freedom as one of the

most crucial values is of utmost importance for the nation. The politician states that Britain fully supports the nations “that believe in democracy and social and economic freedom” [28] After twelve years the views of the politicians about liberty stay the same. In “The Bruges Speech” in 1988 calls England the “island fortress” that has mounted “the liberation of Europe”. In this the politician refers to the historical facts, pointing out that British are “rightly proud” of the way in which, “we have developed representative institutions to stand as bastions of freedom”. Once again, Margaret Thatcher mentions that British people “have fought, and have died for freedom” [41].

This motif is highly metaphorized by the politician. Mostly Margaret Thatcher puts the features of light on freedom. It serves as something that can help to get through darkness, and even warm people up. Deliberation is about getting through wilds in search of a better, affluent future. Margaret Thatcher assures that if the nation wants the freedom to survive, it must be willing to bear the burden placed on them. Again, she turns to history, mentioning that “Throughout our history, we have carried the torch for freedom”. Margaret Thatcher also mentions that the support to resistance movements shown by Britain during the Second World War “helped to keep alive the flame of liberty” not only in Britain, but in a great number of other countries.

She also mentions the long-term results of the actions taken towards development of free society. The win of freedom is a true way to leave a prosperous country for the generations to come. As Margaret Thatcher calls on the audience: “Let's ensure that our children will have cause to rejoice that we did not forsake their freedom”.

In the speeches of Margaret Thatcher freedom always stays in line with such fundamentals as democracy, prosperity, honor. It is viewed as an inevitable part of progression and advancement. The strong force of freedom helps the society enter on a new chapter and play a significant role in world affairs. In the 1980 “The Lady’s Not for Turning” speech Margaret Thatcher reminds that

Europe and North America are centres of stability in an increasingly anxious world [62, 41-50]. She mentions that the Alliance is the warrant “that democracy and freedom of choice are still possible”. She also stresses that during the times “when disorder and lawlessness are ever more widespread” the Alliance stands for order and the rule of law [32].

According to the politician, the endurance of laws and national character depend on how British can address the crisis and whether they can “ensure the prosperity, the freedom, and the honour of Britain” [28].

Finally, Margaret Thatcher transformed the quest for liberty into a memorable catchphrase: “If we were to fail, that freedom could be imperilled. So let us resist the blandishments of the faint hearts; let us ignore the howls and threats of the extremists; let us stand together and do our duty, and we shall not fail” [31].

The motif devoted to environmental concerns was not a prominent part of the politician’s agenda, but still Margaret Thatcher was one of the first politicians to initiate discussions of this topic. Based on ecological issues Margaret Thatcher compared capitalism and socialism. She presented socialism with its unaccountability and inefficiency as the ideology of pollution. She strengthened those arguments with the testimony of socialism commitment to fossil fuels and coal.

Contrarily, the actions taken by representatives of capitalism, that showed the importance of investments into protection of environment and keeping our world a safe and clean place were presented as the ones that pave the way to the future. Additionally, Margaret Thatcher persistently asserted that Conservative were ‘guardians and trustees’ of the Earth, not just its “friends”, who follow “true peace movement”. In her 1990 speech Margaret Thatcher points out that “the socialist regimes in Eastern Europe” have “exploited nature every bit as ruthlessly as they exploited the people”. Due to their actions, the environment became overwhelmed with pollutants such as industrial waste, acid rain, and

sewage, resulting in a situation where people struggled to breathe or function normally. [42].

Speaking about environmental issues Margaret Thatcher used emotive language, describing its impact as “dangerous” and “damaging” one. According to her, the solutions should have been taken at international level with “no good squabbling over who is responsible” [38]. The politician was placing the arguments towards environment in the context of her economic predispositions (which was later highly criticized by the opponents). In the 1979 speech the politician states that the protection of the environment will be possible only is “the economy keeps growing”. Margaret Thatcher believed that pursuing economic growth should not come at the cost of exploiting natural resources and burdening future generations with the negative consequences of such actions [30].

Out of all the motifs presented by Margaret Thatcher, this one was delivered only in two of her speeches. Still, it was seen fundamental, since there was no other Prime Minister who spoke about environmental issues before. Despite being seen as contradictory and questionable one, Margaret Thatcher set a long-term aim for the generations to come.

2.2. Margaret Thatcher’s Political Oratory Style

The actions of the Prime Minister were followed by the clear and undeniable statements. Margaret Thatcher was taking clear lines to make her statements strong and unwavering. She mentioned that the change was inevitable, stating that if a “radical new course is not taken now, it will almost certainly never recur”. Margaret Thatcher took it as a personal aim to send a signal of changes, to make this signal clear and turn it into productive actions [32].

Additionally, Margaret Thatcher used not only linguistic means to prove her statements, but she also included numbers and calculus to make information mentioned valid and reliable. For example, the in the 1979 speech Margaret

Thatcher said: “Over the past five years the economy has hardly grown at all” [30]. The politician states that prices, and inflation have “more than doubled” compared to the indicators of 1974. Another example of the use of calculus in her speeches is the address in 1980, in which Margaret Thatcher mentions the percentage of inflation growth: “there was only a slight increase of less than 3% in output per capita, while inflation rates soared to a peak of 27% annually under the Labour Government” [32].

Margaret Thatcher devoted utmost attention to being credible in her speeches. She tried to establish equal relations with ordinary citizens, demonstrating that she made her way to the politics from an ordinary family, “having no privileges at all”, as she puts it. To add even more credibility to her claims, she compared her background and the background of other Labour politicians, which were seen as more privileged ones. For example, at the Conservative Party Annual Conference in 1978 she said that to catch up with “children from privileged homes, like Shirley Williams and Anthony Wedgewood Benn”, people with her background “needed grammar schools” [29].

Through contrast Margaret Thatcher was trying to gain ordinariness, which was one of the main components of Margaret Thatcher’s approach in interviews and debates. In 1975 she used the ordinariness to defend ordinary families. As Margaret Thatcher mentions in the debate with Healey in 1975, “I oppose the tax (the capital transfer tax proposed by the Labour Party) not because I defend privilege, but because I defend ordinary families, and small family business”. Right after that, to add credence to her claim, Margaret Thatcher states her experience, saying that she had “precious little privilege” in her early years [17, 215-226], [27].

Furthermore, Margaret Thatcher recollects her humble background with respect, putting a good family as one of the crucial aspects of self-development. In a speech delivered shortly after her debate with Denis Healey in 1975, she

made the statement that her own life experiences, including attending a state school and lacking any special privileges aside from a supportive family environment, underscored the value of a Conservative approach that prioritizes hard work and personal initiative.

Fifteen years later, in 1990 Margaret Thatcher kept the same line, mentioning that “deep in their instincts, people find what I am saying and doing right”. When recollecting her gains, she turns to the circumstances that formed her and turned into the kind of person she became: “it is the way I was brought up”. Margaret Thatcher regarded herself as “a very normal, ordinary, person, with all the right instinctive antennae” [45].

As Green points out in 2006, Margaret Thatcher recognized that the Conservative middle ranks finally found account in her views, as she shared the prejudices of these people. Moreover, Margaret Thatcher shared their prejudices that helped to build her appeal and overall position in these terms. She was the transmitter and modifier of the voice of the Conservative middle and lower ranks.

Margaret Thatcher always represented her Party as the one that was promoting independence and choice and the one that was trying to give ordinary people better life conditions. One of the aspects was the ability to own a house. In 1983 Margaret Thatcher mentioned that having own house is “at the heart of the philosophy” of the Conservative Party. She proved the results of the improvements made by the Party with the numbers: “we are proud that during our first term one million more families became homeowners”. It is also presented as one of the factors of better future for quite impressive number of people: “giving them a stake not only in the present but in the future” [37].

In this context Margaret Thatcher did not lose the chance to contrast the results of the Conservative and the Labour Parties. At the same speech she pointed out that under Labour the council house tenants would never purchase their houses [37].

Another evidence of Margaret Thatcher gaining authority through identification with ordinary people can be found in her 1992 speech. She assumes that all the gains of the epoch of her leadership are not her personal gain. It was the result of the collective investment of all representatives of the nation, of their unbreakable character and courage. As Margaret Thatcher puts it, “Thatcherism didn’t start with Thatcher”. She was not the founder, but rather the one who managed to put everything together and organize it: Margaret Thatcher states that she “pulled the best out of the character of British people” and found out that “it is really how it works” [47].

Margaret Thatcher used different political, historical, and juridical documents as a basis of her speeches, and included factual statistics. This advanced the *logos* part of the speeches and increased the trustworthiness. Through means of intertextuality Margaret Thatcher was trying to unite the audience and strengthen the level of understanding and support. This goal was mainly achieved through persuasive strategy involving quotations and citations, which nourished her statements. To fully accomplish this goal the Prime Minister designated the past events from political and historical documents. The factual information that involves figures and statistics supports the ideas and the objective of the politician, making it more convincing and trustworthy [28, 44-53].

For example, in the 1980 speech Margaret Thatcher gives the example of the Conservative politician Geoffrey Howe, under stewardship of whom “Britain has repaid \$3,600 millions of international debt, which had been run up by our predecessors”. More than that, Margaret states, that the United Kingdom “paid quite a lot of it before it was due”. To strengthen the statement, Margaret Thatcher shows the results, so that every British person can understand the outcomes of action taken by the Conservative Party: “Our great enterprises are now free to seek opportunities overseas” [32].

Another example is when Margaret Thatcher refers to the views of Winston Churchill, stating that later she may also become accused of alarmism in pointing to new dangers. To prevent the possible criticism, Margaret Thatcher mentions the points of her actions and the general aim of the steps taken by the politician: “like him (Winston Churchill), I have every confidence in the resources and the values of the Western civilization we are defending”. (Margaret Thatcher recognized her ideas would have their critics but was quickly after that she pointed out that Churchill’s were criticized as well).

Speeches of Margaret Thatcher show her devotion to handling institutional obligation. The argumentation in support of the main standpoints develops gradually, being intensified by affirming the main goals of Prime Minister’s leadership (strong economy, and family as a main point of the prosperous society). These aspects are mentioned in a large quantity of speeches of Margaret Thatcher, showing her firmness of Prime Minister’s conviction. In her speech in 1968 Margaret Thatcher states that: “For too long individuals have been unable to benefit their families sufficiently from the fruits of their efforts”. As a result of the situation, entrepreneurs or business leaders became more risk-averse, leading to a decrease in their willingness to take on additional risks. The politician states that the consequences can be drastic “for those at the bottom of the income scale, where an extra pound earned can be lost in tax and by the withdrawal of means-tested benefits” [26].

Despite all the challenges the country faced, the Prime Minister used to point out the positive results that will occur in case all the spheres are thoroughly transformed and completed for the welfare of the nation. In such appeals the general tone of the message appears to be soft. Still, it is conveyed through grammatical means of conditioning: “When the wealth-creating conditions in our economy are right, when there is confidence about the value of money, when there is a realism in wage bargaining that leaves a satisfactory

reward for enterprise, wealth will be created, wealth will be spent, and in being spent will provide the jobs” [36].

To judiciously assess situations, Margaret Thatcher shows the other side of the coin, making statements clear and unvarnished, using emotive language to awaken the representatives of the Parliament as well as ordinary citizens. In 1979 Margaret Thatcher states that if the public sector becomes too large and is supported by a private sector that is overburdened with taxes and struggling to reduce costs, this could lead to high levels of unemployment [31].

The speech style of Margaret Thatcher quite often puts other politicians in uncomfortable position, with some of them being increasingly irked by Margaret Thatcher’s pronouncements. According to Foreign Secretary Reginald Maudling, her speeches were “in terminology, a good deal harsher than my own”. So, the strong position held by the politician was far more muscular and powerful compared to others. A British politician, writer and diarist who served as a Cabinet minister between the 1960s and 1970s Tony Benn in his diaries admitted that Margaret Thatcher’s oration was “the most rumbustious, rampaging right-wing speech” he has ever heard from the Government Front Bench [30, 40-54].

The analysis of syntax of Margaret Thatcher’s speeches revealed that the sentences of the speaker are mostly syntactically simple and short. As a result, the statements are the ones that are easy to follow and memorize. The complex sentences appear quite often, but since they are used along with clarifications and explanations, it makes it easier for the audience to follow the orator. Most of the sentences are of the declarative type. The usage of questions and imperative sentences is high. They are used towards the opposing side (mostly to criticize them), towards Margaret Thatcher’s team (to strengthen the points) and towards the whole nation (to encourage them and clearly explain the route of the leader and his actions to be taken to reach the goals). There is also an

intense use of repetition of phrases and words to strengthen the position and to increase the negative sentiment towards the opponents.

2.3. Rhetorical Strategies and Devices in the Political Discourse of Margaret Thatcher

The process of influencing audiences by politicians is deeply rooted in the flow of the political communication, and strategies applied by politicians. Among other aims, communication strategies are used to raise awareness on certain issues, to promote the politician, to attack the opponent, and to aim at specific audience.

The effectiveness of the message of the politicians highly depends on the strategies they choose. To be authoritative and persuasive the speaker must adjust the strategies to the situation, target audience, and be flexible and attentive to the factors important in a particular timeline [70, 241-253].

One of the strategies commonly employed by Margret Thatcher is competitiveness. It is used as one of the means to overcome crisis and reach the target. It encourages responsibility and is one of the ways to reduce inefficiencies. According to the politician, competitiveness is one of the factors that leads to survival of national industries. She usually mentions in the speeches that include the topic of development of the economy.

For example, in her 1982 speech Margaret Thatcher mentions that for all industries to thrive, they must be competitive. This is just as important for nationalized industries as it is for private sector businesses. However, since many nationalized industries are monopolies and not subject to the same market pressures as private businesses, they may lack the incentive to become more efficient. According to the speaker, the only way out is to bring the prices down and let the private sector companies grow and develop instead of fighting for their survival [35].

Margaret Thatcher commonly applies the strategy of attacking. Thus, the speaker invokes the senses and shared experience to appeal to the emotions of the audience. The invoked emotions connect the speaker with the audience and the orator trying to reach the agreement can harness the audience feelings. Still, when the level of credibility, reliability, honesty, and authority of the speaker is not sufficient, even though the emotions of the audience can be evoked, the overall strategy will probably fail. An example of the attacking strategy is the 1983 speech of Margaret Thatcher: “you regard workers as if they are different species, how absurd, what an old-fashioned Marxist concept!”. Margaret Thatcher emphasized the importance of democracy and equal human rights, with a view to creating a better future for all members of society: “We all have the same vote, we all have equal rights before the law”. The politician follows up with the statements that the task of the Government is “not to say the world owes you a living”, but to give everyone “the maximum opportunity to make the best of their own talents” [46].

Margaret Thatcher established the unwavering belief in her vision and the actions she performed to achieve the goals. The speaker clearly presented the obstacle of recovery of the economy in Parliament and when her objectives were opposed, Margaret Thatcher dismissed them. Margaret Thatcher states that the trade unions “are destroying the very jobs which they claim to defend”. That is why the importance of “democratically and responsibly” used power is undeniable [38].

As soon as the positive results of Margaret Thatcher’s governance became obvious, and the recessed economy turned into the growing one, the arguments of the Prime Minister were adjusted to reflect the positive impact. Still, Margaret Thatcher remains quite selective when pointing out the economic indicators and admits the fields that still require a huge amount of work to be done before achieving the expected results. Even though the domestic policy of Margaret Thatcher was already justified by the credible results, still there are

challenges to be faced and answered. For Margaret Thatcher “honest money and sound finance” are the ones that require the consistent work and efforts being invested. Margaret Thatcher also mentioned the continuous “course on the restoration” of lower interest rates and lower inflation. She mentions that that is a true way in which “Britain will become competitive again”. Other measures to advance British interests on the global stage include introducing private capital into the public sector, promoting competition to replace monopolies, expanding home ownership, and prioritizing the strengthening of national defenses [34].

After reaching considerable results of governance, the defensiveness of the Prime Minister became stronger. She addresses criticism and takes a strong defensive line.

Comparison is also one of the tactics regularly used by the Prime Minister. She highlights the differences between the regimes that existed in Soviet Union and in the West and employs the rhetorical device called contrastive pairs. This device is constructed to get attention of large audience. Using the pronoun “they” the speaker draws a line between the unions and shows a huge distance between them: “they are not prosperous as we in the West are prosperous, and they are not free as we in the West are free”. Further Margaret Thatcher compares the systems and shows the benefits of the one that her country follows. The politician states that the capitalist system of the UK keeps producing the high levels of prosperity and happiness because “it is founded on human dignity and freedom” [27].

The strategy of comparison is also strengthened by the bright use of negation. These two strategies together make a speech vivid, unwavering, and straightforward. Margaret Thatcher leaves no space for doubts or dubious suggestions. The negative spaces are intentionally used to criticize the weak performances of the previous system and show the power of modern views and approaches. This may also result in shortening of the social distance between the orator and the audience. As an example, we can present Margaret Thatcher’s

1975 speech, in which she states that she disagrees with those who claim that the free enterprise system has failed. The challenges the Government face are not due to shortcomings in capitalism, but rather due to problems with socialism. The politician states that it is impossible for a country to prosper if its economic and social activities are controlled and owned by the government. Margaret Thatcher also mentions that the problem of the UK is “not that we have too little socialism. It is that we have too much” [27].

Another rhetorical technique used by Margaret Thatcher is called the list of three. It is an effective tool to stress the opinion and if used in the debate, it can challenge the opponent. It emphasizes the statement and may turn into a slogan. In the following example the Prime minister repeats the phrase “a deliberate attack” to stress the harmful results of the actions mentioned and to show them from the worst side so that the message has impact on every listener: “A deliberate attack on our values, a deliberate attack on those who wish to promote merit and excellence, a deliberate attack on our heritage and great past” [28]. Another example of the use of this rhetorical device is the Speech to Conservative Election Rally in Plymouth in 2001, in which Margaret Thatcher states that: “There are no half measures, no third ways - and no second chances” for Britain is to remain an independent state [50].

Margaret Thatcher employs the persuasive potential of the speech by selecting the vocabulary to describe the features of the opponents. Surely, the chosen lexis is predominantly negative. It is mostly associated with corruption, deception, and evil. Margaret Thatcher states, that her opponents “don't have to worry about the ebb and flow of public opinion. They put guns before butter, while we put just about everything before guns” [28].

Referring to the “Guns versus butter” model, which is used to demonstrate the percentage of the investments done by the country to improve the geopolitical situation. This aims makes politicians make a choice either to promote the development of weapon to improve the defense system or to invest

into butter (to develop goods industries), or to balance it and try to benefit from combination of these sectors.

Margaret Thatcher refrains from making explicit references to the opponents. She alludes them with the use of pronouns: “They know that they are a superpower in only one sense — the military sense. They are a failure in human and economic terms. They have moved into the Indian Ocean. They pose a rising threat to our northern waters and, farther east to Japan's vital sea routes” [44].

This strategy reveals the unworthiness of the opponent and the lack of respect to even mention the opponents by name.

Still, in some statements Margaret Thatcher used a different strategy and referred to the opponents by using the last name only (not mentioning the full name or ignoring the expected mode of address). For example, when addressing the Former Leader of the Labour Party of the United Kingdom Michael Foot without mentioning his title: “Foot is afraid of an election, is he? Oh, if I were going to cut and run I’d have gone after the Falklands. Afraid? Frightened? Frit? Couldn’t take it? Couldn’t stand it?” [37].

Along with the conclusive negative portraying of the political opponents, Margaret Thatcher uses such rhetorical devices, as rhetorical questions, metaphors, and irony. For rhetorical questions, in some cases she uses them to consolidate the previously created negative image of them. For example, when addressing the previous government: “What has this Government been doing with our defences?”. In some cases, asking questions can be a way of demanding clarification for unexpected actions or outcomes, particularly when they are associated with decisions made by past leaders. For example, in the 1976 speech Margaret Thatcher asks: “If I could press a button and genuinely solve the unemployment problem, do you think that I would not press that button this instant?” Another example is the 1980 speech of the politician: “So

Mr. Chairman, what could stop us from achieving this? What then stands in our way? The prospect of another winter of discontent? I suppose it might” [28].

Since metaphors embody basic motives in Margaret Thatcher speeches, these motives include the misunderstanding between the old administration and the new leadership. In the following example Margaret Thatcher includes the natural phenomena (the seasons of the year) and shows the change from one season to another as an opportunity to improve the general situation. The seasons are presented as a switch from bad to good times. “But I prefer to believe that certain lessons have been learned from experience, that we are coming slowly, painfully to *an autumn of understanding*. And I hope it will be followed by *a winter of common sense*” [32].

Margaret Thatcher also employs the metaphor of servant: “This country which I am privileged to serve” [32]. In this case the verb *serve* can be used to gain the favor of audience. It shrinks the distance between the orator and the audience and can present the mindset of strength of the Leader and the genuine love of the nation that leads to a strong desire to take responsibility of every representative of this nation.

Irony as a rhetorical device in political discourse plays a role of an evaluative attitude expression. This attitude implicates an opposing stance. Margaret Thatcher employs a discursive strategy to enhance a negative representation of the opponents. With the help of the acerbic wit, she implies the evaluative attribution of negative traits of the opponent [35, 605-619]. For example, in her speech in 1976 Margaret Thatcher made a pointed remark about the Defense Secretary, suggesting that the title should be modified to “the Secretary for Insecurity” to reflect the prevailing state of insecurity [33].

Another inevitable part of speeches of Margaret Thatcher is humor. As regarded by Aristotle, humor serves as a good means to disarm the opponents, when used as a demonstration of intelligence to render opponents ridiculous and inspiring the audience to laugh at them.

In case of Margaret Thatcher, humour serves as a tool to discuss current affairs in an approachable manner and to involve as many audiences in current issues as possible. For example, during the Press Conference after winning Conservative leadership in 1975, when being asked about skepticism towards lady leaders, Margaret Thatcher without hesitation gives the following answer: “Give me a chance!”. When asked, if Margaret Thatcher was surprised to have been elected by “the male-dominated Parliamentary Party”, Margaret Thatcher gives a witty answer “No, they seem to like ladies” [27].

For British society humor serves not only to subjugate and mock others, but also to publicly ridicule the opponent to make the image of them look less competent. That is what we can see from the example when Margaret Thatcher is asked about her feelings facing Harold Wilson, to which she replies with: “Ah, about the same as he will facing me. Next one, come on” [43].

Margaret Thatcher opened “The Bruges Speech” with a joke, admitting the courage of those who invited her. This proves, that she openly addressed everyone, making her position clear and unwavering with a touch of irony to face the uncomfortable situations instead of omitting them. Margaret Thatcher compares the invitation of her to speak about Britain and Europe to “inviting Genghis Khan to speak on the virtues of peaceful coexistence!” [40].

In Margaret Thatcher “The Mummy returns” speech we can find the examples of epideictic rhetoric. Epideictic speech appeals to the values of the audience to present a positive or negative judgement over a person, group, idea, or organization. As an example of positive judgement, we can take the praise of Leader of Conservative party William Hague, stating that under his leadership the people of the UK “have the right man with the right message to win through” [50]. While praising Hague, Margaret Thatcher uses informal adjectives “cool and gritty” which is not typical for speaker’s speech style.

At the same speech Margaret Thatcher applies blame rhetoric, mentioning that the Labour Party “has no discernible principles at all”. The politician

describes it as “rootless, empty and artificial” institution. The next statement ruins the image of the principles of the Labour Party: “Labour's election slogan - Ambitions for Britain - is, of course, half-right. They are ambitious. But not, I'm afraid, for Britain” [48].

Margaret Thatcher openly attacks the position of the opponent. With a handful of words, she ruins the whole idea created by the opponents. She divides her opinion into 2 parts (the first one, which seems to be positive at first – she agrees with the statement that “They are ambitious”, but immediately after that she demolished their position with the following words: “They are ambitious. But not, I'm afraid, for Britain”. Additionally, Margaret Thatcher encounters the opponent openly, without making dubious allusions: “The British people are paying a billion pounds a week of extra tax for the privilege of keeping Blair and Brown in Downing Street. What an incentive to evict them!” [19, 44-53], [49].

In general, in this example we can notice how Margaret Thatcher polarizes the positions and gives different interpretations of roles and identities of those involved in the process.

Margaret Thatcher creates a group identity. This way she polarizes the positions and gives different interpretations of roles and identities of those involved in the process. This linguistic strategy is about solidarity with the group represented as “us” and dissociation from the group represented as “them”. For example, in the 2001 speech Margaret Thatcher presents the following statement: “Ours is a Party that knows what it stands for, is proud of its beliefs, and is in tune with the deepest instincts of the British people” [49].

One of the rhetorical devices used by Margaret Thatcher is British exceptionalism. The goal is to obtain audience support. Besides that, British exceptionalism is one of the ways to convince the audience in orator's ability to lead the country through difficulties and do everything possible to keep the country in the position of a global leader. This device fosters speaker's

confidence and promotes the national identity. Additionally, it helps to set up separation between the old administration and the new one. In “The Bruges Speech” in 1988 the politician states that “We are rightly proud of the way in which we have developed representative institutions to stand as bastions of freedom”. Margaret Thatcher expressed her pride in Great Britain’s long-standing tradition of providing a haven for people from other parts of Europe who “who sought sanctuary from tyranny” [40].

With the same aim of keeping Britain exceptional and strengthening the belief that the United Kingdom is the special case of the history Margaret Thatcher turns to facts and peculiarities of origins to point out the unprecedented privileges and accomplishments of the nation. In “The Bruges Speech” in 1988 she reminds of the ancestors of the UK (Saxons, Danes, and Celts) and the rules (the Norman and Angevin ones) under which the nation was “restructured”. Margaret Thatcher also turns to the cultural wealth of Great Britain, calling the audience to “Visit the great churches and cathedrals of Britain, read our literature and listen to our language”. According to Margaret Thatcher, this is a great chance to experience “the cultural riches” that the United Kingdom “have drawn from Europe and Europeans from us” [40].

Margaret Thatcher applies British exceptionalism in two ways: by praising and negation.

Margaret Thatcher praises the United Kingdom to raise the feeling of pride of the audience. In the following speech Margaret Thatcher praises the ability of the nation to rise against the odds. Also, Margaret Thatcher highlighted Great Britain’s comparative advantages over other European countries, pointing to its leading position in terms of opening up its markets to other nations. Margaret Thatcher states that London is “the most successful financial centre in Europe” due to its policies of welcoming world financial institutions. Margaret Thatcher does not omit the chance to point out the leading position of her country in different spheres (in air transport, coastal shipping

trade, telecommunications equipment, etc.): “we have taken the lead in liberalisation and seen the benefits in cheaper fares and wider choice”. She also states that other countries are far behind the UK, mentioning that “others in Europe are only now beginning to face” the spheres, which Britain has mastered so far. The politician expresses the hope to see the same results from other nations: “We wish we could say the same of many other Community members” [40].

In terms of negation Margaret Thatcher describes what Britain is not to promote the concept of British exceptionalism. It shows that the United Kingdom does not embody the negative qualities that might negatively influence future development and international relationships. Margaret Thatcher uses it as one of the aspects of the future economic development. This is an example of face-saving strategies employed towards the whole country. As an example, we can use Margaret Thatcher’s 1980 speech, that says that “Britain does not break Treaties”. Margaret Thatcher proves that to break treaties “would be bad for Britain, bad for relations with the rest of the world, and bad for any future Treaty on trade” [32].

CONCLUSION

The significance of leadership of Margaret Thatcher in politics is undeniable. The rhetoric of the politician is a complex body that has been advancing throughout all her political career. The changes performed by the politician were a symbol of a new way of thinking and positioning towards economy and social life.

The main motifs of Margaret Thatcher’s political discourse included the change of the national attitude of mind. It was supposed to become the main points of progress and development with the main aim of keeping the UK in the role of the world’s leader in politics, economy, defense, and other aspects of life of the nation.

Another vivid motif of Margaret Thatcher's speeches is unity. The speaker indicates collegiality and solidarity on several levels: on the level of family, leader's team, on the level of British society, and on the level of Europe. Margaret Thatcher rejects the blur of the borders between the countries within the European Union.

The motif that was highly metaphorized by the politician is the motif of freedom. Britain as the establisher and strong supporter of liberty, sees the free society as the main aspect of development. According to Margaret Thatcher, the win of freedom is a true way to leave a prosperous country for the generations to come.

In the speeches of Margaret Thatcher freedom always stays in line with such fundamentals as democracy, prosperity, and honor. She turns the pursuit of freedom into a slogan: "If we were to fail, that freedom could be imperilled. So let us resist the blandishments of the faint hearts; let us ignore the threats of the extremists; let us stand together and do our duty, and we shall not fail".

Among the communication strategies used by Margaret Thatcher we pointed out competitiveness, attacking, defensiveness, comparison, creating a group identity. The rhetorical devices include negation, the list of three, rhetorical questions, metaphors, humor, irony, British exceptionalism.

Margaret Thatcher employed competitiveness to overcome crisis, reach the target, and reduce inefficiencies. The strategy of attacking helped to invoke the senses and appeal to the emotions of the audience.

Margaret Thatcher sowed the unwavering belief in her vision and her actions. The speaker clearly presented the obstacle of recovery of the economy and when her objectives were opposed, Margaret Thatcher dismissed them. After reaching considerable results of governance, the defensiveness of the PM became stronger. She addressed criticism and took a strong defensive line.

Margaret Thatcher used means of comparison and negation to make a speech vivid, unwavering, and straightforward. Margaret Thatcher leaves no

space for doubts or dubious suggestions. The negative spaces are intentionally used to criticize the weak performances of the previous system and show the power of modern views and approaches. These two strategies together resulted in shortening of the social distance between the orator and the audience.

Margaret Thatcher employs the persuasive potential of the speech by selecting the vocabulary to describe the features of the opponents. Surely, the chosen lexis is predominantly negative. It is associated with corruption, deception, and evil. In her speeches Margaret Thatcher refrains from making explicit references to the opponents. She alludes them with the use of pronouns. This strategy reveals the unworthiness of the opponent and the lack of respect to even mention this opponent by name.

To obtain audience support, Margaret Thatcher uses British exceptionalism to convince the audience in her ability to lead the country through difficulties and do everything possible to keep the country in the position of a global leader. This device fosters speaker's confidence and promotes the national identity.

Margaret Thatcher took it as a personal aim to send a signal of changes, to make this signal clear and turn it into productive actions. The progress achieved during Margaret Thatcher's leadership can be described by the rhetorical line of "rolling back the frontiers of the state". Nevertheless, the politician designated herself as a political and social outsider. She paved the way of the politician who kept challenging post war consensus, battled against ingrained conventions, overturned institutional rules and as she put it was the "rebel head of an establishment government".

There is still a lot of writing on Margaret Thatcher in the twenty-first century because she is still a very contentious figure in British politics. Many contemporary publications have looked at various facets of her tenure in office, including her social and economic policies as well as the effects of her premiership on British politics and society.

Some notable examples of these works include Peter Hennessy's "The Prime Minister: The Office and Its Holders Since 1945" (2000), Richard Vinen's "Thatcher's Britain: The Politics and Social Upheaval of the Thatcher Era" (2009), John Campbell's "Thatcher: The Downing Street Years" (2013), Charles Moore's "Margaret Thatcher: The Authorized Biography" (2013). These books offer a range of perspectives on Thatcher's legacy and provide insight into the continuing debate about her impact on British society and politics.

3. THERESA MAY: LANGUAGE AND RHETORIC OF THE SECOND FEMALE PRIME MINISTER OF THE UK

3.1. Consistent political motifs in the language structures of Theresa May's discourse

One of the most prominent motifs in the speeches of Theresa May is remembrance. The speaker reflects on the sacrifices made by previous generations, particularly those who fought and died in World War I, and emphasizes the importance of remembering their legacy. She mentions the Battle of Passchendaele in several speeches, e.g., in the Leader's speech in Birmingham in 2018, and in the press conference with Malcolm Turnbull (Prime Minister of Australia) [11]. According to the speaker: "A determination that the men who returned from the quagmires of Passchendaele to their families, here in Birmingham and across the land, should have homes fit for heroes".

In the speech, the speaker highlights the need for a fairer society and recognizes the sacrifices made by men and women who served their country during the First World War. The determination to provide homes for heroes is a symbolic representation of the commitment to recognize the contributions of soldiers who fought in the war. Additionally, the speaker acknowledges the significant role played by women who worked in essential services and calls for their representation in democracy. Theresa May advocated for greater inclusion of women who had served in vital roles during wartime, including munitions production, transportation, firefighting, and law enforcement, in the democratic decision-making process [11].

The underlying message in the speech is the importance of recognizing and appreciating the sacrifices made by different groups of people in society, irrespective of their gender, class, or occupation. The speaker emphasizes the need for solidarity and fairness in society, where every individual is treated with

dignity and respect: “That a country which stood together in solidarity, with people of every class sharing the danger, should become a fairer place” [11].

Furthermore, the speaker highlights the fact that the war brought people from different backgrounds together, and this shared experience should be used as a foundation for building a fairer and more just society. The speaker emphasizes the importance of working together, stating that the government, businesses, and the public sector have worked together to bounce back after the economic crisis of Northern Rock, creating record numbers of jobs and getting more people into work than ever before.

Overall, this motif calls for a collective responsibility to create a society that is inclusive, just, and equitable, where everyone has a voice and is treated with fairness and dignity.

Another motif of the speeches of Theresa May is the idea of transformation. The speaker argues that politics has the power to transform lives and create a fairer society, but emphasizes that this requires hard work and compromise. The speaker sees politics as a way to bring positive change to communities and the country as a whole: “We believe that by standing up to be counted, by working together, we can change our communities and our country for the better” [15].

Theresa May also stresses the importance of working together towards this transformation, highlighting the need for collaboration and unity in achieving political goals. The speaker sees politics as a means of building solidarity among people of different classes and backgrounds. According to Theresa May, they do it because they “believe in potential to transform lives”, even though “sometimes it’s adversarial” [15].

The Prime Minister also describes her party as the one that “conserves the best of inheritance but is not afraid of change” [14].

Overall, this motif presents a vision of politics as a force for positive change, with an emphasis on hard work, compromise, collaboration, and balance between tradition and progress.

The most vivid motifs presented in the speeches of Theresa May are Freedom and Security, Opportunity, The NHS, and National Security.

The speaker emphasizes the importance of freedom and security, which she believes are “the bedrock of a free society”. She acknowledges that freedom must always come with responsibility. The speaker emphasizes the significance of freedom not only as a physical state, but as the foundation of various aspects of life, including freedom of thought, expression, and action, as well as the ability to make independent decisions. By highlighting the importance of these freedoms, the speaker suggests that they are essential to a society that values individual autonomy, and progress.

She also mentions that this freedom has price and that everyone should remember that “grandparents and great grandparents fought for it against tyranny” and that is the only reason, why the modern society can “enjoy it” today.

The next prominent motif after freedom and security is the motif of opportunity. It is the result of being free and secure: “if we are secure and we are free, then opportunity is opened-up” [16]. The speaker highlights the opportunities available to people in the UK, regardless of their background. She gives examples of people who have succeeded in public life, despite their challenging circumstances. The Prime Minister also asserts that following her Party leads to creation of new opportunities, and, as a result, to new changes and achievements: “We, the Conservative Party, are the party of opportunity” [18].

Theresa May describes her Party as the one that “builds bridges” while the Labour Party “builds barriers” and states that they will use all the opportunities to overcome these barriers to reach their aims [1].

In the 2017 Leader's Speech the Prime Minister mentions the importance of freedom in terms of markets, trade, and education. Free markets and free trade are the crucial points that allow Britain to "pursue new agreements with countries around the world". Freedom is the cornerstone of future development. According to the Prime Minister, freedom "ensures our economy and society work for everyone in every part of this country, not just the privileged few" [8].

The idea of free markets operating under the right rules and regulations is presented as a valuable concept that has helped to generate prosperity for Britain and improve the living standards of its people. According to the speaker, the rules-based international system that facilitated the reconstruction of Europe and beyond after World War II and resulted in years of prosperity, improving the living standards of people, has been based on free markets. The idea of free and open markets "has inspired 70 years of prosperity, raising living standards for hundreds of millions of people right across the globe" [10].

In terms of education, Theresa May stands for free and accessible studies for everyone. She mentions that the Parliament extends the Free Schools programme for a new generation of young people by building 100 new Free Schools every year. The reason for such actions is not "because ideology says so, but because Free Schools work" [10].

Opportunity is seen as a driving force of the future development of the whole country. Theresa May states education as the most important stage of developments, she asserts that "it has been Conservative Education Secretaries who have driven the reforms that have widened access and raised standards". The United Kingdom is presented as a country that "wants everyone to have the opportunity to benefit from studying more after they leave school". Theresa May states that the reason for that is that such policies will bring benefits not only to someone, but for the whole country.

Prime Minister frequently mentions the achievements in the National Health Service and the principles embodied by the Conservative Party in this

sphere. Theresa May asserts that Conservatives have looked after the NHS for most of its life, and that the biggest cash boost in its history was given to the NHS during her leadership. In the 2018 Leader's speech in Birmingham Theresa May states that "Conservatives have looked after our NHS for most of its life. And this year we gave the NHS a seventieth birthday present to be proud of: the biggest cash boost in its history" [16].

In the 2017 Leaders Speech Theresa May presents her own example of engagements into NHS. She admits that being diagnosed the type 1 diabetes, she "has seen NHS at its most brilliant – in the world-class response shown by the doctors, nurses and paramedics" [12].

One of the main motifs of political discourse of Theresa May is the renewal of the British Dream, which Theresa May sees as the historic mission of the Conservative Party. She points out that the mission is "to renew the British Dream in each new generation". She emphasizes the idea that each new generation should be able to build a better future and that progress between the generations should be a spur to the country. Theresa May believes that this way the future generations will be prosperous: "each generation should do better than the one before it" [12].

According to the speaker, The British Dream "has inspired people from around the world to come to Britain", "to make their home in Britain", and "to build their lives in Britain" for centuries.

Theresa May admits that it feels increasingly out of reach for many people "for too many people in our country that dream feels distant". She calls for the party to renew the British Dream, which is her purpose in politics, by staking out an agenda for Britain and uniting behind it: "the historic mission of this party is to renew the British Dream" [12].

To make the idea of the British Dream more open to the audience, Theresa May provides her personal background, including her grandmother's hard work and sacrifice, as an example of the British Dream in action. Despite

her origins as a domestic servant, the grandmother worked tirelessly and made significant sacrifices driven by the belief in a better future for her family, a decision that has yielded impressive results with three of her grandchildren now serving as professors and one as a prime minister.

And to sum up, Theresa May states, that the British Dream is accessible and with putting the enough number of efforts “Britain’s long-term future is bright. The British Dream is still within reach”. The speaker discusses the need for economic and social reform to ensure that the British Dream is within reach for all, including fixing the housing market, providing affordable housing, and addressing student debt. Theresa May also emphasizes the importance of continuing to meet the international aid target and helping those in need around the world.

In the analysis of political discourse, we cannot omit the motif of Brexit. The speaker emphasizes the importance of getting Brexit right, stating that the people have decided, and Britain is leaving the European Union in March 2019 [21]. The speaker presents a vision of a new deep and special partnership between a strong, successful European Union and a sovereign United Kingdom, one that allows the two to continue to trade and cooperate with each other while ensuring that the United Kingdom is a sovereign nation once again.

In the 2016 Leader’s speech the focus of the Prime Minister is on building a country that works for everyone, where fairness and opportunity are paramount, and everyone plays by the same rules. The speaker emphasizes the need for determination and effort to bring about change and acknowledges that a vision alone cannot solve problems [6].

The Brexit vote is seen as a call for change in the way the country works, reflecting a sense that the world works well for a privileged few, but not for ordinary people. The roots of the revolution run deep, with many feeling that society, economy, and democracy are not working for them.

The 2016 speech acknowledges the sacrifices made by ordinary, working-class families after the financial crash, and emphasizes the need to tackle long-standing challenges, such as training enough people to do the jobs of the future. The speech ends with a call to change again, to create a turning point for the country, and to step back and ask what kind of country British want to be [6].

In the 2017 Leader's speech, the Prime Minister discussed Brexit in the context of the UK's future relationship with the European Union. She emphasized that Brexit represented a "new chapter" for the UK and that it was time for the country to move forward and take advantage of the opportunities that lay ahead [9].

The Prime Minister acknowledged that there were challenges associated with Brexit, particularly around issues such as trade, but she argued that these challenges could be overcome through innovation and creativity. Theresa May also emphasized the importance of maintaining good relations with the EU and building strong partnerships with other countries around the world. According to the speaker, the primary and most crucial obligation is to execute Brexit correctly.

The speaker argues that Britain must prepare itself for an "open, global future". In her view, Brexit is not about turning inward or being isolated, but rather about embracing the opportunities that come with leaving the EU.

Theresa May emphasized the need to use Brexit as an opportunity to tackle issues of inequity and discord in society, and to create a more cohesive and centralized Britain. Theresa May also discusses the role of government in providing security and support to its citizens, as well as the need to reject ideological templates and embrace a new center ground.

The speaker acknowledges that there are many prominent people in British politics who want to stop Brexit or hold a second referendum. However, they argue that this is unnecessary because the people have already voted to leave. They warn that going in different directions and pursuing different

visions of Brexit could lead to no Brexit at all, which would be a disservice to the people who voted for it.

Theresa May also contrasts the desire of the United Kingdom for independence with their desire to maintain close ties with the European Union. She contrasts the UK's desire for flexibility with the EU's tendency towards uniformity: "while I know Britain might at times have been seen as an awkward member state, the European Union has struggled to deal with the diversity of its member countries and their interests" [13].

The Prime Minister also uses contrast to emphasize the differences between the UK's current situation and its desired outcome. For example, she contrasts the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice with judges in courts across the UK. This helps to make the Prime Minister's arguments more compelling by highlighting the benefits of leaving the EU. According to Theresa May, "upon exiting the European Union, laws governing the United Kingdom will be formulated by domestic legislative entities in Westminster, Edinburgh, Cardiff, and Belfast, while judicial interpretation will be performed by courts located within the country instead of in Luxembourg". [13].

The speaker emphasizes the importance of the practical implications of Brexit for various groups in society. She provides examples of workers in a factory in Pendle who need a Brexit that keeps trade friction-free, fishermen in Peterhead who need a Brexit that delivers full control of the waters, exporting businesses in Penarth who need a Brexit that will open new global markets, and people living in Pettigo on the Irish border who need a Brexit that keeps it frictionless, and communities connected. The speaker emphasizes that these practical considerations matter to the people they serve and that they must be considered when negotiating the terms of Brexit.

Theresa May also stresses the need for unity during the negotiation process. It is being contended that the most challenging part of the negotiations lies ahead, and it is imperative for the UK to remain united and resolute to

secure an agreement that benefits the country. They express confidence in the UK's ability to do so but emphasize that it will require a collective effort from all involved, including politicians, business leaders, and citizens.

Overall, the speaker's messages about Brexit are about determination. Theresa May believed that Brexit presents the UK with an opportunity to shape its future in a way that reflects its values and priorities. However, she also recognized that the road ahead would be challenging, and that the UK must approach the issue with care and consideration, with a focus on achieving the best outcome for the country.

At the same time Theresa May takes the points of view of all citizens, especially of those who were opposing Brexit. She asserts that they should not worry that Britain will become a closed country and that it might "turn back on the world". The Government rejects isolationism and tries to prepare the country for an open, global future. The speaker also emphasizes the importance of valuing the contribution of EU citizens who have made their life in the country, stating that they are welcome and urging the negotiating teams to reach agreement on their status quickly [17].

Another motif present in the speeches of the Prime Minister Theresa May is the motif of prosperity and business. The speaker celebrates the wealth creators, the risk takers, the innovators, and entrepreneurs, presenting them as the large and small businesses who generate jobs and prosperity for the country and make British enterprises the object of admiration worldwide. The speaker argues that it is the success of these wealth creators that funds the things the country wants to do. The speaker provides explanations, mentioning that "the Government understand that it is the wealth creators whose taxes fuel our public services" [17].

In the 2018 speech Theresa May points out the achievements of the Government in the business sector and the positive outcomes of these achievements: "with government, businesses and the public sector working

together, we have bounced back – creating record numbers of jobs and getting more people into work than ever before” [17].

Theresa May calls prosperity the key to the future. The politician affirms the goal of maintaining low taxes and ensuring economic growth reaches all regions of the UK. The achievement of prosperity will result into improvement of the living standards of all people of the United Kingdom. Theresa May states that this will help to “cement Britain’s influence as a force for good in the world”.

3.2. Theresa May as a Political Orator

Theresa May makes focus on economic and social reform. The speech from 24 July 2019 emphasizes the importance of embracing economic and social reforms to build a stronger economy and a fairer society. The speaker emphasizes the UK government's intentions to implement a new Modern Industrial Strategy that would aid all regions and nations in capitalizing on forthcoming opportunities, along with its dedication to overhauling schools to equip every child with the necessary knowledge and abilities to succeed in a post-Brexit United Kingdom. Theresa May also stresses the need to take a balanced approach to reducing the deficit, investing in infrastructure to boost growth potential and improve people’s lives across the country [25].

In her speeches Theresa May puts emphasis on the concept of “Global Britain”. This term became a key theme of Theresa May’s speeches and policies after the Brexit vote. It reflects her vision of the UK as a globally oriented, outward-looking country that seeks to forge new relationships and trade links with countries beyond Europe.

The concept of “Global Britain” emphasizes the historic role of the United Kingdom as a trading nation with strong cultural and historical links to countries around the world and positions the country as a natural bridge between Europe and other regions. This term has been criticized by some who

argue that it oversells the global reach of Great Britain and underestimates the challenges of forging new trade deals and relationships outside the EU [25].

Prime Minister Theresa May shows a commitment to preserving the Union. She emphasizes the importance of the UK coming together as a union of nations and people to make the most of the opportunities ahead. This reflects her concerns that Brexit could lead to a breakdown of the UK's internal unity, particularly regarding Scotland's desire for independence. Theresa May emphasizes the need for all parts of the United Kingdom to work together to build a stronger, more prosperous country, and positions herself as a leader who is committed to the preservation of the Union. As the politician puts it, "only by coming together as one great union of nations and people", every country can make the most of the opportunities ahead. Theresa May is confident that the EU and the UK will follow a better path. She also states in the 2018 and the 2019 speeches that she is confident that a positive agreement can be reached "because of shared values and the spirit of goodwill" that exists on both sides [19], [24].

One of the peculiar traits of the politician is a conciliatory tone towards the EU. Theresa May stresses her desire for the EU to continue to succeed, and positions Brexit not as a rejection of Europe, but rather as a desire to forge a different kind of relationship with the EU based on greater control over laws, borders, and money. She emphasizes the UK's historic links with Europe and the importance of maintaining close relationships with European partners, while also stressing the need for the UK to be free to forge new relationships and trade links with countries outside the EU.

Theresa May states that history and culture of the UK is profoundly internationalist. She stresses that British are "proud of shared European heritage", but they are also a country that "has always looked beyond Europe to the wider world". Theresa May expresses her pride in the fact that Britain is among the most ethnically diverse countries in Europe and is also one of the most multicultural nations in the European Union.

Prime Minister also shows a strong sense of determination. Throughout her speech 2019 speech, Theresa May presents a determined and confident vision of the UK's future outside the European Union. She emphasizes the country's potential, talent, and ambition to be a great, global trading nation that is respected around the world, and stresses the need for the UK to take advantage of the opportunities ahead. Theresa May's rhetoric emphasizes the need for the United Kingdom to be strong, confident, and united in the face of the challenges ahead, and presents herself as a leader who is determined to deliver a successful Brexit and build a better future for the country [22].

Theresa May also emphasizes the differences in political traditions and the strong attachment to accountable and democratic government in the UK, which make it difficult for supranational institutions such as the EU to sit comfortably with the country's political history and way of life. Additionally, she argues that the EU has struggled to deal with the diversity of its member countries and interests and calls for the organization to respect and cherish difference and reform so that it deals better with the diversity of its member states.

Theresa May employs a straightforward and direct speaking style that is designed to connect with ordinary, working-class people. In the "Britain, the Great Meritocracy" speech the politician begins by referencing their mission to build a country that works for everyone, a goal that is likely to resonate with many people who feel left behind by the political establishment. In her inaugural speech as Prime Minister outside 10 Downing Street on July 13, 2016, Theresa May declared that her mission is "to build a nation that works everyone" [19].

The politician then proceeds to lay out her vision for a meritocratic Britain, which places the interests of ordinary people first. This vision is likely to appeal to those who feel that the system is stacked against them, and that success is only attainable for the privileged few. By positioning themselves as a

champion of the working class, the author can build trust and credibility with audience. She also states, that voting in the referendum was not just to leave the European Union, it was about “the way in which politics and politicians have failed to respond to concerns of ordinary people” [19].

The speaker positions herself as the one who is committed to creating a more just and equal society. She expresses a desire for everyone to have an equal opportunity to succeed based on merit rather than privilege or background. The speaker acknowledges that achieving this goal will require significant effort, including overcoming entrenched barriers and vested interests. Theresa May also emphasizes the need for a fundamental shift in the way that government works to ensure that those who are just above the poverty line are not overlooked and have access to the help they need. Theresa May positions herself as a champion of social reform and a better deal for ordinary working-class people. As Theresa May puts it, the government must deliver social reforms “across every layer of society” to provide “who are by no means rich or well off” with the help they need [2].

Theresa May employs simple, accessible language that is easy to understand. She avoids overly complex or technical jargon, which could alienate listeners. Instead, the politician uses concrete examples and relatable anecdotes to illustrate her points.

In her resignation speech Theresa May demonstrates a clear and concise communication style, effectively conveying her message to the public. She employs various rhetorical techniques such as repetition (“I have done my best”, “we must remember”, “security; freedom; opportunity”), emotive language (“burning injustices”, “tragedy at Grenfell Tower”), to strengthen her message and appeal to her audience.

Theresa May’s tone is somber, reflecting her regret at not being able to deliver Brexit and her decision to resign as prime minister. She emphasizes the importance of compromise and finding consensus in parliament, citing the

advice of Sir Nicholas Winton, and stresses the need for profound change in the country to make it work for everyone [23].

Theresa May also highlights the achievements during her time in office, including reducing the national deficit, creating more jobs across the country, and protecting the environment. She underscores her commitment to fighting injustice and inequality, particularly with regards to mental health, domestic abuse, and inequality.

Theresa May's mention of being the second female Prime Minister is intended to highlight the progress made towards gender equality in British politics, and to underscore her personal achievement as a woman in a male-dominated field. By acknowledging her status as the second female Prime Minister, Theresa May is paying tribute to the woman who preceded her in the role, Margaret Thatcher, and the pioneering work she did to break down barriers for women in politics. At the same time, Theresa May is highlighting the fact that there is still more work to be done to ensure that women have equal representation and opportunities in politics and other spheres of public life [7].

Overall, Theresa May's speech exhibits strong political oratory skills, effectively conveying her message with clarity, passion, and conviction.

3.3. Rhetoric and Linguistic Devices in the Political Discourse of Theresa May

Mini debates are vowed into the performance of the Governments. The questions asked to the Prime Minister are often not seeking information. Rather, they tend to include pre-existing viewpoints and attitudes, and the Prime Minister is not expected to provide a purely informative response. These types of questions usually begin with a series of assertions that defend a particular perspective, which is often implied rather than stated explicitly. The way the question is framed often requires the Prime Minister to commit to the preceding assertions if they provide a direct answer. The practice of using "prefaced

questions”, which involves introducing a question with a statement or opinion, is commonly employed in political discourse.

One of the examples is a mini debate between the Member of the parliament Ian Mearns and Prime Minister Theresa May, in which the MP blames Theresa May of not taking actions in the field of mental health services. According to him, the Prime Minister keeps talking and promising instead of increasing the funding of psychological services [3].

The Prime Minister does not give the direct answer to the accusations. Instead, Theresa May states the actions performed by the Government in this area. Additionally, she admits that the statement of the PM is important and is on the agenda of representatives of the Government. The Prime Minister supports her words with the facts. For instance, that the amount of people who can access the NHS therapies become higher and that the problem overall should be addressed more widely, providing students with information on how to deal with those who suffer from mental problems.

Theresa May also compares the actions of the current administration to the actions taken by the previous ones, admitting that it is “putting more money” and has “taken more action” than “any previous Government” [9].

Question Time Sessions typically involve two types of questions: tabled questions, which are submitted to the Table Office before the session, and supplementary questions, which follow up on the same topic as a tabled question and are asked by the MP who submitted the original question. Tabled questions are submitted to the Table Office before the session, and each one is followed by at least one supplementary question in which the MP who asked the original question can delve deeper into the topic. After the Prime Minister answers a question, more supplementary questions and answers can follow until the Speaker announces the next tabled question. This continues until Question Time is over or time runs out [2].

One of the examples of the use of tabled and supplementary questions is the exchange between MP Paula Sherriff and Prime Minister Theresa May in the Question Time session in 2016, in which the first tabled question was actually the routine question about the Prime Minister's official engagements of the twelfth October 2016, to which Theresa May has given the conventionally standardized answer, mentioning that she "had meetings with ministerial colleagues" and that she "shall have further such meetings later" in addition to other duties of the Prime Minister. The following supplementary can address almost anything falling under the responsibility of the government, making it an important platform for MPs to hold the government accountable and demand answers from the government [2].

In this exchange, Paula Sherriff used her supplementary question to raise concerns about the outsourcing of NHS services to private companies and alleged unethical practices that compromise patient safety. The Prime Minister's response focused on the previous government's actions and did not directly address the concerns raised by the MP. According to Theresa May, the Government want "to see the provision of local services as the best services for local people".

Sherriff uses her supplementary question to highlight unethical practices in the NHS that she witnessed while working for a service that was outsourced to Virgin Care by the coalition government. Sherriff asks whether the Prime Minister finds it acceptable for Virgin Care to impose a system of double appointments, which forces patients to have unnecessary extra consultations before surgery and boosts its profits at the expense of the taxpayer and patient safety. The Prime Minister responds by emphasizing that the government wants the best possible services for local people and pointing out that the Labour Party was responsible for putting greater privatization into the NHS.

In the exchange between Paula Sherriff and Theresa May, we can observe several linguistic devices used by the Prime Minister. The first one is hedging:

Theresa May begins her response with the phrase “Of course”, which is a hedge used to soften the response and signal that the speaker is not being confrontational.

Besides that, Theresa May uses deflection by shifting the focus away from the specific issue raised by Sherriff (Virgin Care’s unethical practices) and instead directing attention towards the broader topic of “the provision of local services” and the issue of outsourcing in the NHS.

Another theoretical device is blame-shifting. Theresa May engages in blame-shifting by pointing out that the previous Labour government was responsible for introducing privatization into the NHS, rather than her own Conservative party: “the party that put greater privatizations into the NHS was not my party but the Labour party”.

Theresa May also uses repetition. The Prime Minister repeats the phrase “the best services possible for local people” in her response, emphasizing the importance of this goal and attempting to align herself with it.

In the 2016 Leader’s Speech the phrase “government can and should be a force for good” is repeated twice in the opening paragraph, emphasizing that government has the potential to make a positive impact on people’s lives. It suggests that government has a responsibility to work for the good of the people and to provide what individuals, communities, and markets cannot [1].

Furthermore, the use of the phrase “force for good” conveys a sense of power and agency, implying that government has the ability to actively shape and influence society for the better. By framing government as a force for good, the speaker is positioning it as a positive and constructive entity. Through repetition, the speaker reinforces key points and ideas, creating a sense of momentum and urgency that can capture the attention of the audience.

Overall, the repetition of the phrase “government can and should be a force for good” in the 2016 Leader’s Speech serves as a clear example of how

rhetorical devices can be used to emphasize key ideas and create a persuasive message [1].

All the mentioned linguistic devices are designed to deflect criticism and reframe the issue in a way that aligns with the political agenda of the Prime Minister.

Theresa May's use of an accusation of inconsistency against her political opponent is a tactic that can be interpreted as an attempt to discredit her opponent and dismiss any substantive criticism they may have of her policies or actions. The accusation serves to cast doubt on the validity of the opponent's views and portrays the criticism as untenable. This can be seen as a strategic move to avoid addressing the substantive issues at hand and to excuse the Prime Minister from dealing with them.

By undermining the credibility of her opponent's arguments, Theresa May's accusation seeks to silence her opponent and avoid engaging in a substantive debate about the merits of the criticism being raised. This form of discourse may be seen as questionable, as it does not address the substance of the criticism and fails to promote a constructive exchange of ideas. Instead, it can be interpreted as an attempt to manipulate the public's perception of the issue and to protect the Prime Minister from scrutiny [20].

In this sense, Theresa May's use of an accusation of inconsistency can be viewed as a political maneuver that prioritizes short-term gains over the pursuit of a meaningful and productive dialogue. By focusing on the opponent's supposed inconsistency, Theresa May avoids engaging with the substantive issues and potentially misses out on opportunities to learn from her opponent's perspectives and to improve her policies and actions.

Theresa May's response to Paula Sherriff's question also contains some rhetorical devices, including: *ad hominem*, euphemism, and false equivalence. In terms of *ad hominem*, Theresa May does not directly attack Paula Sherriff, but she does attack her party by suggesting that Labour was responsible for

privatization in the NHS. This is a type of ad hominem attack that attempts to discredit the other party rather than engaging with the substance of the issue [2].

Theresa May uses the phrase “greater privatisation” as a euphemism for the outsourcing of services in the NHS. This is a way of downplaying the negative connotations of privatization and presenting it as a more acceptable option.

False equivalence: Theresa May’s response implies that outsourcing services in the NHS and the practices of Virgin Care are equivalent issues. This is a false equivalence, as outsourcing is a general policy issue while the practices of a specific company are a more specific and immediate concern.

One of the sources of information about the linguistic peculiarities used by politicians is the language used in press conferences. The language used in the press conferences can provide insights into the politician’s goals, values, and worldview, as well as the political context and the audience they are addressing.

In the press conference that happened in London on 10 July 2017 the UK Prime Minister Theresa May and Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull had a productive meeting, covering a range of topics. They paid tribute to the bravery of the police and emergency services who responded to the recent terror attack in Borough Market, and discussed how the two countries can increase cooperation in security and defense. They also talked about the importance of trade and investment, and the UK’s intention to establish a comprehensive bilateral trade deal with Australia following Brexit. Additionally, the two leaders discussed how they can work together to address global challenges such as the threat from North Korea, and how they can support the renewal of the Commonwealth [11].

Theresa May used various linguistic and rhetorical devices, including allusion, anaphora, antithesis, enumeration, hyperbole, metaphor, parallelism, personification, repetition, rhetorical question, and tripartite structure.

The allusion can be found in the reference to the Battle of Passchendaele, a major battle of World War I in which British and Australian soldiers fought together: “this month, as we commemorate a hundred years since the Battle of Passchendaele, we again remember their service and their sacrifice” [11].

The evidence of anaphora may be seen from the repetition of the phrase “we will” at the end of several consecutive sentences, which creates a sense of determination and commitment:

“We will persist in collaborating to promote increased global trade liberalisation and reform.”

“We will remain steadfast as strong allies and loyal friends, standing up against those who seek to undermine our cherished values and our manner of living.”

In the 2016 Leader’s Speech Theresa May uses anaphora to emphasize the need for change. The phrase “A change has got to come” is repeated on five occasions. The word “change” is used 29 times. Theresa May sees change as a duty of government. According to the Prime Minister, the most important outcome to achieve is to create the country that works for everyone [3].

The antithesis can be found in the contrast between “those who want to destroy our precious values and our way of life” and “our close partnership with Australia”, which emphasizes the importance of the latter.

This rhetorical device is also used in the 2016 Leader’s Speech, in which Theresa May compares generations and their ways to achieve better standards of life. She also points out the division and unfairness “between a more prosperous older generation and a struggling younger generation”. Besides that, Theresa May also compares the life in the capital of the UK and other parts of the country, pointing out the difference “between the wealth of London and the rest of the country” [3].

The enumeration involves the listing of the areas of cooperation that were discussed, including security and defense, trade and investment, and the

international stage. For example, in the 2017 Brexit Speech the Prime Minister uses a list of objectives to structure her argument and convey her priorities. She outlines three main objectives: providing certainty, building a stronger Britain, and strengthening the union. This enumeration helps to clarify the Prime Minister's position and make it easier for the audience to follow [13].

Speaking about Brexit Theresa May uses alliteration. The phrase "truly Global Britain" is used three times to create a memorable and catchy phrase and thus represent the positive implications of the process. Another emphasis of the positive changes that leaving the European Union will bring are presented with the means of repetition. The phrase "a brighter future" is repeated throughout the speech [13].

The example of hyperbole can be found in the exaggeration of the UK's recent victory over Australia in women's cricket, which adds a touch of humor: "It's always a pleasure to welcome our Australian friends to London, even more so when we have just beaten them at cricket. That's women's cricket, of course" [11].

The use of parallelism is illustrated by the recurrence of the phrase "we work together" when describing the collaborative efforts between the UK and Australia on the global stage. This emphasizes the significance of cooperation, as demonstrated in the following statement: "Our partnership entails working jointly through institutions such as the Commonwealth, United Nations, and G20, in order to tackle the collective global issues that confront us" [11].

Personification: the attribution of the qualities of "hateful" and "malicious" to the ideology and cyber activity of Daesh, which makes them seem more tangible and threatening [11].

In terms of repetition, by emphasizing the phrase "shared" in reference to interests and challenges faced by the UK and Australia the idea of commonality is reinforced: "our intelligence-sharing partnership under the Five Eyes alliance is central to our efforts to address the shared threats we face".

Theresa May does not miss the chance to mention her opponents in the negative light. In the 2016 Leader's Speech she poses the rhetorical question: In terms of repetition, by emphasizing the phrase "shared" in reference to interests and challenges faced by the UK and Australia the idea of commonality is reinforced: "our intelligence-sharing partnership under the Five Eyes alliance is central to our efforts to address the shared threats we face".

Rhetorical question: the question "And I made clear to Prime Minister Turnbull that an ambitious and comprehensive bilateral trade deal with Australia remains a priority for the UK", which is asked for rhetorical effect, as the answer is already implied [11].

You know what some people call them? The nasty party", to suggest that the Labour Party is viewed negatively.

The tripartite structure involves the use of a three-part structure to organize the discussion of cooperation in security and defense, trade and investment, and the international stage.

In the 2016 Leader's Speech Theresa May also appeals to emotion, especially when speaking about Brexit. The speech employs emotionally charged language to describe the Brexit vote as an act of "quiet resolve" by the people to "defy the establishment" and "make their voice heard" [2].

Theresa May appeals to the audience's emotions and creates a sense of unity. For example, she describes the UK and other EU member states as "reliable partners, willing allies, and close friends" and emphasizes the shared values and interests between the two [4].

Among the metaphors used by the politicians there are the ones that describe the exceptionalism of the United Kingdom, for example in the 2016 Leader's Speech there is the following example in which the UK is described as "a country of decency, fairness and quiet resolve". Prime Minister also uses this rhetorical device to present the main principles of her Party: unity and

cooperation. For example, the politician states that they stand for “building bridges” instead of “building barriers” in modern politics [1].

Economic growth and prosperity are said to be progressive only when the Great Britain starts working for the maximum result possible, which Theresa May also describes as “firing on all cylinders”. The politician compares the country’s economic performance to the smooth functioning of a well-tuned engine [5].

CONCLUSION

Theresa May’s political language contains prominent motifs of remembrance and the importance of recognizing and appreciating the sacrifices made by different groups in society, as well as the idea of transformation through politics as a force for positive change. Theresa May emphasizes the need for collaboration, unity, hard work, and balance between tradition and progress. Other vivid motifs include freedom and security, opportunity, the NHS, and national security. Overall, Theresa May presents a vision of a fair, just, and equitable society, where everyone has a voice and is treated with dignity and respect.

Former UK Prime Minister emphasizes the importance of freedom, security, and opportunity. She argues that freedom is necessary for prosperity and development, citing free markets, free trade, and accessible education as crucial components. Theresa May highlights the Conservative Party’s commitment to the NHS and the history of supporting it. She presents her own experience with the NHS and stresses the need to provide everyone with the opportunity to benefit from education and public life, regardless of their background. The Conservative Party is portrayed as the party of opportunity that builds bridges instead of barriers.

The speeches of Theresa May regarding Brexit emphasize the importance of getting it right, acknowledging the call for change in the way the country works and the need for a deep and special partnership between the UK and the

EU. Theresa May argues that Brexit is an opportunity for the UK to embrace a global future while tackling issues of unfairness and injustice and building a united and secure country. Overall, Theresa May presents Brexit as a chance for the UK to shape its own future while working with the EU and building partnerships around the world.

The government rejects isolationism and aims to prepare the country for an open, global future, while valuing the contribution of EU citizens who have made their life in the country. Improving the living standards of all people in the UK will help cement Britain's influence as a force for good in the world.

Theresa May emphasizes the importance of economic and social reform to build a stronger and fairer society. She highlights the concept of "Global Britain" as a key theme of her speeches and policies, positioning the UK as a globally oriented, outward-looking country that seeks to forge new relationships and trade links with countries beyond Europe. Theresa May shows a commitment to preserving the Union and stresses the need for all parts of the UK to work together. Theresa May presents a determined and confident vision of the UK's future outside the European Union, emphasizing the country's potential, talent, and ambition to be a great, global trading nation that is respected around the world.

Theresa May has given speeches highlighting her commitment to building a meritocratic society where everyone has equal opportunities to succeed based on their abilities. She advocates for social reform and a better deal for working-class people. Theresa May's speeches use simple language, relatable anecdotes, and emotive language to connect with her audience. She emphasizes compromise and finding consensus and highlights achievements, including reducing the national deficit, creating more jobs, and protecting the environment. Theresa May also states the progress made towards gender equality in politics while recognizing that more work needs to be done. Overall,

Theresa May's speeches exhibit strong political oratory skills, effectively conveying her message with clarity, passion, and conviction.

In her speeches Theresa May uses such rhetorical devices as blame-shifting, repetition, and accusations of inconsistency, as well as ad hominem, euphemism, and false equivalence to deflect criticism and reframe issues in a way that aligns with the Prime Minister's political agenda. In the press conferences Theresa May used such rhetorical devices as allusion, anaphora, antithesis, enumeration, hyperbole, metaphor, parallelism, personification, repetition, rhetorical question, and tripartite structure to emphasize the importance of collaboration and commonality between the countries. Examples of these devices include referencing the Battle of Passchendaele, using repetition to create a sense of determination, using antithesis to contrast values and partnerships, and listing areas of cooperation.

CONCLUSIONS

Political speeches in the UK are shaped by the country's political culture and constitutional framework, reflecting the ideologies and agenda of political actors. British political language is marked by pathos-oriented logos and focuses on personality features such as wit and intellectual capacities.

The choice of rhetorical appeals used by politicians is influenced by political traditions such as conflict tolerance, competition, consensus, and confrontation. British politicians use direct quotations to emphasize authority. The repetition of such statements reinforces the credibility of the contents of the speech.

Humour is seen as a tool of intelligence and wit in British politics, used to disarm opponents, break down mental barriers, and influence opinions. Political rituals and symbols create an emotional state that makes messages incontestable and define how politicians relate to each other and the public.

Gender affects the way people behave and are judged in politics. Female politicians in the UK historically faced challenges in conforming to gender stereotypes, but the trend towards acceptance of female political leaders and their unique communication styles is on the rise. Female politicians are believed to be more emotional and less repetitive in their speeches compared to male counterparts, relying on personal experiences and expressing positive emotions.

Overall, political speeches in the UK reflect the country's political culture and constitutional framework, with a focus on collective decision-making and the use of rhetorical appeals influenced by political traditions.

Margaret Thatcher was a transformative leader in British politics. Her speeches and actions had a profound impact on the country, particularly in the areas of the economy and society. Margaret Thatcher's political discourse was complex and multifaceted, with several motifs that were consistent throughout her career.

One of the themes of Margaret Thatcher's rhetoric was the need for a change in national attitude towards progress and development. She sought to position the UK as a world leader in politics, economy, defense, and other aspects of national life. Another key motif was unity, which Margaret Thatcher emphasized at various levels - from the family to British society. She believed in preserving national identity and borders and rejected the idea of blurring lines between countries in the EU.

Freedom was another central theme in Margaret Thatcher's speeches, and she saw it as essential to the development of a prosperous country. Margaret Thatcher used various communication strategies, including competitiveness, attacking, defensiveness, comparison, and creating a group identity. She employed rhetorical devices such as negation, the list of three, rhetorical questions, metaphors, humor, irony, and British exceptionalism.

Margaret Thatcher's competitiveness was aimed at encouraging responsibility and reducing inefficiencies, while her attacking strategy was designed to appeal to the emotions of the audience. She dismissed opposing views that conflicted with her vision and goals. When her actions were criticized, Margaret Thatcher took a strong defensive line. She used comparison and negation to create a vivid, unwavering, and straightforward speech. By employing British exceptionalism, Margaret Thatcher fostered confidence and promoted national identity.

In addition to her linguistic skills, Margaret Thatcher used numbers and calculus to make information valid and reliable. She took it as a personal aim to send a signal of changes, to make it clear and turn it into productive actions. Margaret Thatcher's leadership style challenged post-war consensus, battled against ingrained conventions, and overturned institutional rules.

The political language of the second female Prime Minister of the UK Theresa May is characterized by several prominent motifs, including remembrance, collaboration, unity, hard work, and transformation through

politics. She emphasizes the importance of recognizing and appreciating the sacrifices made by different groups in society, and presents a vision of a fair, just, and equitable society where everyone has a voice and is treated with respect.

Theresa May argues that freedom is necessary for prosperity and development, citing free markets, free trade, and accessible education as crucial components. Theresa May also highlights the Conservative Party's commitment to the NHS and stresses the need to provide everyone with the opportunity to benefit from education and public life, regardless of the background. She positions the Conservatives as the party of opportunity that builds bridges instead of barriers.

Theresa May's speeches regarding Brexit emphasize the importance of getting it right, acknowledging the call for change in the way the country works and the need for a deep and special partnership between the UK and the EU. She argues that Brexit is an opportunity for the UK to embrace a global future while tackling issues of unfairness and injustice and building a united and secure country. Theresa May presents Brexit as a chance for the UK to shape its own future while working with the EU and building partnerships around the world.

Theresa May emphasizes the importance of economic and social reform to build a stronger society. She highlights the concept of "Global Britain" as a key theme of her policies, positioning the UK as a globally oriented, outward-looking country that seeks to forge new relationships and trade links.

In her speeches, Theresa May uses rhetorical devices such as blame-shifting, repetition, and accusations of inconsistency, as well as ad hominem, euphemism, and false equivalence to deflect criticism and reframe issues in a way that aligns with her political agenda. In press conferences Theresa May employs such rhetorical devices as allusion, anaphora, antithesis, enumeration, hyperbole, metaphor, parallelism, personification, rhetorical question, and

tripartite structure to emphasize the importance of collaboration and commonality between countries.

Theresa May emphasizes compromise and finding consensus, and highlights achievements such as reducing the national deficit, creating more jobs, and protecting the environment. She also acknowledges the progress made towards gender equality in politics while recognizing that more work needs to be done.

Analyzing the language characteristics and unique communication styles of notable personalities, particularly in the realm of politics, can be an effective method for investigating their linguistic tendencies and communication tactics. This can help identify underlying meanings and patterns in their discourse and shed light on effective communication strategies for public figures. Additionally, studying political discourse can provide insight into how it influences society. The knowledge gained from such analysis can be applied to the development of effective communication strategies for other politicians and leaders, as well as to the understanding of the impact of political discourse on society.

REFERENCES

1. Abeles, M. Modern Political Ritual: Ethnography of an Inauguration and a Pilgrimage by President Mitterrand. *Current Anthropology*. Vol. 29, 1988.
2. Atkins, J., Finlayson, A., Martin, J., & Turnbull, N. *Rhetoric in British politics and society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2014.
3. Atkins, J., O'Barr, W. "Women's language" or "Powerless language"?. *Language, Communication, and Education*. 2005.
4. Bale, T. In life as in death? Margaret Thatcher (mis)remembered. *British Politics*, 10(1), 2015.
5. Bale, T. *The Conservative party: from Thatcher to Cameron*, 2nd edition. London: Polity, 2011.
6. Baumgartner, J., Becker, A. *Political Humor in a Changing Media Landscape*. Lexington Books, 2018.
7. Belova A.D. *Political discourse of the United Kingdom and the USA*. Lira-K, Kyiv, 2022.
8. Bennister, M. *Prime Ministers in Power: Political Leadership in Britain and Australia*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2012.
9. Bennister, M. Worthy, B. *Going On and On? Tony Blair and Margaret Thatcher: Leadership Capital Compared*. University of London, 2015.
10. Benjamins, B.V. *Cross-cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*, University of Bologna, 2004
11. Boussalis, C. Travis, G.C., Mirya, R.H., Muller, S. *Gender, Candidate Emotional Expression, and Voter Reactions During Televised Debates*, Cambridge University Press, 2021.
12. Boussalis, C. Travis, G.C., *Facing the Electorate: Computational Approaches to the Study of Nonverbal Communication and Voter Impression Formation*. *Political Communication*, Vol. 38, Issue 1-2, 2021

13. Bryce, D., Hayes, M., O'Brien, D.Z. *Pitch Perfect: Vocal Pitch and the Emotional Intensity of Congressional Speech*, Cambridge University Press, 2019
14. Brown, P. Levinson, S.C. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
15. Bull, P., & Wells, P. Adversarial discourse in Prime Minister's questions. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 2012.
16. Cameron, D. *Gender, and the commodification of language in the globalized service economy*. Blackwell Publishers, 2002.
17. Campbell, J. *The Iron Lady: Margaret Thatcher, from Grocer's Daughter to Prime Minister*, 2012
18. Cannadine, D. *In Churchill's Shadow: Confronting the past in modern Britain*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
19. Daddow, O. Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair and the Eurosceptic Tradition in Britain. *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 15(2), 2013.
20. Denver D. and Garnett M. The Popularity of Prime Ministers. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 14 (1), 2012.
21. Denver D. *Elections and Voting in Britain*. London: Palgrave. Dorey, P., 2015. A farewell to alms: Thatcherism's legacy of inequality. *British Politics*, 10(1), 2007.
22. Dickson, E., Scheve, K. Social Identity, Political Speech, and Electoral Competition. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, Vol.18, 2016.
23. Dietrich, B., Hayes, M., O'Brien, D. *Pitch Perfect: Vocal Pitch and the Emotional Intensity of Congressional Speech*. *American Political Science Review*. Cambridge University Press, Vol. 113 , Issue 4, 2019.
24. Dowding, K. The Prime Ministerialisation and the British Prime Minister. *Parliamentary Affairs.*, Vol. 66, No. 3, 2013.

25. Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekman, A. B. Social Role Theory of Sex Differences. *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Gender and Sexuality Studies*.

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2000.

26. Eder, D. The Cultural Production and Reproduction of Gender: The Effect of Extracurricular Activities on Peer-Group Culture. *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 60, No. 3, 1987.

27. Fairclough, N. *Discourse and Social Change*. Blackwell Publishing, 1993.

28. Fetzer, A. "And I quote": Forms and functions of quotations in Prime Minister's questions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 157, 2020.

29. Fetzer, A., Reber, E. Quoting in Political Discourse: Professional Talk Meets Ordinary Postings. *The Pragmatics of Quoting Now and Then*. De Gruyter Mouton, 2015

30. Gamble, A. *The Thatcher Myth*. British Politics, 2015.

31. Govier, T. *The Philosophy of Argument*. Cambridge University Press, 1999

32. Hargrave, L., Langengen, T. The Gendered Debate: Do Men and Women Communicate Differently in the House of Commons?, *Cambridge University Press*, Vol. 17, Issue 4 2020.

33. Harvey-Smith, N. *The Practical Guide to Debating*. Worlds Style/British Parliamentary Style. IDEBATE Press.

34. Heffernan, R. Prime Ministerial Predominance? Core Executive Politics in the UK. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Volume 5, No 3, 2003.

35. Heffernan, R., Exploring (and Explaining) the Prime Minister. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Volume 7 Number 4, 2005.

36. Heffernan, R. *British Political Parties in Flinders*. *The Oxford Handbook of British Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

37. Heffernan, R. There is no need for the “-isation”: The Prime Minister is merely Prime Ministerial. *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 66, No. 3, 2013.
38. Helms, L. *Presidents, Prime Ministers and Chancellors*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005.
39. Higgins, E., Kruglanski, A., Lange, P.V. *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2011.
40. Hopkin, J., Bradbury, J. British Statewide Parties and Multilevel Politics. *The Journal of Federalism*, Vol. 36, 2006.
41. Horiuchi, Y., Laing, M., 't Hart, P. Hard Acts to Follow: Predecessor Effects on Party Leader Survival. *Party Politics*, 2013.
42. 't Hart, P. and Uhr, J. *How Power Changes Hands: Transition and Succession in Government*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011.
43. Ilie, C., Palonen, K. *Parliamentary Discourse and Deliberative Rhetoric. Parliament and Parliamentarism: A Comparative History of a European Concept*. Berghahn Books, 2004.
44. Ilie, C. Interruption patterns in British parliamentary debates and drama dialogue. In A. Betten & M. Dannerer, *Dialogue analysis IX: Dialogue in literature and the media: Selected papers from the 9th IADA conference, Salzburg 2003*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer. 2005
45. Ilie, C., *Identity co-construction in parliamentary discourse practices. European Parliaments under Scrutiny*. John Benjamins Publishing House, 2010.
46. Jackson, B., Saunders, R. *Making Thatcher's Britain*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
47. Jansen, S. “The Future Is Not What It Used to Be”. *Gender, History, and Communication Studies*, 1993.
48. Johnson, R. Govier's “Invention” of the Theory of Argument. *Informal Logic*, Vol. 33, 2013.
49. Kaarbo, J. Prime Ministerial Leadership Styles in Foreign Policy Decision Making. *Political Psychology*, 18(3), 1997.

50. Kavanagh, D. & Seldon, A. The power behind the Prime Minister: the hidden influence. *Transforming British Government*, No. 10. 2002.
51. Kavanagh, D. *Thatcherism and British politics: the end of consensus?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
52. Kolb, D., Putnam, L. The Multiple Faces of Conflict in Organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 13, No. 3, Special Issue: Conflict and Negotiation in Organizations: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives, 1992).
53. Kolb, D., Ibarra, H., Robin J. Ely *Women Rising: The Unseen Barriers*. Harvard Business Review, 2013.
54. Kunin, M. *Pearls, Politics, and Power: How Women Can Win and Lead*, Chelsea Green Publishing Company, 2008.
55. Larkin-Galiñanes, C. An Overview of Humor Theory, *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Humor*, 2017.
56. Lazar, M. *Politicizing Gender in Discourse: Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis as Political Perspective and Praxis*. *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2005.
57. Lukes, S. Political Ritual and Social Integration. *Sage Journals*, Vol. 9, British Sociological Association, 2016.
58. Maltz, D., Borker, R. *A Cultural Approach to Male-Female Miscommunication*. *The Matrix of Language*, 2018.
59. McCarthy, H. The League of Nations, Public Ritual and National Identity in Britain. *Arrow Helen History Workshop Journal*, Vol. 70, 2010.
60. Mohammed, D. *Argumentation in Prime Minister's Question Time*. *Argumentation in Context*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018.
61. Nash, K., Scott, A. *The Blackwell Companion to Political Sociology*. Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
62. Norton, P. The Lady's Not For Turning: But What About The Rest? *Parliamentary Affairs*. 43(1), 1990.
63. Nye, J. *The Powers to Lead*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

64. Rhodes R. A. W and 't Hart, P. Oxford Handbook of Political Leadership Oxford: OUP, 2014.
65. Rai, S., Gluhovic, M., Jestrovic, S., Saward, M. The Oxford Book of Politics and Performance. Oxford University Press, 2021.
66. Shaw, S. Women, Language and Politics. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
67. Simons, P. Park, D. The international History of Communication study. Routledge, Taylor, and Francis Group, 2016.
68. Steinmetz, W. A code of its own: rhetoric and logic of parliamentary debate in modern Britain Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought, 2002.
69. Stevens, D., Jeffrey A., Leadership traits and media influence in Britain. Political Studies 60 (4), 2012.
70. Stewart, M., Twyman, J., Clarke, J., Kellner P., Whiteley, P. Austerity and Political Choice in Britain, Oxford University Press, 2004.
71. Strangio, P., 't Hart, P., Walter, J. Understanding Prime Ministerial Performance, 2013.
72. Talbot, M. Language and Gender. Wiley, Routledge, 2019.
73. Tannen, D. The Argument Culture. Moving from Debate to Dialogue. Random House, 1998.
74. Tannen, D. You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation, Ballantine Books, 2007
75. Teun A. van Dijk Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. Discourse & Society, Vol.4, No.2, Special Issue, 1993.
76. Teun A. Dijk Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse. Published by De Gruyter Mouton. Vol. 101 in the series Janua Linguarum, 1981.
77. Teun A Van Dijk Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Sage Publications, 2006.
78. Theakston, K. Political Skills and Context in Prime Ministerial Leadership in Britain, Politics and Policy, 30 (2), 2002.

79. Theakston, K., & Gill, M. Rating 20th-Century British Prime Ministers. *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 8(2), 2006.
80. Tsakona, V., Popa, D. *Studies in Political Humour: In Between Political Critique and Public Entertainment*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011.
81. Vinen, R. *Thatcher's Britain: the Politics and Social Upheaval of the 1980s*. London Simon Schuster, 2009.
82. Wodak, R. *The Discourse of Politics in Action*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, Macmillan, 2011.
83. Wodak, R. *The Contribution of Critical Linguistics to the Analysis of Discriminatory Prejudice and Stereotypes in the Language of Politics*. *The Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*. Germany: Hubert and Göhingen, 2008.
84. Wodak, R., Forchtner, B., *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Politics*, Routledge Handbooks in Linguistics, 2018.
85. Wodak, R., Meyer, M. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Sage Publications, 2001.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. May, T. 2016 Theresa May's launch statement: ConservativeHome, 30 June. Available at: <https://www.conservativehome.com/parliament/2016/06/theresa-mays-launch-statement-full-text.html>.
2. May, T. 2016 Statement from the New Prime Minister Theresa May. 13 July. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/statement-from-the-new-prime-minister-theresa-may>.
3. May, T. 2016 PM statement in Paris. 21 July. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-statement-in-paris-21-july-2016>.
4. May, T. 2016 G20 Summit: PM press conference with President Obama – 4 September <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/g20-summit-pm-press-conference-with-president-obama-4-september-2016>.
5. May, T. 2016 G20 Summit, China: Prime Minister's press conference – 5 September <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/g20-summit-china-prime-ministers-press-conference-5-september-2016>.
6. May, T. 2016 Speech to the Conservative Party Conference. 5 October. Available at: <http://britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=364>.
7. May, T. 2016 European Council: Prime Minister's press statement 21 October <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/european-council-october-2016-prime-ministers-press-statement>.
8. May, T. 2017 The Government's Negotiating Objectives for Exiting the EU. 17 January. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/the-governments-negotiating-objectives-for-exiting-the-eu-pm-speech>.
9. May, T. 2017 Theresa May's speech to US Republicans 26 January. Available at: <https://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/26/politics/theresa-may-us-speech-transcript/index.html>.
10. May, T. 2017 Theresa May's general election statement in full. 18 April. Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-39630009>.

11. May, T. 2017 PM press conference with Australian PM Malcolm Turnbull: 10 July Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-press-conference-with-australian-pm-malcolm-turnbull-10-july-2017>.
12. May, T. 2017 Speech to the Conservative Party Conference. 4 October. Available at: <http://britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=367>.
13. May, T. 2017 Theresa May's Florence Brexit Speech in Full. 22 September. Available at: <http://uk.businessinsider.com/theresa-may-florence-brexit-speech-in-full-2017-9>.
14. May, T. 2018 Mansion House Speech. 2 March. Available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-43256183>.
15. May, T. 2018 Theresa May's post-Salzburg speech 21 September. Available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/bb313136-bda9-11e8-8274-55b72926558f>.
16. May, T. 2018 Speech to the Conservative Party Conference. 3 October. Available at: <https://blogs.spectator.co.uk/2018/10/full-text-theresa-mays-conservative-conference-speech/>.
17. May, T. 2018 Theresa May's Conservative party conference. 4 October <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/politics/2018/10/03/theresa-mays-conservative-party-conference-speech-full-transcript/>.
18. May, T. 2018 PM's statement on Brexit. 14 November. Downing Street, London. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-statement-on-brexit-14-november-2018>.
19. May, T. 2018 Britain, the Great Meritocracy. 17 November Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/britain-the-great-meritocracy-prime-ministers-speech>.
20. May, T. 2018 PM letter to the nation: 24 November 2018, London: Prime Minister's Office. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pm-letter-to-the-nation-24-november-2018>.

21. May, T. 2019 PM statement on Brexit, 20 March. London: Prime Minister's Office. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-statement-on-brex-20-march-2019>.
22. May, T. Speech introducing "new Brexit deal" 21 May. Available at: <https://brexitcentral.com/full-text-of-theresa-mays-speech-introducing-her-new-brex-2019/>.
23. May, T. Prime Minister's statement in Downing Street: 24 May 2019 Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/prime-ministers-statement-in-downing-street-24-may-2019>.
24. May, T. 2019 PM speech on the Union, 4 July. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-on-the-union-4-july-2019>.
25. May, T. Final speech as Prime Minister: 24 July. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/theresa-mays-final-speech-as-prime-minister-24-july-2019>.
26. Thatcher, M. 1968 Conservative Political Centre (CPC) Lecture ("What's wrong with politics?") 11 October. Available at: <https://www.margarethatcher.org/document/101632>.
27. Thatcher, M. 1975 Speech Accepting the Leadership of the Conservative Party. Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 20 February. Available at: <https://www.margarethatcher.org/document/102777>.
28. Thatcher, M. 1976 Speech at Kensington Town Hall ("Britain Awake") (The Iron Lady), 19 January. Available at: <https://www.margarethatcher.org/document/102939>.
29. Thatcher, M. 1978 Speech to the Conservative Party Annual Conference. Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 13 October. Available at: <https://www.margarethatcher.org/document/103764>.
30. Thatcher, M. 1979 Speech to a Conservative Party Rally in Cardiff. Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 16 April. Available at: <https://www.margarethatcher.org/document/104011>.

31. Thatcher, M. 1979 Press Conference after Dublin European Council 30 November. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/104180>.
32. Thatcher, M. 1980 Speech to the Conservative Party Annual Conference (“the lady’s not for turning”). Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 10 October. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/104431>.
33. Thatcher, M. 1982 Rejoice Speech. 25 April. Available at: <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1982/apr/29/falkland-islands>.
34. Thatcher, M. 1982 House of Commons Statement (Falkland Islands) 14 June. Available at: <https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/1982-06-15/debates/39c162f7-da2b-4e6e-a42d-1e90c67a1901/FalklandIslands>.
35. Thatcher, M. 1982 Speech to Conservative Rally at Cheltenham 3 July. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/104989>.
36. Thatcher, M. 1983 TV Interview for London Weekend Television Weekend World (“Victorian Values”) 16 January. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105087>.
37. Thatcher, M. 1983 Conservative Party General Election Press Conference. Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 18 May. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105320>.
38. Thatcher, M. 1983 Conservative Party General Election Press Conference. Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 20 May. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105454>.
39. Thatcher, M. 1984 Speech to Conservative Party Conference, 12 October. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105763>.
40. Thatcher, M. 1988 Speech to the College of Europe (“The Bruges Speech”) 20 September. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107332>.
41. Thatcher, M. 1988 Speech to the Royal Society, 27 September. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107346>.

42. Thatcher, M. 1990 House of Commons Statement [Rome European Council] (“No no no”), 30 October. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/108234>.
43. Thatcher, M. 1990 Interview for Sunday Times, 15 November. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107868>.
44. Thatcher, M. 1990 Interview for The Times, 17 November. <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107869>.
45. Thatcher, M. 1990 Remarks outside the Paris Embassy (“I confirm it is my intention to let my name go forward for the second ballot”), 20 November. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/109188>.
46. Thatcher, M. 1990 Written Statement announcing decision to resign as Prime Minister, 22 November. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/108254>.
47. Thatcher, M. 1992 Speech in the Hague (“Europe’s Political Architecture”), 15 May. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/108296>.
48. Thatcher, M. 1990 House of Commons [Confidence in Her Majesty’s Government], 22 November. Available at: <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1990-11-22/debates/6c776281-04cb-47fe-afdf-cadd8bb232c3/ConfidenceInHerMajestySGovernment>.
49. Thatcher, M. 1996 Speech to the New Atlantic Initiative. Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 11 May. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/108361>.
50. Thatcher, M. 2001 Speech to Conservative Election Rally in Plymouth. Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 22 May. Available at: <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/108389>.

SUMMARY

The direction in which a state operates is determined by politics, as each state has a dominant political figure who is responsible for making and executing all political decisions and actions. In this sense, politics plays a crucial role in shaping the nature and direction of a society.

Political speeches reflect the country's political culture and constitutional framework, with a focus on collective decision-making and the use of rhetorical appeals influenced by political traditions.

In the United Kingdom the Prime Minister is a focal point of politics. The Prime Minister is the head of government and the most senior political figure in the country, who is responsible for leading the government, setting policy agendas, and managing the day-to-day affairs of the state. As such, the Prime Minister wields significant power and influence over the political landscape of the United Kingdom, and is a key figure in shaping the country's political and social direction.

The present thesis aims to examine the intricate and multifaceted relationship between politics and society, with a particular focus on the United Kingdom. Specifically, this research endeavors to explore in depth the challenges that female politicians encounter in their pursuit of political careers, with a particular emphasis on linguistic barriers that may impede their ability to be taken seriously within the political realm. Furthermore, it acknowledges the rise of alternative perspectives and distinctive styles of female politicians, which have made substantial contributions to political discourse.

The political discourse of UK prime ministers has a profound impact not only on British citizens but also on leaders of other countries and ordinary individuals around the world. As such, it is imperative to conduct research on the language profiles of these leaders to identify the linguistic strategies that enable them to project a positive and influential image both domestically and internationally. Through such research, we can gain valuable insights into the

ways in which language is used in political discourse and the impact it can have on society.

The master's thesis discusses the linguistic strategies used by Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May, female Prime Ministers of the UK, and how they effectively communicated their message to the public. The master's thesis aims to analyze the image, language profile, and individual style of Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May based on their speeches and responses during press conferences.

The research material consists of 20 speeches of Margaret Thatcher and 21 speeches of Theresa May, 59 pages of Margaret Thatcher's responses during press conferences, and 50 pages of Theresa May's responses during press conferences. The methods of descriptive, interpretive, contextual, and discourse analysis were used to analyze the data.

This research holds significant practical value as its methodology for analyzing language profiles and individual styles can be used in further studies investigating the language patterns of prominent individuals, uncovering underlying patterns and meanings of political discourse, and illuminating communicative strategies employed by public figures. The knowledge gained from these studies can inform the development of effective communication strategies for politicians and leaders, while also deepening understanding of the impact of political discourse on society.

The political speeches in the UK are shaped by the country's political culture and constitutional framework, reflecting the ideologies and agenda of political actors. British political language is marked by pathos-oriented logos and focuses on personality features such as wit and intellectual capacities. The choice of rhetorical appeals used by politicians is influenced by political traditions such as conflict tolerance, competition, consensus, and confrontation.

British politicians use direct quotations to emphasize authority, and the repetition of such statements reinforces the credibility of the contents of the

speech. Humour is seen as a tool of intelligence and wit in British politics, used to disarm opponents, break down mental barriers, and influence opinions. Political rituals and symbols create an emotional state that makes messages incontestable and define how politicians relate to each other and the public.

Gender affects the way people behave and are judged in politics. Female politicians in the UK face challenges in conforming to gender stereotypes, but the trend towards acceptance of female political leaders and their unique communication styles is on the rise. Female politicians are believed to be more emotional and less repetitive in their speeches compared to male counterparts, relying on personal experiences and expressing positive emotions.

Both Prime Ministers, Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May, demonstrated their exceptional communication skills through their speeches and press conferences. They were able to effectively convey their message and influence public opinion on important issues. Margaret Thatcher's powerful and decisive speaking style was particularly notable, she often used her communication skills to rally support for her policies and agenda. Theresa May, on the other hand, was known for her calm and measured approach, and was able to effectively communicate her vision for the country and navigate difficult political situations. Both Prime Ministers' ability to effectively communicate with the public played a significant role in their political success.

Margaret Thatcher, a transformative leader in British politics, had a complex and multifaceted political discourse that centered around several consistent motifs, such as unity, freedom, and the need for a change in national attitude towards progress and development. She sought to position the UK as a world leader in politics, economy, defense, and other aspects of national life. She believed in preserving national identity and borders and rejected the idea of blurring lines between countries in the EU.

Margaret Thatcher employed several communication strategies to convey her messages, including a competitive approach, using attacks and defensive

tactics, making comparisons, and creating a sense of group identity. She employed rhetorical devices such as negation, the list of three, rhetorical questions, metaphors, humor, irony, and British exceptionalism.

In addition to the linguistic devices, Margaret Thatcher used numbers and calculus to make information valid and reliable. She took it as a personal aim to send a signal of changes, to make it clear and turn it into productive actions. Margaret Thatcher's leadership style challenged post-war consensus, battled against ingrained conventions, and overturned institutional rules.

Margaret Thatcher also used historical and political documents to support her arguments. This intertextuality strategy helped her to unite her audience and strengthen the level of understanding and support for her ideas. The politician also emphasized the importance of independence and choice, particularly when it came to homeownership. She argued that owning a house was at the heart of the Conservative Party's philosophy and that the Party was committed to giving ordinary people better life conditions.

Overall, in her speeches Margaret Thatcher's approach was to establish herself as a credible and trustworthy leader who understood the concerns and aspirations of ordinary people. She used personal anecdotes, historical and political documents, to support her arguments and build support for her policies.

The political language of the second female Prime Minister of the UK, Theresa May, is characterized by several prominent motifs, including remembrance, collaboration, unity, hard work, and transformation through politics. She emphasizes the importance of recognizing and appreciating the sacrifices made by different groups in society, and presents a vision of a fair, just, and equitable society where everyone has a voice and is treated with respect.

Theresa May believes that freedom is vital for prosperity and development, with free markets, trade, and education as essential factors. She emphasizes the Conservative Party's support for the NHS and equal

opportunities in education and public life, regardless of background. The Conservatives are portrayed as the party of opportunity that unites people. Theresa May's Brexit speeches stress the need for a deep UK-EU partnership, emphasizing the opportunity for a fairer and more united country with a global outlook.

In her speeches, Theresa May uses rhetorical devices such as blame-shifting, repetition, and accusations of inconsistency, as well as ad hominem, euphemism, and false equivalence to deflect criticism and reframe issues in a way that aligns with her political agenda. In press conferences, she employs rhetorical devices such as allusion, anaphora, antithesis, enumeration, hyperbole, metaphor, parallelism, and personification.

Theresa May's speeches and policies emphasize the importance of economic and social reform, the concept of "Global Britain", the preservation of the Union, a conciliatory tone towards the EU, a strong sense of determination, and a vision for a meritocratic Britain. She positions herself as the voice of the working class, committed to creating a more just and equal society. Theresa May emphasizes the need for the UK to be strong, confident, and united in the face of the challenges ahead, and stresses the importance of maintaining close relationships with European partners while also forging new relationships and trade links with countries outside the EU.

The research can provide insights into the strategies used by politicians in the UK and contribute to the study of political discourse and leadership. It can contribute to the field of linguistic studies of political speeches and social media messages and provide insights into the linguistic patterns of gendered language in politics. Additionally, the research can contribute to the study of gender and language and highlight the linguistic challenges faced by women politicians as well as provide insights into the communication strategies, motifs, oratory style peculiarities, linguistic, and rhetorical devices used by politicians in the UK.

