

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE**  
**Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv**  
**Institute of philology**  
**Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication**

## **“LANGUAGE PROFILE OF BRITISH POLITICIANS”**

**Master`s thesis**

written by the student of the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of study

of the Master`s program

“English Communication Studies and Translation  
and Two Western European Languages”

Field of science: 03 “Humanities”

Specialty: 035 “Philology”

**Mihashko Dariia Vasylivna**

**Supervised by:**

**Kaptiurova O. V., PhD.**

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології

та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 8 від 12.05.2020

Завідувач кафедри \_\_\_\_\_ д. філол. н., проф. Белова А.Д.

KYIV – 2020

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. THEORETICAL BASIS OF INVESTIGATION OF LANGUAGE PERSONALITY IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1. Political discourse as the object of linguistic research .....	6
1.2. The notion “language personality” and its verbalization in discourse...	14
1.3. Linguistic mechanisms of influence in political discourse.....	25
<b>Conclusions to chapter 1.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>2. LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF BRITISH POLITICIANS` LANGUAGE PROFILES.....</b>	<b>36</b>
2.1. Lexical potential of the individual style.....	36
2.2. Grammatical aspect of the individual style .....	45
2.3. Stylistic peculiarities of British politicians` speeches .....	50
<b>Conclusions to chapter 2.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>3. REALIZATION OF COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES IN THE SPEECHES OF BRITISH POLITICIANS.....</b>	<b>62</b>
3.1. Strategy of discrediting.....	62
3.2. Strategy of group identification.....	69
3.3. Strategy of image creation.....	71
3.4. Strategy of persuasion.....	81
3.5. Strategy of evasion.....	84
<b>Conclusions to chapter 3.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>95</b>

## INTRODUCTION

In the modern world people are constantly influenced by large amount of information on various topics: culture, art, technology, medicine, science and many other. Political sphere is not an exception, and it is perhaps the most influential domain in the 21st century. Since anthropocentrism has become an important direction in modern linguistics, a lot of attention is focused on the use of language by the person and its influence on individuals.

Due to the increasing role of politics in people`s lives, during the last decades political discourse has become one of the most popular objects of linguistic research. The notion “language personality” is being investigated more since political leaders influence not only the choice of audience, but also social, cultural and ethical principles of communication.

The revitalization of research in the sphere of political linguistics contributed to the emergence of studies by T. van Dijk, R. Wodak, V. Bell, A. Baranov, O. Sheigal, L. Nagorna. The notion “language personality” was studied by L. Lasswell, D. Graber, G. Saucier, L. Weisgerber, V. Vinogradov, Ju. Karaulov.

Relevance of the research is conditioned by the need to conduct a comprehensive research of linguistic and communicative features of language profile of British politicians and identify the use of manipulative strategies and tactics. The processes of changes in the government of Britain are driven by people who are influenced by politicians` actions and what is more important, by their speeches. The detailed analysis of tendencies of the development of British political discourse will help to describe and define the peculiarities of language profiles of politicians, identify manipulative strategies and tactics that are used to influence the audience.

The aim of the research is to create a generalized language portrait of a modern British politician and identify the specific features of his/her language style and methods of influence on an individual, his/her actions and decisions.

The tasks of the research:

- to substantiate the conceptual foundations of the research of political discourse; to investigate the notion “language personality” and to examine the current state in the theoretical background of this notion;
- to define the linguistic mechanisms of influence in political discourse;
- to define lexical and grammatical aspects of the British politicians` individual style and determine the functional and stylistic peculiarities of linguistic units in the process of their language personality formation;
- to create and describe a typology of communication strategies and tactics in British political discourse, to identify the verbal means of their realization.

The object of the research is speech of British politicians which contains linguistic characteristics that are peculiar to political leaders and help to build up politicians` profiles.

The subject of the research is the verbal means of realization of language profile of British politicians at lexical, grammatical and stylistic levels of the language that in combination actualize various communicative strategies.

The research is based on the transcribed speeches of British politicians, the total number of symbols was 305525. Speeches of two British politicians were analysed: Prime Minister Boris Johnson and ex-Prime Minister Theresa May.

The main research methods employed were descriptive method and method of observing the peculiarities of politicians' statements in certain situations. In addition, the following methods were implemented: a quantitative method (to count the occurrence of linguistic units in the speech), a comparative method (to identify the common and distinctive features in the speeches of different political leaders), method of semantic-stylistic analysis (to detect deviations from linguistic norms, to define the peculiar speech techniques) and analytical method with techniques of rhetorical analysis (for interpretation and generalization of expressions in linguistic contexts).

The novelty of the research consists in the investigation of various linguistic aspects of British political speeches. Performing multifaceted analysis of language

profile of British politicians, the stylistic potential of peculiar language means that are involved in formation of British political leaders was outlined. The ways of formation of language profile of the politician were identified, the influence of British politicians` speeches on individuals and their decisions was investigated.

The practical significance of the research is that the obtained results can be used in the investigation of political discourse, in studying grammatical and lexical means employed by politicians and in learning efficient manipulative strategies and tactics in political domain.

The report based on the findings of the research under the title “Scenario of Brexit in the cognitive perception of the British people” was presented at the conference “English across Discourse, Literature, Culture” (Kyiv, April 2020).

The structure of the research paper. The research paper consists of introduction, three chapters, conclusions and reference list, the total number of pages is 107.

# **1. THEORETICAL BASIS OF INVESTIGATION OF LANGUAGE PERSONALITY IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

## **1.1 Political discourse as the object of linguistic research**

Communication is an integral part of our everyday life. The process of communication is influenced by a number of factors: the communication participants themselves, their background knowledge, physical and psychological state, goals, objects and situations of communication, social norms and cultural traditions and values. Depending on the communication environment and social role, one can speak about the same phenomenon in different ways, therefore each person has her/his own unique set of communicative practices that are applied in specific situations and under specific conditions. From the perspective of modern humanities, such stable, socially and culturally defined tradition of human communication is denoted by the term “discourse”.

Nowadays, as the world becomes more multinational, more multilingual and globalized, the issue of the role of political discourse becomes especially relevant, in particular, the linguistic personality of politicians and their influence on the formation of internal and external political image of the country.

Interest in studying the language of politicians was caused by the prevalence of anthropocentric approach in science today. First attempts of investigating this issue were made in ancient Greece and Rome, when there existed need to understand how famous orators built out their speeches, which rhetorical methods they used for effective public speaking.

Any modern politician should obtain the following essential fundamentals: literacy, erudition, high level of education and communicative competence, as well as style and manner of speaking, lucidity and understandability of speech in order to be successful not only in his country, but be respectful around the globe.

Nowadays the role of political communication increases, thus there is a need to study the development of main linguistic characteristics of a language profile of politicians. Politics is a specific sphere of life where individuals and political groups

struggle to gain power with all possible strategies and tactics. The process of studying politics helps to understand the mechanism of the realization of all communicative influence.

The culture of society, the variety of its spheres consists of the great number of discourses that are realized in real life, such as: everyday, official, educational, scientific, political, religious and other. Taking into consideration the fact that the term “discourse” is used in multiple sciences: linguistics, literary studies, philosophy, anthropology, ethnography, sociology, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology and others, it is difficult to define the term itself and give it one universal definition as it is multifaceted and demands various approaches to its interpretation.

In the 21st century changes in the international environment have become the path to interstate political cooperation, thus, the role of oral communication in politics increased. As a result, more and more scientists are focusing on studying trends and forms in the process of development of linguistic characteristics of politicians from different countries. The United Kingdom as one of the most developed countries in the world with its efficient and independent economy may create its own trends to follow across the globe not only in economy, but in political sphere as well. Thus, British politicians and their communicative influence also have a considerable influence on the world politics.

The notion “discourse” is widely used in different sciences and is interpreted in different ways by researchers. The existence of multiple meanings and various approaches to the interpretation of this notion is connected with its use in linguistic sciences.

As V. Z. Demyankov notices, in the Latin language, the word “discursus” in the meaning “conversation, talk” appears in the fifth century [19, p. 36]. Although, it is not always possible to state that it has only one meaning “conversation”. Thus, one should agree that the term “discourse” appeared much later, namely in the Renaissance period. Later the term was used by scholars who studied rhetoric and eloquence in 18-20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Discursive analysis originated in French linguistic tradition in the 50s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, where the discourse was considered as a speech, appointed by the speaker [6], on the basis of which the position of the speaker in communication became the major object of research. Almost at the same time Anglo-American concept of discursive analysis started to develop, which is associated with the name of Zelling Harris, who was first to use the term “discourse analysis” and defined it as “a method of the analysis of the connected speech or writing for continuing descriptive linguistics beyond the limit of a single sentence at a time and for correlating culture and language” [94, p. 1]. Discourse itself is defined as “the sentences spoken or written in succession by one or more persons in a single situation” [94, p. 3]. Harris interpreted discourse as a sequence of utterances, a section of text larger than a sentence. This idea is supported by one of his statements: “Language does not occur in stray words or sentences, but in connected discourse – from one-word utterance to a ten-volume work, from a monologue to a Union Square argument” [94, p. 3]. As M.V. Gorbunova says, “the introduction of the term discourse into linguistic science is explained by the need to study language and language units in context” [15, p. 246].

Since the 70s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, discursive analysis has become an integrative discipline that includes the main achievements of ethnolinguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and other scientific fields. In this period N. D. Aurtyunova defines “discourse” as “speech immersed in life”, as “a coherent text combined with extralinguistic, pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors” [2, p. 136-137]. Thus, the term goes beyond linguistic discipline and acquires new aspects for further research, such as cognitive aspect which is involved in the processes of peoples` communication and interaction.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century scholars by “discourse” mean “actual instances of talk, writing, or linguistic communication in some other medium” [84, p. 8]. Therefore, it is any type of oral or written communication that occurs between people.

F. S. Batsevych defines “discourse” as “the type of communicative activity, an interactive phenomenon, a flow of speech that has different forms of expression

(oral, written, paralingual), that occurs within a specific channel of communication, that is governed by participants' strategies and tactics; the synthesis of cognitive linguistic and extralinguistic factors that are determined by a particular circle of "forms of life", dependant on the subject of communication, the result of which is the formation of various speech genres" [5, p. 138].

As one may notice, during the last decades, apart from linguistic factors, scholars added to this notion extralinguistic factors that help people understand this term from various angles and perspectives. Taking into consideration this fact, the appeal to cognitive processes of communicants creates certain rules and strategies of formation and realization of speech in various communicative situations.

Some scholars claim that throughout a long period of time the terms "text" and "discourse" were considered to be synonymous. However, with the emergence of works by Michel Pêcheux and Michel Foucault, scholars started to differentiate the abovementioned terms.

It should be pointed out that there exist many distinctions between text and discourse, for example G. Cook considers discourse as the unity and interaction of text and context, whereas text is understood as "linguistic forms temporarily and artificially isolated from the context with the purpose of analysis" [78, p. 1]. The context is taken in the broadest sense and includes linguistic, extralinguistic and pragmatic aspects: paralinguistic (facial expressions, gestures, mimics), situation (relationships of people and surrounding objects in the perception of communication participants), intertext (text, belonging to another discourse, but related to this text) and others. Thus, discourse is represented as combination of text and context (situation).

According to Teun van Dijk, discourse is "an actually pronounced text, while text itself represents an abstract grammatical structure of what has been pronounced" [80]. Taking into consideration a speech-language dichotomy, discourse is considered to be a concept, related to speech, i.e. to an actual speech action, text is understood as a concept of the language system and deals with formal linguistic knowledge, linguistic competence [81].

In fact, in modern linguistics the term “discourse” is very close to the term “text” but discourse is regarded as having dynamic, unstable aspect of communication, whereas text is a static object, the result of language process. Scientists G. Brown and G. Yule are regarded to be the proponents of this point of view and they claim that “text” is “an existing factor of reality, and it has to be considered as a product of discourse, which, in turn, is represented as a valid and processual phenomenon. Thus, they distinguish two approaches: functional “discourse-as-process” and structural “text-as-product” [64].

M. Fairclough also supports the “process/result” approach to study the discourse and text interrelation. For him text is a product of generation and interpretation process. Discourse represents a dynamic process, where text is its integral part. Thus, text analysis is only a part of discourse analysis. Except text analysis, discourse includes social conditions which predetermine text generation and perception, mental processes [70].

As it was mentioned before, discourse is “speech immersed in life”. That is why the term “discourse”, unlike the term “text”, is not used with ancient texts and texts of previous centuries because it is impossible to make connections with real life.

As for political discourse, generally it is as multi-faceted as the notion discourse due to its natural diversity and the fact that it is an interdisciplinary term. Anyway, political discourse is understood as the total number of “all speech acts used in political discussions, as well as the rules of public policy, sanctified by tradition and verified by experience” [4, p. 33]. As stated by O. I. Sheigal, “the connection between language and politics is manifested, first of all, in the fact that no political regime can exist without communication” [56, p. 27]. That is why she states that political discourse includes the notion of political communication, which, in turn, is understood as communication, the main intention of which is the fight for power.

I. V. Klymenko pays attention to the pragmatic aspect of political discourse, saying that it is “a complex communicative phenomenon, the aim of which is fight

for power by means of forming public opinion that contains text as a verbalized result of speaking and context which is situational and sociocultural, as well as special linguistic means that serve both, the purpose and the task of discourse ” [28, p. 185].

A. G. Kirilov reckons that political discourse can be viewed from three perspectives. Firstly, from philological, since it is a certain text, but the one that is colored by the political background (the presence of political, ideological concepts that dominate in the world of interpreter); secondly, from a sociopsycholinguistic point of view, since one speaks about measurement of the effectiveness for achieving hidden or obvious political goals of the speaker; thirdly, from individually-hermeneutic, by explaining the personal contents of the author or the interpreter of discourse in certain conditions. [27, p. 15].

To sum up, one may say that political discourse is seen as communication in the sphere of politics aimed at gaining power and thus, the one that has interactional nature. Also, the attention is paid to the pragmatic and extraverbal aspects of discourse as they are important for understanding sociocultural interaction between communicants.

Many foreign scholars and linguists are interested in the studying of the term “political discourse”. Like Ukrainian scholars, they also declare that this notion is a broad term with various definitions which “integrates a whole palette of meanings” [105, p. 42], “covering a large area from linguistics, through sociology, philosophy and other disciplines” [67, p. 26]. Western linguists claim that language and politics are intimately linked at a fundamental level [75].

Some scholars state that the definition of the term “political discourse” is closely connected with two understandings of politics – wide and narrow, that is more concrete. A wide definition of politics includes the activities of those organizations that belong to civil society and which are not necessarily regulated by the state but at the same time compete for resources – trades unions, business associations, environmental groups, etc. In its most simple definition, politics is

limited to the activity of the institutions, such as government, parliament and parties, fulfilling their role of distributing resources.

One of the most prominent foreign linguists is Dutch professor Teun A. van Dijk who states that “political discourse is identified by its actors or authors, viz., politicians” [82, p. 2]. As he is a representative of critical discourse analysis, who made effort to its development, Dijk thinks that discourse should always be analyzed in contexts of a given situation, in the existing cultural tradition and the prevailing ideology of the time. Context plays a fundamental role in the theory of political discourse by T. A. van Dijk, who sees it as a mental model through which the participant of political process perceives received information.

In addition to this, the scholar believes that political discourse should be understood as a class of genres limited by the social sphere, in particular by politics. Debates of government officials, parliamentary hearings, party programmes, speeches delivered by politicians are genres that belong to the political sphere. T.A. van Dijk limits political discourse with professional framework, the activity of politicians. According to the scholar, this type of discourse should be considered as a form of institutional discourse. The presence of institutional environment (parliamentary session, government meeting, political party meeting) is a prerequisite for the existence of discourse as a discourse of politician. Furthermore, it is required that information delivered by the politician be proclaimed in the institutional setting. Political act, which occurs in the political environment, ensures the existence of political discourse [80, p. 243-285].

However, scholars such as Okulska and Cap point out that political discourse should be conceived as “socially oriented studies of policy and/or policies, located at the intersection of political/public discourse and political/social institutions, and studies conducted within the Critical Discourse Analysis paradigm with emphasis on politics” [101, p. 4]. As stated by Chilton and Schäffner, the concept of political discourse can be understood in its institutional sense but it can also have a broader meaning and refer to any type of power negotiation at any level [75, p. 6]. They define political discourse as “the use of language to do the business of politics and

includes persuasive rhetoric, the use of implied meanings, the use of euphemisms, the exclusion of references to undesirable reality, the use of language to arouse political emotions and the like” [76, p. 226].

Another scholar Ruth Wodak points out sociological approach to studying discourse, saying that “the complex interrelations between discourse and society cannot be analyzed adequately unless linguistic and sociological approaches are combined” [110, p. 181].

Bell argues that “the political linguistic analysis of negotiation requires attention to the full range of linguistic strategies—not only power, but also influence and authority as well” [68, p. 86] and also political discourse “entails a wide spectrum of communication behaviour, enlivened and expanded by a whole range of non-linguistic communication” [68].

According to professor of Lancaster University Paul Chilton, “in discourse studies of politics there are two broad strands. On the one hand, politics is viewed as a struggle for power, between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it... On the other hand, politics is viewed as cooperation, as the practices and institutions that a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money, influence, liberty and the like” [74, p. 3]. He also argues that there are “micro” and “macro” levels that correlate with each other. Conflicts of interest, struggles for dominance and efforts at co-operation between individuals, genders and various social groups belong to the “micro” level. At this level people use multiple techniques to get what they want, such as persuasion, rational argument, threats, irrational strategies, manipulation, bribes. At the “macro” level there are the political institutions of the state that, on the one hand, serve to resolve conflicts of interest, and on the other, serve to assert the power of a dominant individual or group. Here different parties and political leaders play crucial role.

To sum up, political discourse is studied by different disciplines. It requires the analysis of the content, tasks and forms of discourse, which are realized in certain situations in the political sphere. Wide range of linguistic strategies and sociological

aspect of discourse are needed to be analyzed in order to understand the notion of political discourse.

For modern linguistics, it's extremely important to include a whole range of components, connected with linguistic activity: political outlook of the politician; other types of discourse that can be represented either explicitly or implicitly; pragmatic and sociological aspects of discourse; extraverbal ways of communication and political context as the whole in the analysis of political discourse.

### **1.2 The notion “language personality” and its verbalization in discourse**

Language does not exist outside the culture. This is one of its most important components, a form of thinking, a specific manifestation of human life, which is, in turn, the real being of the language. Therefore, language and culture are inseparable. If language is culture, then culture is, first of all, the language. One of the trends in the development of linguistics is a detailed elaboration of the problem of human factor in speech activity. Since a person plays a pivotal role in creation and use of language, anthropological approach is the focus of linguistic research.

The social essence of language lies in the fact that it exists primarily in the linguistic consciousness - collective and individual. Accordingly, the linguistic collective, on the one hand, and the individual, on the other hand, are carriers of culture in the language. A collective as an ethnos or a nation and an individual are the extreme points on the relative scale of linguistic consciousness.

The carrier of linguistic consciousness is a “language personality”, that is a person that exists in the language space - in communication, in stereotypes of behavior fixed in the language, in the meanings of linguistic units and the meanings of the texts. Thus, linguistic paradigm puts forward the notion “language personality”. It is such an object of research that combines the interests of linguists, culturologists, psychologists, sociologists and philosophers. From the point of view of philosophy, “personality” is “the aspect of a person’s inner world, which is characterized by uniqueness and openness...” [55, p. 457]. Psychological aspect is

connected with the investigation of mental processes of the personality. “Personality is a person taken in the system of such psychological characteristics, which are socially determined and define his actions” [40, p. 377]. Thus, sociology studies personality in various social systems.

The origin of the concept of “language personality” is associated with the name of the German scientist Leo Weisgerber, who first used it in his book “Muttersprache und geistesbildung” (“Mother tongue and the formation of the spirit” (1927). In his opinion, language is the most universal cultural heritage; no one speaks a language only thanks to his own linguistic identity; on the contrary, a person speaks it thanks to the fact that he/she belongs to a particular linguistic community.

He also states that a human being has language ability (Sprachfähigkeit) that gives us the ability to hold in memory life impressions, process them and compare with other ones. The application of this language ability we find further in the form of thinking and speaking. Thus, this ability has a decisive effect on human thinking and behavior in all respects. Therefore, he implements the notion “language picture of the world” and declares that language is a stimulus to the formation of language picture of the world of the person. Later Leo Weisgerber takes a bit different look at this which states that in every language there is a certain point of view on the world, the one, from which the nation (that created this language) looked at the world. Since 1950s he points out “energetic” aspect of “language picture of the world”, which means that the influence of the language on the person arises, from his/her point of view, first of all, from the originality of his/her “language picture of the world” and not from its universal components [9].

Another scholar, Russian academician V.V. Vinogradov also studied the notion “language personality” but he approached this concept by studying the language of fiction. A literary text is a special field of creativity of a language personality, and the writer’s language to the full extent gives an idea of the individual’s artistic manner. In his works, the necessity of studying individual characteristics in speech, individual styles within the framework of fiction is put

forward. The scientist emphasized the relationship of “object-structural properties and qualities” with “subjective qualities of the writer's personality and his artistic manner” [12, p. 16]. Also he emphasized the influence the person has on the formation and development of the language.

In addition to this, Vinogradov explored two aspects of artistic language personality, namely the image of the author and the image of the narrator. The image of the author is “the embodiment of the essence of the literary work, that unites the entire system of speech structures of the characters in their relations to the narrator, storyteller or storytellers and through them it becomes the ideological and stylistic focus, the focus of the whole” [12, p. 118], whereas the narrator is “speech creation of the writer” and the image of the narrator is “a form of literary “acting” of the writer” [11, p. 191]. To sum up, every literary text is a product of a particular language person who, while creating a text and expressing his/her attitude to the world uses only his/her inherent language elements.

After that, in the 1980s philologist and linguist G. I. Bogin and Russian linguist Ju. M. Karaulov developed the scientific definition of the term “language personality” in their works. G. I. Bogin offered the model of language personality, according to which “language personality” is “a person viewed from the point of view of his willingness to make speech acts” [7, p. 3]. “Language personality is the one who appropriates the language, i.e. the one, for whom the language is the speech. Language personality is characterized not by what he/she knows about the language, but by the thing what he/she can do with it” [7, p. 3]. In addition to this, while studying the features of a perfect language personality, he highlights that “a person has an ancestral ability to be a language personality but every individual has to become one” [ibid.].

Afterwards, J. N. Karaulov in his book “Russian language and language personality” (1987) gives his own definition of the notion “language personality”. In his opinion, language personality is “a combination (and the result of realization) of abilities to create and perceive speech works (texts) that differ: a) in the degree of structure-language difficulty, b) in depth and precision of reflection of the reality

and c) in target orientation” [26, p. 245]. However, in his book he also gives a completely different definition: “language personality is a personality, expressed in language (texts) and through language he/she becomes a personality, reconstructed in their major characteristics on the basis of language means” [26, p. 38].

Both definitions underwent some changes and were later used in the encyclopedia “Russian language” edited by J. N. Karaulov. According to the first definition, language personality is defined as “the name of complex ways of describing the linguistic ability of an individual to combine systemic representation of language with functional analysis of texts”, and according to the second one, as “any native speaker of any language, characterized on the basis of the analysis of texts produced by him/her from the point of view of using in these texts the system tools of this language in order to reflect his vision of the surrounding reality and to achieve certain goals in this world” [44, p. 671].

In the abovementioned book “Russian language and language personality” Karaulov offered his structure of language personality. The linguist claims that there are three levels of the structure of language personality: verbal-semantic, lingvo-cognitive and motivational. Verbal-semantic level is considered to be the basic one. “At the level of ordinary language semantics, at the level of semantic connections of words, their combinations and vocabulary there are still no opportunities for the manifestation of individuality. As a last resort, at this level we can state non-standard, unique verbal associations, which themselves do not yet provide information about the language identity, about the more complex levels of organization of language identity” [26, p. 36]. Primitive linguistic combinations do not show the competence of language personality, but it is a necessary prerequisite for their formation and functioning.

Lingvo-cognitive level (thesaurus) consists of units such as notions, concepts, ideas that are developing in each language personality into a more or less ordered picture of the world, reflecting a hierarchy of values. Stereotypes at this level correspond to stable standard relationships between descriptors that find their expression in generalized sentences, definitions, catch phrases from the variety of

which the language personality selects those that correspond to the connections between concepts in their thesaurus. Thus, this level involves reflection in the description of the linguistic model of the world of personality.

Motivational level (pragmatics) is higher comparing to verbal-semantic and lingvo-cognitive levels and includes the identification and characterization of motives and goals that drive the development of language personality, their behavior that manages their text production and ultimately determines the hierarchy of meanings and values in their linguistic model of the world. At this level, units are pragmatically oriented and manifest, according to Yu.N. Karaulov, “in the communicative-active needs of the individual” [26, p.53]. To sum up, the three-level representation of the model of the language personality of Yu.N. Karaulov correlates with the three-level process of speech activity: motivating, shaping and implementing.

Despite the “debatable nature of some of the points” in the book “Russian language and language personality”, as D. S. Mukhortov claims, Karaulov`s theory served as an incentive for the development of a wide range of typologies and classifications.

V. Krasnykh refers to a “language personality” as “a personality who manifests himself/herself in speech activity and possesses a certain set of knowledge and ideas. Speech personality - as a personality who realizes himself/herself in communication, chooses and implements a particular strategy and tactics of communication, chooses and uses a particular repertoire of means (both linguistic and extra-linguistic). A communicative personality is a particular participant of a specific communicative act that actually takes part in real communication” [32, p. 22]. V. Krasnykh in the monograph ““A friend” among “foes”: myth or reality?” compares the concepts of the speech activity of F. de Saussure and O. O. Leontiev and concludes that it is necessary to distinguish, firstly, for the theoretical understanding of the homo loquens, four concepts related to different language personalities: 1) “A person who speaks”- a person whose activity is speech activity, which encompasses both the processes of generation and the perception of speech

messages; 2) language personality - a person who realizes himself/herself in speech activity on the basis of a set of certain knowledge and ideas; 3) speech personality - a personality that realizes himself/herself in communication, choosing and implementing one or the other communication strategy and tactics that selects and uses a particular repertoire of means (both purely linguistic and extra-linguistic); 4) communicative personality - a specific participant of a specific communicative act that takes part in real communication [31].

One of the most important components of a person`s speech organization is linguistic consciousness, as claimed by V. I. Karasik. V. V. Krasnykh contrasts two fundamentally different types of mental formations: knowledge and ideas. Knowledge is interpreted as relatively stable, objective and collective information units, representations as relatively labile, subjective and individual entities, including ideas, images and concepts, as well as the connotations and assessments associated with them. In individual and collective linguistic consciousness, knowledge and representations form an integral unity, and three sets of knowledge and representations are distinguished: 1) individual cognitive space, 2) collective cognitive space, 3) cognitive base [30, p. 41–45]. The first set is a unique combination of all knowledge and representations of a given person as an individual; the second set is a combination of knowledge and ideas that determine a person`s membership in a particular social group; the third set contains the necessary knowledge and ideas that unite all the carriers of this knowledge and ideas in the “national-linguistic-cultural community”. While studying language personality of particular politicians the first set is the most important because it focuses on the features of the language and style of one or another personality.

Ukrainian scholars interpret the notion “language personality” differently. In particular, the “Short Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms” gives the following definition: “Language personality is a combination of the speaker`s linguistic competence, the desire for creative expression, free, automatic implementation of versatile linguistic activity in one person. A language personality

has conscious attitude to his/her language practice, he/she bears the imprint of socio-social, territorial environment, traditions of education in national culture” [23, p. 95].

F. Batseyvych claims that “language personality is an individual who possesses a set of abilities and characteristics that predetermine the creation and perception of texts by this person that differ in structural-linguistic complexity level and depth and accuracy of reflection of reality” [5, p. 212].

L. Struganets characterizes language personality as “a native speaker who is competent at system of linguistic knowledge (knows concepts and relevant rules), reproduces speech activity, has skills to work actively with words, takes care of the language and promotes its development” [52, p. 38].

O. Selivanova defines the phenomenon as "an inherent feature of personality as a native speaker and communicator that characterizes their language and communicative competence and their realization in generation, perception, understanding and interpretation of verbal messages, texts, and in interactive discourse interaction” [47, p. 370].

While studying the notion “language personality”, scientists appeal to linguopersonology. V. P. Neroznak was the first who said about the formation of a new direction in linguistics. At the beginning of the 21st century a conceptual-terminological apparatus, research methodology, and theoretical basis were developed. Nowadays this discipline studies gender, professional, mental and psychological features of the language personality and their types in these aspects and is aimed at comprehensive study of personality and their speech activity. Linguopersonology helps to investigate language personality synchronically and diachronically that gives possibility to identify trends of development and predict behavior patterns of individuals depending on their social status [39, p. 161].

The notion “language personality” is studied from its psychological, philosophical, sociological, cultural and linguistic aspects which gives the variety of definitions of this term and provides multiple understanding of it. However, nowadays linguistics is focused mostly on the language that language personality uses, on the communicative purposes and pragmatic aspects of her/his speech.

While investigating the notion “language personality” and speech characteristics of a person, scholars also pay attention to the notion “idiolect”. The term was firstly introduced in American linguistics in the 40s of the previous century and was coined the following way: *ídios* (from Greek) “one`s own, peculiar, special” + *lectós* “able to talk” [51, p. 3]. L. Stavytska understands “idiolect” as, in general, the realization of a particular language by an individual, that is, a set of texts generated by the speaker and studied by a linguist to study the language system. In the narrow sense, it is just specific speech features of a particular native speaker [51, p. 3]. Stavytska also claims that while studying “idiolect”, sociological characteristics of the speaker and communicative situations should be taken into consideration.

Definitions of the term “idiolect” are quite typical and very similar to each other. According to the Literary Dictionary idiolect is “individual speech, explained by place of residence, age, occupation, social status, general level of culture of a certain person. Idiolect as a linguistic characteristic of personality not only defines the special, but also reveals diverse aspects of language as a nationwide phenomenon, its inexhaustible potential” [16, p. 293]. This definition gives the idea that a person`s language is built not only by factors, not connected to language, but also by collective national language heritage.

The term “idiolect” is created according to the model of the term “dialect” to denote individual variation of the language, in contrast to territorial and social variation, with, for example, certain speech features that are inherent to the whole groups or groups of speakers” [34, p. 171].

S. Ya. Yermolenko states: “The system of individual style is based on the connection of language and thinking, on the formation of the linguistic picture of the world in which general and individual, general and single are combined” [22, p. 305].

The abovementioned definitions emphasize the collective nature of the term “idiolect”, it means that without language of a group or a nation, there is no individual style of each person.

Short dictionary of linguistic terms offers their definition: “idiolect is a language practice of a particular native speaker; set of formal and stylistic features that distinguish individual language” [23, p. 67].

According to V. Vinogradov, “idiolect is the totality of formal and stylistic features inherent in the speech of an individual native speaker of a given language” [34, p. 171].

F. Batsevych states that it is “a unique way of communication, inherent to the individual; set of linguistic and extralinguistic components, factors of linguistic and communicative competence of the particular native speaker of language and culture” [5, p. 325-326].

A Dictionary of Stylistics gives its definition of “idiolect”. It is defined as a system of individual stylistic features [109, p. 211]. Personal identity and the peculiarities of the style of each person can be observed not only in speech, but also in writing. If politicians are taken into account, it may be observed they also develop their own personal rhetorical styles. It is due to the use of certain grammatical or lexical features that are typical of certain person.

In the aforementioned definitions, it is observed that all of them are focused on some individual linguistic or extralinguistic features of a personality. This fact may compel some people overestimate the significance of the term “idiolect” and suggest that language consists of the total number of idiolects. This idea was offered by the nineteenth-century linguist Hermann Paul, who claimed that “the language of the individual speaker-hearer encompassed the structured nature of language, the consistency of speech performance, and the regularity of change”. He argues that “each individual speaks his/her own language and each of these languages has their own history, then one may conclude that there are as many individual languages in the world as there are individuals” [7, p. 99]. Each person has her/his individual language style and prefers to use some grammatical constructions or lexical units, stylistic elements of, for example, the English language. However, it does not mean that each of Englishmen speaks a different language. The English language remains the same, but the person uses it by focusing on his/her inherent peculiarities.

To conclude, idiolect denotes a language (or some aspect of it) with its peculiar parameters (phonological, semantic, lexical, syntactic, etc.) that can be characterized according to characteristics of a certain individual or a group of people.

According to V. I. Karasik, there are various types of language personalities and they are investigated from different perspectives. Taking into account the point of view of sociolinguistics on language personality, one may say that here language portrait of a certain social type of a personality is modelled (a TV presenter, politician, entrepreneur) and certain signs of language personality of social type of personality are distinguished.

As one of the representatives of social-status type of language personality is a politician, a complex strategy for analyzing his/her verbal behavior can be implemented. According to N. A. Vostryakova, this strategy should consist of the following components: biological (gender and age), mental (that is the emotional state of the speaker while speaking), social (includes four parameters – “nationality”, “social status”, “profession”, “place of birth/residence of the speaker) and individual (vocabulary, key words, ideas, set of rhetorical instruments, phonological peculiarities) [13]. Having analyzed all the aforementioned components, scholars may get an opportunity to understand how a personality creates reality, and in case with politicians, to explain or predict their behavior.

In order to analyze and represent the language personality of any politician, some scholars consider the notion “functional model of language personality”. There is a structural-functional model by O. L. Lavrynenko that deserves being mentioned. It is built by defining the connections between individual components and their functions, taking into account the integrity of the personality. The author focuses on the need to study three components of the language personality: cognitive, motivational and emotional, each of which is represented by its own elements at the psychological, linguistic and biological levels [33, p. 15].

The linguistic level is represented in his study with the analysis of lexical and stylistic means that have high argumentative and educational potential. As it is well

known, political speeches aim not only at informing the audience, but also at creating either positive or negative attitude towards events or information said.

O. V. Osetrova offers her own two-component model to describe the model of language personality of a politician, which consists of content and communicative components. Content components include concepts (key words), model of the present, model of the future and slogans. Speech (communicative) component of the model of language personality comprises communicative mode (monologue – dialogue), genre preferences, communicative success (speech errors) and the degree of sincerity [41, p. 63].

O. I. Astashova points out three main aspects of the research of the language portrait of the politician: linguocognitive (conceptual), focused on the actualization of the conceptual picture of the world by linguistic means; communicative, aimed at exploring strategies and tactics of language material; individual-linguistic, which relies on the analysis of linguistic means (lexical, phraseological, word-formation, grammatical, etc.) according to the motivational choice [3, p. 12]. The most important are the two latter aspects because various strategies and tactics are the most vital things for politicians various, using which they may attain different communicative goals and these goals may be reached with the help of special linguistic means, namely words, word combinations, idioms, grammatical patterns.

On the basis of the abovementioned definitions it is possible to state that a comprehensive analysis of a language personality of a politician consists of three vital components: the first one is psycholinguistic, which comprises personal characteristics, psychological and cognitive characteristics; the second one is linguistic, which aims at studying linguistic means of the politician`s speech and the third one is communicative, which consists of various strategies and tactics used for attaining particular goals, and pragmatic aspect of an individual`s speech.

Language personalities with peculiar linguistic and extralinguistic characteristics that can be realized in different communicative situations are studied from psychological, social and linguistic aspects and the unique way of communication, that is idiolect, should be studied focusing on the individuals. A

comprehensive analysis of a politician may help to identify and analyze the language personality as a whole and define his/her distinctive features.

### **1.3 Linguistic mechanisms of influence in political discourse**

One of the most important components of modern society is communication. Communication is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that represents a necessary and fundamental basis for humans. Communication is the process of exchanging certain sign messages that contain informative component to influence people's activity [58, p. 180]. Communication lays the foundation for such sphere of human activity as politics. Modern linguistics studies not only the process of communication in general, but also investigates various professional domains where communication exists: political, medical, military, business and others.

Among the wide range of social functions that political culture performs in every society, the most crucial ones are such as expression and realization of social interests, educational, normative, integrative [36]. Just as political activity needs language—oral, written—as its vehicle, language maintains structures of domination and resistance, of power imbalance and of empowerment [90]. The behavior of people and the activity of their organizations, the perception by the population of the phenomena of domestic and international politics are all influenced by politics, either directly or indirectly.

Generally, influence and the ways how others affect our behavior and attitudes has been a vital focus of investigators for a long time. In fact, social influence represents the oldest experimental paradigm in the behavioral sciences [87, p. 1], as claimed G. R. Ferris. He and his colleagues conducted the study where they presented other studies that show how social influence and politics affect image making, reputation and other people`s behavior. The political scientist, H. Lasswell described politics as “who gets what, when, and how,” thus contributing to the investigation of the issue of influence which is still being investigated.

The theory of influence is fully presented in psychology, because its mechanism provides an activation of mental processes of the recipient. S. Golovin defines influence as a process and the result of a person's change in another person's behavior, attitudes, intentions, ideas, evaluations, etc. when interacting with it [50, p. 77]; in social studies influence involves intentional and unintentional efforts to change another person's beliefs, attitudes, or behavior [88].

The study of linguistic influence dates back to the time of the existence of ancient Greek rhetoric. Studying oratory however, included some kinds of linguistic influence on the listeners, but it was not limited to the rhetorical aspect. In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the return to the problem of effective communication affected the formation of pragmatic concepts of speech, general theory of communication, linguistic theory of argumentation, etc. The need for such investigations is conditioned by “globalization of the world, expansion of public communication spheres and reviewing a general concept of a person in a society.

In political speeches ideas and ideologies need to be conveyed through language so that they are agreed by the receivers as well as by others who may read or hear parts of the speech afterwards in the media [96, p. 1]. For that reason different kinds of influence were distinguished by linguists. Bloom and Keil made the distinction between two types of theories of linguistic influence: the first one was called “interesting”, the second one was called “trivial”. They insisted on the distinction between the interesting claim that language induces theory change because of linguistic structure (e.g. the particular words it has) vs. the trivial claim that language induces theory change because of the information it conveys [69, p. 362]. The scholars suggested a theoretical perspective on cognitive development.

Nowadays there is a universal classification of mechanisms of linguistic influence in linguistics: persuasion, proving, inculcation, order, conviction, request, incitement.

O. Shelestyuk differentiates social influence (greetings, goodbyes, presentation, gratitude, apology, promise); influence with the help of artistic images (a story about your own experience, the experience of the character; artistic

description); informing (news, messages); proving (justification, explanation, interpretation, proof, refutation, generalization, assumption); argumentation; stimulating dialogue (address, rhetorical question, question-and-answer complexes); exhortation (request, suggestion, advice, wishes, inculcation, bribe); call (slogan, agitation, advertising, presentation); order (instruction, order, command, request, ban, permission, reminder, wish); coercion (threat, intimidation, pressure); evaluation (approval, condemnation); emotional impact (consolation, joke, mockery, boasting, complaint, insult); mental programming (coding formulas, exclamations, affective-emotional phrases, "insertive commands") [57, p. 15–16].

D. Terculova distinguishes stylistic and syntactic means (antithesis, parallel constructions, repetitions, enumerations); stylistic-morphological (verbs); lexico-stylistic (lexis of positive objective-rational evaluation, lexis of positive subjective-emotional evaluation) [53, p. 16]. A. Naydenov distinguishes lexical and stylistic means (colloquial elements, terminology, emotionally colored vocabulary); structural-syntactic techniques (complex sentences, interrogative questions, homogeneous members of the sentence, dialogical structure of the message) [38, p. 18].

However, the process of influence does not always pass smoothly. The person who attempts to manage and direct other people may face resistance from the latter. In this case the initiator has two ways: either to force the addressee to fulfil the necessary actions, that is to break the resistance, or to try to disguise the influence that would not cause hostile attitude. Having considered this, it is possible to distinguish directed/undirected, direct/hidden influence. The directed mechanisms are inculcation and persuasion, the hidden mechanism is manipulation [43, p. 145].

Some scholars claim that the main objective of persuasion is to change other people's opinion. The speaker should know the needs, beliefs, wishes of the group so that the persuasion had its effect. Besides, persuasion involves changing persons' mental states, usually as precursors to behavioral change. Persuasion is regarded as the process of influence person's behavior. This might involve change in the valence (positive or negative) of the evaluation or a change in the extremity of the evaluation

(as when an attitude changes from extremely negative to only slightly negative [100, p. 32]).

Unlike directed influence, the undirected one does not have a similar special task, although the interaction effect occurs, often manifested in the mechanisms of infection, inculcation, imitation, emotionality and suggestion. Thus, the nature of the influence on the addressee is determined by verbal persuasion, emotionality and dynamism of the message itself.

K. Möijer claims that linguistic influence implies the presentation of a message appealing to both mind and emotion, as well as imagination [99, p. 8]. Therefore, language becomes a powerful tool to express ideas and influence the audience, and is most powerful when used implicitly.

It is worth mentioning that from the point of view of linguistics manipulation has its peculiar features. O. Dmitruk claims that while investigating manipulation, linguistics is focused on the process of influence, on those linguistic methods, that are chosen to ensure its efficiency. Unlike other disciplines, in which manipulative strategies are presented schematically, without the description of particular examples, linguistics deals with analysis of certain cases of usage of linguistic means for one-sided submission of information. Linguistic means that are used regularly become certain tactics that are used within manipulative strategies. The latter have a lot in common with general communicative strategies and tactics (for example, strategy of political correctness, evasion, falsification, distortion, etc.). The difference lies in general macro intention of the addresser: manipulative strategies aim at creating positive or negative perception of the object [21, p. 23].

In political argumentation manipulation is defined as an illegitimate control used by the manipulator over other people to make them believe that things are done in their best interests when, in fact, they only favor the manipulator [71]. Therefore, manipulation “not only involves power, but specifically abuse of power, that is, domination” (*italics in original*) [79, p. 360].

The addresser should obtain necessary language manipulation skills to know how to use and channel language means into right direction to achieve the expected

result [35, p. 1]. The politician-manipulator chooses from all possible methods and ways of manipulation only those that fit the necessary communicative situation and those that create a desired outcome and lead to the behavior that is needed.

Mechanisms of linguistic influence affect not only other people and their behavior, but also the reputation of the political leaders themselves and sometimes even the reputation of the country. In two studies conducted by Renshon J., Dafoe A., and Huth P. scientists discovered evidence “that reputations develop based on past resolved behavior, and that reputations adhere to both states and leaders” and also that “leader-specific reputations were stronger when the leader was more influential in foreign policy” [103, p. 13]. It means that politicians should choose their verbal means and build up their speeches so thoroughly in order to acquire a positive reputation as a good, fair and strong leader who is able to present the country on the international level.

In another study made by S. M. Utych participants were presented with information about two politicians who were competing for gubernatorial elections, but one group received the information about one of the politicians in neutral affective language, the other one – in negative affective language. After that they had to answer a question which candidate they would vote for. The results showed that “individuals in the negative affective language group report significantly higher levels of negative affect” [106, p. 12]. These findings show how the words used by the news media and politicians can influence political decision making. That is why lexical units of politicians should be thought over before any speech or election debates because it influences how citizens evaluate a politician and develop political attitudes.

Linguistic mechanisms of influence include communicative strategies and communicative tactics. Communicative strategy is a cognitive process, that is, a global level of awareness of the situation in which the speaker compares his /her communicative purpose with a specific linguistic expression. And communicative tactics are specific speech actions aimed at reaching influence at a certain stage of strategic interaction [49, p. 176]. Some scholars such as O. Ya. Goihman and T. N.

Nadeina, T. A. van Dijk point at flexibility of strategy and its dependence on the situation in general, on local contextual restrictions that define the direction of the development and the organization of influence in order to gain the aim of communication [14, p. 145; 18, p. 274].

Strategy is a sequence of actions that contribute to the most successful implementation of the intention(s) of the communicants and is characterized by the choice that is imposed by the features of the communicative situation, first of all, by the inability to predict accurately the reaction of the partner, their communicative behavior and their following moves and also the direction in which the dialogue will continue to develop after the reciprocal response of the listener [46, p. 2]. That is why the politician has to be extremely flexible in adjusting to the communicative situation that may appear, modify the strategy and make right decisions as to implementation of an alternative to the existing communicative tactics.

It is worth pointing out that an important role is devoted to the defining of the aim: while using one or another strategy the addresser pursues a specific goal – “general motif of action” or “higher intention”, “super-task” [10, p. 32], which determines the choice of linguistic actions. The lines that implement language actions within a chosen strategy may be different in terms of their lexical-syntactic filling, but they are unique in terms of their meaning. Lines similar according to their semantic content, are combined into tactics, subordinate to the goal of communication [10, p. 36].

Communicative tactics is a set of practical ways of communicative intention realization in the real process of communication [29, p. 19]. Thus, tactics differ from the strategy in the scope: while tactics are certain communicative “moves” (steps, stages) in communicative situation, communicative strategy is a general vector, intention of language behavior.

Since political discourse is by its character aimed at inculcation and system of points of views of the addressee or the audience is taken into consideration with the intention to modify this system and behavior, the politician needs to “stick to the

main communicative strategy of discourse and also combine tactics skillfully, including them into this strategy” [54, p. 2].

There are various classifications of communicative strategies, but all scholars come to the conclusion that there are three main communicative strategies that conceptually describe the major social processes that evoke communication actions. Here belong the following: presentation (or self-presentation), manipulation and convention; the main means for them are: notice, message and dialogue accordingly [17, p. 1].

O. V. Yashenkova examines language communication and specifies the following basic strategies of political discourse: self-presentation, agitation, formation of emotional control, information-interpretation, argumentative, manipulation, discredit, attack, self-defense, etc. [60, p. 168–170].

In political linguistics the classification of communicative strategies and tactics by O. N. Parshyna can be regarded as the most complete one. In oral political discourse she distinguishes the following communicative strategies and tactics:

1. *The strategy of self-presentation* (presentation of the political image)
  - identification tactics (presentation of belonging to a political or social group);
  - solidarity tactics (desire to give the impression of having common views and beliefs);
  - opposition tactics ("we" and "others").
2. *Strategies of fight for power* include the following strategies:
  - a) *The strategy of discredit and attack*
    - insult tactics, prosecution tactics;
  - b) *Manipulative strategy* (different tricks in discourse, purpose of which is to dishonestly convince the addressee or voter to accept the speaker`s position)
    - demagogic tricks (pompous statements, worthless promises, understatement);
    - manipulative tactics (politeness tactics, tactics of exaggeration or hyperbolization);

c) *Self-defense strategy*

- tactics of justification (explanation of the speaker's action);
- criticism tactics;
- impingement tactics.

3. *Strategy of power retention* unites such types as:

a) *Information-interpretation strategy* (informing compatriots about significant events in the political or socio-economic sphere)

- tactics of admitting the existence of a problem;
- clarification tactics;
- commenting tactics;
- tactics of considering the problem from a new angle;
- tactics of problem resolving.

b) *The strategy of formation of the emotional mood of the addressee*

- unity tactics (unity of citizens as "one nation", striving for common views);
- tactics of appealing to emotions;
- tactics of accounting moral and spiritual values.

4. Among *persuasion strategies*, the following ones are:

a) *Argumentative strategy*

- tactics of argumentative evaluations (statements by which the speaker wants to characterize the situation objectively and to explain their evaluation);
- contrastive analysis tactics (analysis and comparison of facts, events, results);
- tactics of pointing to the future (forecasting the development of events, the expression of strategic goals, positions and intentions of the speaker);
- illustration tactics (usage of facts and examples).

b) *Propaganda strategy* (influence on the actions of the listeners to encourage them to make a certain action)

- promise tactics; appeal tactics [42].

Political discourse has the widest range of examples how communicative strategies and tactics are used that is why the focus of attention in the current research

is on the investigation of political speech of British political leaders. The basis of political communication consists of certain political ideas that explain the peculiarities of the ways of their transmission [20, p. 50], according to N. Derenchuk. One of the aspects of political communication that is worth studying is pragmatic aspect. Studying pragmatic aspect of communication involves taking into consideration aims, interests, motives, intentions that define language behavior and determine the use of certain communicative strategies and tactics.

To sum up, studying linguistic mechanisms that are used by politicians will help create the system of linguistic means that they use and understand his/her intentions, aims and plans. Summing up all information will enable to create a language profile of the politician.

## CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 1

Political activity occupies a special place in the life of the country and the society. Political discourse is a complicated, socially determined, linguistic and extralinguistic phenomena with its pragmatic aspect. The notion “discourse” is central in linguistics and in general it means the speech immersed in life. Despite the wide range of definitions of the term “discourse”, it remains blurred and ambiguous. On this basis, one can attribute this concept to the linguistic universals, because every day its range of interpretations expands.

The notion “language personality” is a vital notion in many sciences that was investigated from various perspectives. In linguistics language personality has its peculiarities and includes linguistic ability, has their own linguistic picture of the world and inherent speech features that distinguish this linguistic personality. Nowadays modern linguistics is focused on communicative purposes and pragmatic aspect of language personality.

One of the notions that is close to the notion “language personality” is “idiolect”, which is described as a system of individual linguistic features of an individual. Biological, mental, social and individual aspects should be taken into account while identifying idiolect. Having considered the investigations on idiolect, one may conclude that idiolect is characterized by certain parameters of language (phonologic, lexical, syntactic, etc.) that are inherent to an individual or a group of people.

Comprehensive analysis of language personality of a politician consists of three vital components: the first one is psycholinguistic (personal characteristics, psychological and cognitive characteristics); the second one is linguistic (linguistic means of politician`s speech) and the third one is communicative (various strategies and tactics used for attaining particular goals and pragmatic aspect of an individual`s speech).

As for mechanisms of influence, they are studied by sociology, psychology, behavioral studies and linguistics. For linguistics the interest lies in linguistic

mechanisms of influence, namely verbal and non-verbal mechanisms. The importance of studying them is explained by scholars by the fact that with proper use of linguistic means politicians may achieve political goals, shape people's opinions and persuade them to act in their interests of a certain political force.

The choice of communicative strategies and tactics is driven by pragmatic aspect and intentions of the politician. Depending on the effect they want to achieve, linguistic means (semantic, lexical) are chosen. But the encompassing analysis of political communication and language profile depend not only on formal-grammatical or semantic features, but also on pragmatic and cognitive elements.

## 2. LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF BRITISH POLITICIANS` LANGUAGE PROFILES

### 2.1 Lexical potential of the individual style

Society of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is full of the phenomena of influence, stimulation, manipulation. The problem of studying the factors that influence decision-making and choice is of particular importance. Every day the person listens to the words of other people and his/her mind is full of "alien" words that change his/her life directions, modify the value system. The choice of vocabulary for presenting information, especially the one that represents socio-political processes influence its evaluation while being perceived by the recipient.

Some linguists claimed that social importance of words, which is the source of their content, has the possibility and necessity of managing lexical meaning of linguistic units, certain control over semantic level of the language [язык и идеология]. The necessity of such control was determined by the needs of scientific perception, the understanding of the core principles of things, phenomena, processes of the real world by the person, their connections and interrelations. Despite various interpretations of the necessity of control over lexical meaning of words and the use of certain lexical units, the essence of this process remains the same: the selection of lexical units that are used to denote phenomena and events in life of a society is one of the ways of influence and manipulation of people`s consciousness.

Lexical choice of words is considered to be the most "mobile" in institutional discourse because it is the lexical composition, which actively and directly responds to all social shifts. The vocabulary of political language reveals a tendency for language to be adequate, that is, to establish a relation, which implies that the word is fully consistent with the thought.

The use of specific vocabulary which is determined by political activity is not a single peculiarity of this discourse. Its uniqueness lies also in the specific selection and organization of certain structures of expression in accordance with the pragmatic

goals and conditions of communication formed in the process of politicians' professional activity.

The lexical potential of politicians lies primarily in the use of emotive language. The objective world is evaluated by the politician on the basis of his/her subjective attitude towards it, from the point of view of the value character of the object of assessment - taking into account the concepts of good and evil, beauty and hostility, benefit and harm, truth and falsity, degree of intelligence, etc.

In the study of the language evaluation scholars focus on the formation of the estimated value at different language levels (word-building, morphological, lexical, syntactic), the functioning of the evaluation units in the text, the search for links between the language assessment and various personality characteristics - age, gender, national, psychological, social and others.

The total number of lexical units in the analysed speeches by Prime Minister Boris Johnson is 67881 symbols, 22565 symbols of which are evaluative ones. It is worth mentioning that under the term lexical units nouns, adjectives and verbs are meant because the investigation was focused on these three parts of speech. They help to understand the structure and peculiarities of assessment of people, ideas, phenomena and carry positive or negative, emotional or rational evaluation. The number of evaluative lexemes with positive connotation prevails and consists of 13537 symbols, compared with vocabulary with negative connotation – 9028 symbols. Nouns constitute the biggest part in both groups. Group of nouns with positive connotation includes the following ones: *ambition, advantage, respect, friends, peace, freedom, liberator, security, success, agreement, opportunity, benefit, independence, right*. The examples of nouns with negative connotation are: *trouble, backmarker, horrors, surveillance, harm, disease, prosecution, mistake, problem, violence, slavery*. Adjectives constitute the second group (*splendid, fantastic, beautiful, strong, optimistic, free, joint, excellent, wonderful; outdated malignant, unfashionable, unmentionable*). The third group of lexical units includes verbs (*to promote, to advance, to ensure, to protect, to build, to heal, to master; to*

*compete, to fail, to dump*); adverbs constitute the smallest number of symbols (*wondrously, benignly; reluctantly*).

The total number of lexical units in the analysed speeches by ex-Prime Minister Theresa May is 76405 symbols, 29877 symbols of which are evaluative ones. The number of evaluative lexemes with positive connotation prevails and consists of 16703 symbols; words with negative connotation comprise 13174 symbols. As well as in the analysis of lexical units from Boris Johnson`s speeches, the biggest part consists of nouns with positive and negative meaning. Nouns such as *peace, security, prosperity, partnership, progress, friend, ally, support, ambition, achievement* have positive meaning. The examples of nouns with negative meaning are: *threat, weapon, danger, abuse, uncertainty, anxiety*. Adjectives comprise the second group (*sincere, free, easy, confident, safe, tolerant, powerful; illegal, tough, frightened, offensive*). The third group which is the smallest one is a group of verbs (*to defend, to enable, to support, to solve, to help, to protect; to break up, to leave, to undermine, to damage*).

The lexical classification is presented as divided into several groups. The first group comprises *evaluations based on axiological interpretation*. The classification is based on two polar criteria - “good / bad”, which allows us to distinguish two types of assessment, depending on the “+” or “-” sign: positive (reclamation) and negative (pejorative, derogative). This classification is generalized, because, based on the axiological basis of the assessment category, it allows only one question to be answered: does the author of the statement positively or negatively relate to the object of reality, thereby recognizing or not recognizing its value?

In the statement made during Parliament Address on Brexit on the 19<sup>th</sup> of October 2019, Prime Minister Boris Johnson uses an adjective with negative connotation: *Many times in the last 30 years I've heard our European friends remark that this country is half-hearted in its EU Membership*. [114] The adjective *half-hearted* is used by European politicians to describe the actions of Britain in the EU. This adjective has negative meaning and is supported by the next statement of the politician: *And it is true that we in the UK have often been a backmarker<sup>1</sup> -- opting*

*out of the single currency, not taking part in Schengen, very often trying to block some collective ambition.* [114] Here the use of a noun *backmarker* also describes the position of Britain in the decisions and resolutions made by the EU. On the one hand it may sound unusual because usually political leaders try to praise their country, but on the other hand there is a logical explanation for this. Boris Johnson used this trick to glorify Britain a bit later in his speech in the statement: “...*if we have been half-hearted Europeans, then it follows logically that with part of our hearts, with half our hearts, we feel something else: a sense of love and respect for European culture and civilization of which we are a part; a desire to cooperate with our friends and partners in everything -- creatively, artistically, intellectually...*”. [114] This sentence contrasts with the first two and presents British people as the ones that love and respect their European friends.

The speech to delegates at the 2019 Conservative Party conference vibrates with vocabulary with positive meanings. *Hospitals that are finally getting the investment to match the devotion of the staff; schools where standards of reading are rising through the use of synthetic phonics; police colleges where idealistic young men and women are enrolling in large numbers to fight crime across the country; shipyards in Scotland that are building superb modern type 26 frigates for sale around the world...* and so on. [120] All of the underlined lexical units are used to praise Britain and the actions of the former government which was under the guidance of Theresa May. He says: ... *I should begin by paying tribute to my predecessor Theresa, I know the whole of conference remains full of gratitude to you, and to Philip May...* [120] This statement means that Boris Johnson being a newly elected Prime Minister shows respect and aims at maintaining good relationship with Theresa.

In the speeches by Theresa May the words with positive connotation occur more frequently while she is describing her vision for the “*future economic partnership between the United Kingdom and the European Union*”. For example: *First, the agreement we reach with the EU must respect the referendum; Third, it must protect people’s jobs and security; Fourth, it must be consistent with the kind*

*of country we want to be as we leave: a modern, open, outward-looking, tolerant, European democracy. [129] Theresa May known as a moderate proponent of Brexit, nevertheless, tried to do everything possible to reach an agreement with the EU to make Brexit profitable for Britain. She, as a political leader of the country, thought about protection and job security of the British people and emphasized the need to create Britain with European democracy.*

Vocabulary with negative meaning is used by Theresa May to express the limitations that Brexit may bring (*And this would mean customs and regulatory checks at the border that would damage the integrated supply chains that our industries depend on and be inconsistent with the commitments that both we and the EU have made in respect of Northern Ireland [129]*); to point at the violence and appalling things British police officers face every day (*Because it is not many of us that get up in the morning not knowing whether that day will bring regular duties on the beat or a confrontation with a violent criminal [126]*); to show the negative attitude towards Russia`s wrongful actions and the terrorism in the Middle East (*Since then, Russia has fomented conflict in the Donbas, repeatedly violated the national airspace of several European countries, and mounted a sustained campaign of cyber espionage and disruption; We see the spillover effects of this instability in the challenge of mass migration and humanitarian crises in countries like Yemen.[131]*).

The second group is the *classification of grades based on the grading method*. Depending on the wording of the appraisal statement, N.D. Arutyunova distinguishes two types of evaluation: absolute assessment and comparative assessment [2, p. 83]. In the formulations of the first classification, such concepts as “good/bad” are used, in the second one - “better/worse”. In the case of an absolute assessment, we are talking about one evaluative object; in a comparative one, there are at least two objects or two states of the same object. The third type was added in this classification – superlative assessment and the corresponding concepts “the best/the worst”. This type of assessment shows either the highest or the lowest degree of the quality of the object and stresses the uniqueness of the latter one.

The focus in this type of evaluation was on the comparative and superlative assessment. Having analyzed adjectives in Boris Johnson's speeches the following data were found: adjectives of comparative and superlative degree are also used with positive or negative connotation. The total number of adjectives of comparative degree is 71, among which 68 are with positive meaning (*better, safer, further, faster, kinder, more loving, more life-saving*) and only 3 are with negative meaning (*lower*). The total number of adjectives of superlative degree is 47, among which 45 are with positive meaning (*the best, the fastest, the most productive, the greatest*) and only 2 are with negative (*the worst*).

The most frequently used adjective of comparative degree is the adjective *better*. The highest concentration of this adjective is represented in Boris Johnson's speech on the steps of Downing Street on the 13<sup>th</sup> of December 2019, right after the victory of the Conservative party on parliamentary elections: *As well as providing better schools, safer streets, and in the next few weeks and months we will be bringing forward proposals to transform this country with better infrastructure, better education, better technology* [118]. In a single sentence Prime Minister uses 5 comparative adjectives, 5 of which are adjectives *better* and all of them have positive meaning. The explanation of this lies in euphoric mood over the victory of his party and also to assure people that with new government they will achieve better results in all spheres of British life.

Other comparative and superlative adjectives with positive meaning are used by the politician in order to describe the superiority of Conservatives over Laborites (*Our food is better, our cars are faster and safer, our life expectancy is certainly a lot longer* [119]); to praise Great Britain (*...have the best doctors and the best nurses and the most effective treatments known to medical science* [120]); to present his political course (*in the next 10 years we will build 40 new hospitals in the biggest investment in hospital infrastructure for a generation* [120]); to rear Britain over the EU (*It is not just that we want to go further than the EU in banning live shipment of animals: there are ways in which we already are further ahead* [116]).

Talking about speeches by Theresa May and having analyzed them in terms of use of comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives, the following data were discovered: the total number of adjectives of comparative degree is 88, among which 81 are with positive meaning (for example, *brighter, stronger, fairer, better, more united, more prosperous*) and only 7 are with negative meaning (*fewer, lower, harder*). As for adjectives of superlative degree, 77 units comprise adjectives with positive meaning (*the best, the freest, the greatest, the fastest, the most advanced*) and 7 – with negative (*darkest, the poorest, the lowest, the most egregious*).

Speeches by Theresa May are abundant in adjectives with positive meaning. Most of them are used to describe Britain after Brexit, to show how she sees it: *I want this United Kingdom to emerge from this period of change stronger, fairer, more united and more outward-looking than ever before* [123]. And also her expectations from this agreement between the GB and the EU: *This agreement should allow for the freest possible trade in goods and services between Britain and the EU's member states; So an important part of the new strategic partnership we seek with the EU will be the pursuit of the greatest possible access to the Single Market...* [123].

The politician believes that it is possible to reach an agreement with the EU with profitable conditions for Britain. However, she claims that if they don't maintain discipline, all the benefits Britain wants to achieve will be neglected: *That is why I have said before - and will continue to say - that every stray word and every hyped up media report is going to make it harder for us to get the right deal for Britain* [123]. Adjectives with negative meaning are used also towards terrorists: *And just as it the responsibility of nations not to seek to advance their interests through terrorist or proxy groups, so it is also the responsibility of each of us to act together in the face of the most egregious violations of our common rules and standards* [122]. By saying this Theresa May emphasizes that British government will never try to achieve their goals by means of terrorism because that would neglect the rules and standards of peace and democracy.

Socio-political factors influence the process of formation of a wide range of words with social connotations and that may express the social evaluation of the reality. For example, lexis that belongs to political vocabulary of politicians reflects Western ideology of democratic orientation (the notions *democracy, freedom, equality*); political clichés (*human rights, national security, civil liberties, etc.*). The use of such expressive ideological vocabulary creates possibilities for manipulation with public consciousness, because it makes the text expressively marked that creates certain ideas for its perception. For example, in the speech to Scottish conservative conference ex-Prime Minister Theresa May used the following phrase: *The national security of the Union in a changing world has never been more important* [130]. The use of political cliché *national security* that belongs to the conceptual lexis forms positive attitude towards the actions of the government, because security is something every individual thinks is important and ex-Prime Minister also emphasized that, which means she will do everything that is necessary to protect and secure the citizens of the Union.

However, the aforementioned political clichés may be used not only for manipulation, but also to present some ideas as something that is extremely vital. For example, in the speech to the Scottish conservative conference Theresa May said the following: *And the great institutions which we have built together, the pillars of our national life, are the result of common endeavour. The National Health Service, the BBC, our armed forces, our Parliamentary democracy, our constitutional monarchy, our commitment to the rule of law, our respect for fundamental human rights* [130]. Ex-prime Minister points out that except typically British institutions such as The National Health Service and the BBC, there are also human rights that are “*admired and imitated around the world*”, though they are not typically British. By these words Theresa May intended to emphasize the perfect work of the government that made this their common achievement.

In the statement by Theresa May addressing the UN General Assembly in New York she emphasizes the unforgivable use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime and in this context says about *human rights*: *I believe that the only way for*

*us to respond to this vast array of challenges is to come together and defend the international order that we have worked so hard to create and the values by which we stand. For it is the fundamental values that we share, values of fairness, justice and human rights, that have created the common cause between nations to act together in our shared interest and form the multilateral system [122].* Here she addresses all nations to unite in the process of protection of one of the most important values of a person, human rights.

The current Prime Minister Boris Johnson uses political cliché such as *human rights* but he uses it very rarely, only three times per 10 speeches:

1) *It is very worrying that the European Court of Justice – Luxembourg, not Strasbourg – should now be freely adjudicating on human rights questions, and whether or not this country has the right to deport people the Home Office believes are a threat to our security or national security [117].*

2) *Seven decades ago, this general assembly adopted the universal declaration of human rights with no dissenting voices, uniting humanity for the first and perhaps the only time behind one set of principles [113].*

3) *We now have arrangements of such complexity and obscurity that I ask even my most diehard of Remainer friends if they can explain their Spitzenkandidaten process – which has genuinely delighted the MEPs in Strasbourg but has mystified us in the UK; or the exact relationship between the EU’s Charter of Fundamental Rights, justiciable in Luxembourg, and the European Convention on Human Rights whose court sits in Strasbourg [112].* Other political clichés are not used by Boris Johnson.

Unlike Theresa May, Boris Johnson does not use word-group *human rights* as the method of manipulation. In the aforementioned examples it is used as a general principle which is just a simple word-group. In the examples by Theresa May *human rights* become a notion that represents Britain as a bearer of these rights.

As for the political cliché national security, the Prime Minister does not use it, but he uses lexeme *security* instead. It is used in his speeches with the connection to the European Union and in his Brexit speech on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2018 it is shown in

the best way in the following examples: *To all who worry about our strategic position and the alleged loss of Britain to European security I can offer this same vital reassurance that the Prime Minister has made so many times and that I believe has been welcomed by our partners* [112]. Johnson talks not about the security of Great Britain, but about the security of Europe, which, to the fears of some people may lose it after Brexit. But the politician reassures that it will not happen and that Europe will still remain their ally in the issue of security. *It makes sense for us to continue to be intimately involved in European foreign and security policy* [112]. It gives the feeling that while stating this he does not want to lose European support and support of European countries that is why by offering the help in maintaining European security, Boris Johnson wants to gain support in response.

## **2.2 Grammatical aspect of the individual style**

Grammar is considered to be one of the cornerstones of the language. Without knowing the rules of grammar one may not be able to communicate. The description of grammatical units with detailed investigation of the rules of their functioning gives more holistic picture of political discourse. The use of these units by politicians will help to work out the language profile of the politician.

The category of modality is attracting more and more attention of linguists due to its versatility and variety of manifestations. In linguistics modality is classified as one of the most researched categories along with research into metaphors. Modal meanings and methods of their reproductions are studied at different language levels, such as syntactic, semantic-syntactic, textual and communicative-functional.

The term modality is defined as a category covering either a speech act or the degree of certainty with which something is said. Some scholars say that modality, as used in logic, semantics and grammar is concerned with speakers` attitudes and perspectives towards the proposition they express.

There are various classifications of modality, but many scholars come to the conclusion that there are generally two types: epistemic modality and deontic modality. They come from the classification by Von Wright who divided modality into four categories (he called them *modes*):

- 1) The alethic modes or modes of truth.
- 2) The epistemic modes or modes of knowing.
- 3) The deontic modes or modes of obligation.
- 4) The existential modes or modes of existence [108].

"Epistemic interpretations have to do with knowledge and understanding" [91]. It concerns the necessity and possibility of a proposition when there is clear-cut evidence. Therefore, epistemic modality is derived from the fact that can be true from reality [111, p. 880]. Deontic modality is a modality that connotes the speaker's degree of requirement, desire or commitment to the proposition. It relates to "constraints grounded in society: duty, morality, laws, rules etc." and deontic proposition often concerns obligations or permissions, hope or requirements etc. [91].

Modal verbs are the main carriers of modality. Epistemic modality deals with possibility, necessity, predictability and ability etc. Modal verbs like *must/ have to, should/ought to, will/shall, would/should, may/might, can/could/be able to* etc. are often used for these modality. Deontic modality deals with obligation, volition and permission and modal verbs such as *must/have to, will/shall, may/can* etc. are often used. It should be stressed that the targeting of a particular modality depends on the contextual supplementation.

In political discourse the category of modality is widely used by the politicians to express the concepts such as: possibility, necessity, impossibility, probability, improbability and their degrees — as well as presence or absence.

The total number of modal verbs used in the analysed political speeches by Boris Johnson is 436 units. The whole range of them is seen at the table below. The most frequently used are: *will, can and would*; the least frequently used is *ought to*.

<b>Modal verb</b>	<b>Number of units</b>
Will	156
Can	69
Would	42
Should	36
Must	28
Need	24
Can't	15
Won't	14
May	13
Might	10
Be going to	5
Wouldn't	5
Couldn't	4
Mustn't	4
Shall	4
Shouldn't	3
Have got to	3
Ought to	1

**Table 1. Number of modal verbs in Boris Johnson`s speeches**

The extensive use of verb of deontic modality *will* is explained by the need to express volition or willingness and intention of the politician. This verb is used mostly in speeches where Johnson presents his political strategy and his future actions and actions of the Conservative party, especially while having been elected as Prime Minister: *We will work for a deal with our EU friends; We will under no circumstances have checks at or near the border in Northern Ireland; it is we Conservatives who will solve the problem of social care; And at the same time we will allow the UK - whole and entire - to withdraw from the EU, with control of our own trade policy from the start)* [120];.

The use of the verb of epistemic modality *can* shows ability and possibility of the speaker and of the country: *We can simplify planning, and speed up public procurement* [112]; *It is not just that we can do free trade deals* [119]; *That will put huge strains on our system, it will require full effort and change but we know we can do it* [116]. The use of this modal verb creates the image of Britain as a powerful country that is able to deal with its internal issues, as well as manage the external ones.

Sometimes Boris Johnson uses the verb *can* together with the verb *will* for emphasis: *Let's get Brexit done, we can we must and we will* [120]. This statement sounds like a slogan and call for action; the politician shows that the exit of Britain from the EU is possible, necessary and will definitely happen.

As it was observed, modal verbs in the negative form, such as *couldn't*, *mustn't*, *shouldn't* represent the smallest part of the sampling. The explication may be that they already have a negative connotation and politicians try to avoid using them in order not to create a negative image of her/him in the consciousness of the people. It is better to focus on what will, can and must be done, not on the things that won't or can't be done.

The total number of modal verbs used in political speeches by Theresa May is 608 units. In the table below it is possible to see all of them. The most frequently used are: *will*, *can* and *need*; the least frequently used are *must not* and *may not*.

<b>Modal verb</b>	<b>Number of units</b>
Will	192
Can	96
Need	67
Must	66
Would	64
Should	46
Can't	18
Won't	12

Have to	12
Could	12
May	6
Wouldn't	5
Might	3
Don't/doesn't need to	3
Couldn't	2
Shouldn't	2
Must not	1
May not	1

**Table 2. Number of modal verbs in Theresa May's speeches**

It is seen that in the speeches Theresa May extensively uses the modal verb *will*. *We will remain a close friend and ally. We will be a committed partner. We will play our part to ensure that Europe is able to project its values and defend itself from security threats. And we will do all that we can to help the European Union prosper and succeed* [132]. In the present language samples modal verb *will* occurs predominantly in commissives, speech acts by means of which the speakers commit themselves to future action. In the abovementioned examples Theresa May describes the future actions of Britain after leaving the EU.

*The government I lead will be driven not by the interests of the privileged few, but by yours. We will do everything we can to give you more control over your lives* [129].

*As we leave the European Union, we will forge a bold new positive role for ourselves in the world, and we will make Britain a country that works not for a privileged few, but for every one of us* [129].

In these examples modal verb *will* denotes a promise. Theresa May uses this common and effective tool to enhance the credibility of her party's programme and the most assuring commitments to future action will considerably affect the audience's persuasion. Theresa May claims to focus on ordinary people's needs, to create a country that will not be aimed at the privileged ones.

*But I also understand the good that government can do, creating the conditions where successful businesses can emerge and grow, and helping them to invest in the future of our nation [127].*

*I am confident about the future of our United Kingdom and optimistic about what we can achieve together as a country [130].*

In these declarative sentences modal verb *can* expresses ability of the government headed by Theresa May to ensure better life to the citizens of Britain. However, to get the benefits the politician claims that it is necessary to do it together and emphasizes the need to unite as a country, thus inclining to support her.

*We need to act decisively to help people benefit from global growth now... And just as we act to help support new jobs today, so we also need to help people secure the jobs of tomorrow [127].*

*The tech companies have made significant progress on this issue, but we need to go further and faster to reduce the time it takes to reduce terrorist content online, and to increase significantly their efforts to stop it being uploaded in the first place [122].*

Theresa May uses semi-modal verb *need* in these statements, which expresses necessity. The politician describes actions that should be done for the benefit of British people. The first sentence is constructed in such a way that shows the politician`s appeal for people to act together with government.

The negative form of modal verbs is less used with the purpose not to focus on the negation of actions. The speech of politician is full of verbs that do not form a negative image of the politician.

### **2.3 Stylistic peculiarities of British politicians` speeches**

Specifics of political modeling are studied quite eagerly in modern linguistics. Political speech is a holistic text with its peculiar features and functions. The directive function lies in the category of modality and pragmatic orientation that is why informative argumentation of language actions is used. Effective language

image helps establish contacts with the electorate, persuade that the politician understands people`s needs and does everything possible to be remembered so that people voted for him/her during the elections.

Power gaining and its retention demands more and more efforts from the politicians in the modern, vibrant political world. A good orator`s speech depends not only on the collection of statements worthy of belief, but also on logical and progressive arrangement and an effective style [104, p. 2]. Political leaders are concerned about their language and pay attention to various rhetoric techniques how to enhance their ideas. They use a number of stylistic devices in communicating their intentions to the electorate. While some are propagandistic in nature, others are purely stylistic and persuasive.

Language presents its users with a wide variety of linguistic options from which they can make choices to effectively communicate their intentions. Such choices are distinct and describable from the style of a particular language user [61, p.3]. Political public speech is a special kind of public opinion manipulation that is created according to the practical goals of the addressor. Due to that fact, in political discourse “linguistic rhetorical devices are highly recommended due to their effectiveness in expressing the user`s pragmatic purposes” [107, p. 1]. The researchers argue the specificity of various means of argumentation use in political discourse, in particular stylistic figures. According to R. A. Harris there are 60 rhetorical devices. It is known that according to rhetoric stylistic means are divided into stylistic figures and tropes.

A figure of speech is a “an expression that departs from the accepted literal sense or from the normal order of words, or in which an emphasis is produced by patterns of sound.” [64, p. 130]. The definition stresses that there are certain modifications in word order and the meaning of language elements. These features cause stylistic effect.

In other words, such figures contain the grammatical choice that lies in the definition of syntactic models such as collocation, repetition, or indirect word order, while tropes suggest vocabulary choice and can be analyzed by defining lexical

meaning of polysemic units. Both of these categories influence the political speech units persuasiveness [20, p. 53-54]. Persuasiveness is one of text characteristics, a special type of strategy that includes inculcation, manipulation with the aim of influence realization.

The grammatical structure of the text changes with the help of stylistic figures. Rhetoric effect, which is created with the help of word order change, influences its aesthetic form. Tropes provoke the audience reaction because the unusual meanings of transformation of words attract the listeners' attention. It results in the negative or positive image formation of certain phenomena or events.

One of the most persuasive tropes that is based on intellectual association is metaphor. It is widely used in political discourse and some scholars claim that it is necessary since political events are abstract and too numerous for public consumption. Therefore, metaphors help community catch the meanings of political events and understand partly the process. Metaphors together with symbolic representations are able to draw the public's concentration at the unconscious level.

Metaphors used by British Prime Minister Boris Johnson constitute the largest group of tropes and are so diverse that it is difficult to classify them according to some criteria. Metaphors are used to describe countries that surround the Mediterranean Sea: *It has not boosted the rate of British exports to the EU; it has not even boosted growth in exports between the EU 12; and it has not stopped a generation of young people – in a huge belt of Mediterranean countries – from being thrown on to the scrapheap [117]*. In this sentence this metaphor describes whole range of countries in the Mediterranean Basin.

Boris Johnson uses metaphoric expression to describe the actions of two outstanding Frenchmen: Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman: *Their inspired idea was to weave a cat's cradle of supranational legislation that would not only bind the former combatants together, but create a new sensation of European-ness [117]*. It means to do something intricately complex or elaborate.

Prime Minister expresses his negative attitude towards British parliament: *If parliament were a laptop, then the screen would be showing the pizza wheel of doom*

[114]. He compared the parliament with a sign of a computer that is spinning around due to some problem. It is an allusion to the parliament that got stuck in the process of Brexit.

Talking about the political course of his Party, Boris Johnson states the following: *We can continue the whirl of academic exchanges that have been a feature of European cultural life since the middle ages, and whose speed of cross-pollination has been accelerated by the internet as well as by schemes like Horizon or Erasmus – all of which we can continue to support, and whose participating scholars are certainly not confined to the EU* [112]. Metaphors are used to express the need to increase the number of academic exchanges of students between Britain and the EU that will make Britain less insular and give possibility to attract smart people.

In general, many metaphors serve as a means of reproducing the negative characteristics of political, social, economic life. On the other hand, the appeal to universal values and needs, British politician tries to create a positive image of himself.

The second biggest group of rhetoric devices used by Boris Johnson is rhetorical questions. Usually they are used to persuade or influence the audience and they are not meant to be answered. However, the Prime Minister gives answers to questions he poses. The following examples concern Jeremy Corbyn's (who served as Leader of the Labour Party and Leader of the Opposition) position on a referendum on the union with Scotland.

*Will he campaign against his own deal? Will he actually try to destroy his own contraption like Alec Guinness blowing up the bridge he built on the River Kwai? Or will he urge Labour colleagues to vote against his incomprehensible text, like the dying Virgil urging his friends to burn the Aeneid?*

*It's a mystery.*

*Is he for leave? Is for remain?*

*Nobody knows* [115]. Answers to rhetorical questions are no new findings [66, p. 8], as seen from political speeches of politicians around the world. According to

some scholars, self-answering to rhetorical questions is characteristic of the subgenre of political speeches within political discourse. Such questions are used to express the politician`s attitudes towards people or events and to persuade the audience to feel the same way.

As seen from the examples Boris Johnson uses strings of questions in his speeches: *What will it mean? Helpful robots washing and caring for an aging population or pink-eyed Terminators sent back from the future to cull the human race? What will synthetic biology stand for? Restoring our livers and our eyes with miracle regeneration of the tissues like some fantastic hangover cure or would it bring terrifying limbless chickens to our tables? Will nanotechnology help us to beat disease or will it leave tiny robots to replicate in the crevices of our souls? It is a trope as old as literature, that any scientific advance is punished by the gods* [113]. In the aforementioned examples questions are used to make the audience think over for a while on the answers and they present a new idea. Then Boris Johnson again expresses his own attitude by using Greek myth about Prometheus.

However, rhetorical questions are not always used with manipulative aim or to impose somebody`s opinion. In Boris Johnson`s victory speech on the 13<sup>th</sup> of December, 2019, where the audience was able to ask questions and give answers he asked three questions and got the answer:

*And with this mandate and this majority, we will, at last, be able to do what?*  
(crowd shouts "Get Brexit done!")

*And so we will deliver 50,000 more nurses, and 50 million more GP surgery appointments and how many new hospitals?*

(Crowd shouts "40!")

*And all the other priorities that you, the people of this country, voted for. Record spending on schools, an Australian-style points-based immigration system, more police, how many?*

(Crowd shouts "20,000!") [118]. Here the answers are clear because the information was said by Johnson in his pre-election speeches and these questions draw attention to important things.

The third largest group comprise figures of speech that is based on repetition of linguistic units, syntactic parallelism. According to S. Balogun, parallelism is used to motivate the audiences and to explicate important information [65]. In case with speeches by Boris Johnson, both reasons serve as triggers of parallelism usage.

The first reason is expressed by the analytical form *let* + infinitive without the particle *to* and is addressed to third person plural: *Let us come together as democrats to get behind this deal, the one proposition that fulfils the verdict of the majority but which also allows us to bring together the two halves of our hearts, to bring together the two halves of our nation. Let's speak now both for the 52 and for the 48. Let us go for a deal can heal this country. Let's go for a deal that can heal this country and allow us all to express our legitimate desires for the deepest possible friendship and partnership with our neighbors...* [114]. The construction *let us do something* denotes an invitation to a joint action and is used at the end of the political speech. By using this construction, the Prime Minister addresses the audience and urges and inclines people to vote for British exit from the EU that is why it serves as a manipulative technique.

The second reason implementation can be found in some other examples:

*What people want*

*What leavers want*

*What remainers want*

*What the whole world wants – is to be calmly and sensibly done with the subject, and to move on* [120]. Parallel constructions here function as the units that give an approach to the explanation of the information. The peculiarity of these constructions is that these are special questions that demand an open answer, which Boris Johnson gives. He answers for the British nation and the whole world that they want to leave the EU which also causes manipulative effect.

The peculiar feature of Boris Johnson`s speeches is the use of allegory which is expressed by myths from ancient Greek mythology. This trope has a twofold function. It is at the same time, an expression of the old ways of thinking and a means of describing the present. Thus, the Greek myth exists on two levels: historical and

contemporary, being a carrier of memory about the old times and the beginnings of civilization, but at the same time an expression of present-day values and a way to justify the current situation.

The Prime Minister uses the myth about the Titan Prometheus who gave the human race the gift of fire and the skill of metalwork, an action for which he was punished by Zeus, who ensured everyday that an eagle ate the liver of the Titan as he was helplessly chained to a rock. Another myth is retold just after the first one and is about Jason who was the leader of the Argonauts, whose quest for the Golden Fleece featured in Greek literature.

These two myths are used by Boris Johnson while he was giving the “bizarre” (as some critics call it) speech “Brexit, Chickens and AI”. In the speech while Johnson speculates about AI as a good or bad force, he says: *It is a trope as old as literature, that any scientific advance is punished by the gods* [113]. By saying that he means that if Prometheus hadn’t brought fire to mankind, he wouldn’t have had his liver pecked out by an eagle. And *if only they had never invented the ship, then Jason would never have sailed to Colchis and all sorts of disasters would never have happened* [113]. By making a parallel between the ancient and modern times he points out that AI is rather a bad force because although it brings some benefits, in the future these benefits may act as a pure evil to mankind. By including ancient myths in the political speech it is possible to explain a certain moment or episode of modern time which not only adds the expressiveness to the speech, but also presents the speaker as a well-educated person.

The political speeches by Theresa May do not flourish that much with stylistic means as Boris Johnson’s. As well as in case with Boris Johnson, the biggest group of stylistic devices used by Theresa May constitute metaphors.

*We do not seek to hold on to bits of membership as we leaven* [123]. The politician emphasizes the discontent of Britain being half-in, half-out the European Union. She stresses the need to stay in independent partnership with Europe and only some conditions will not urge them to stay in the EU.

So at the heart of the plan I set out earlier this week, is a determination to pursue a bold and ambitious free trade agreement between the UK and the European Union [125]. This metaphor is also connected with Brexit and conditions of partnership of the two parties. *Heart of the plan* here means the main objective of the politician to have a free trade agreement. It influences the perception of the trade agreement, making it the most vital thing in the addressee's consciousness.

The following example is used to express the negative attitude towards Russia's illegal and hostile actions. *It is seeking to weaponise information*. The noun "weapon" comes from military sphere, has a negative connotation and evokes a full range of negative emotions. Theresa May coins a verb from this noun, "to weaponise" which is aimed at creating an attitude opposite to a positive one. The metaphor means that Russia uses information as a weapon to promote its ideas and attack other countries in the information warfare. Thus, Russia is presented as an enemy.

The second largest group of stylistic means comprises syntactic parallelism.

*I want this United Kingdom to emerge from this period of change stronger, fairer, more united and more outward-looking than ever before. I want us to be a secure, prosperous, tolerant country - a magnet for international talent and a home to the pioneers and innovators who will shape the world ahead. I want us to be a truly Global Britain - the best friend and neighbour to our European partners, but a country that reaches beyond the borders of Europe too* [132]. In this example Theresa May uses a similar syntactic pattern using the verb of wish and intention "to want". It is used to design a good image of a politician because usually this verb is followed by things that the addressee wants to hear and that correspond to his/her desires.

*When we take the big calls, we'll think not of the powerful, but you. When we pass new laws, we'll listen not to the mighty but to you. When it comes to taxes, we'll prioritise not the wealthy, but you. When it comes to opportunity, we won't entrench the advantages of the fortunate few* [129]. These syntactic parallel constructions are presented by conditional sentence of the first type. Subordinating conjunction of

condition “*if*” is substituted by the subordinating conjunction of time “*when*” which means something that according to the speaker will happen. It means that in case of considering new laws, taxes, opportunities and other vital things that happen in life of the country, Theresa May will focus on the wishes of ordinary people, not on the privileged groups. This forms a positive image of the politician.

*So together, let us renew our commitment to co-operation across governments, business, investors and society at large. And let us set ourselves on a path to deliver prosperity and growth for the benefit of all our people, now and for generations to come* [127]. The construction *let us do something* urges the audience to some actions, to common actions together with the government. These phrases were said by Theresa May at the end of her speech at the World Economic Forum in 2018. Parallelism is used in order to empower, emphasize, persuade and have a big impact on recipients. The appeal to benefits people will get and future generations obtain also influences the decision of the audience and makes them decide in favour of ex-Prime Minister`s ideas.

The third group of linguostylistic categories is anaphora which is a figure of speech that is based on repetition of linguistic units. It is the repetition of the same word at the beginning of successive sentences, clauses or lines. One of the most effective ways of making sure someone remembers what you say is to keep repeating it until they can't get it out of their head. In case it is done well, anaphora can stir and intensify an audience's emotions as the repeated elements build towards an unforgettable climax.

*It is a plan for a new deep and special partnership between Britain and the European Union. A partnership of values. A partnership of interests. A partnership based on cooperation in areas such as security and economic affairs. And a partnership that works in the best interests of the United Kingdom, the European Union and the wider world* [132]. In this example it is shown that Theresa May defines Brexit as a new and special relationship between Britain and the European Union which is called *partnership*. According to the Cambridge English Dictionary “partner is a person or organization you are closely involved with in some way”

[Cambridge dict]; in Collins English Dictionary one of the definitions of this word is “an ally or companion” [77]. It is seen that the word *partner* has a positive connotation and implies the cooperation of two or more people or organizations. In such a way the politician forms a positive image of Brexit in the people`s minds.

*Together, we make up the world`s fifth-largest economy, despite accounting for less than 1 per cent of the world`s population. Together, we fought against and defeated tyranny* [130]. In the speech at Scottish Conservative conference Theresa May enumerates all the achievements of Great Britain of the past years. She includes inventions from various spheres: medical, social, cultural and summarizes it by the two abovementioned sentences. The politician stresses the idea of closeness and amity of the nation that helped them achieve high goals and emphasizes that togetherness and unity as a nation will help them achieve even more.

*You demonstrate the true meaning of public service. You put yourselves on the line, time and time again, for the sake of others. You are the reason why in this country we have the finest police officers in the world* [126]. In this example Theresa May honours British police officers. Since personal pronoun *you* in the English language denotes both the first person singular and the third person plural, it may mean that Theresa May accentuates either the collective spirit of police officers that help in country protection or want to point out the importance of each police officer in particular. In both cases the ideas stressed are positive and create a positive image of the police forces.

In the speeches by Theresa May the factual information prevails. She gives data which is connected to economics, education, social life of Britain and of other countries and it is considered to be the peculiarity of her language portrait.

To summarize, the stylistic means used by politicians definitely have an impact on the audience which can be profound and long-lasting. Politicians try to employ all forms of linguistic features for their propagandistic discourse of speech. It has been shown that all of them are employed to reinforce and support the politician`s ideas and strategies.

## CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 2

In the analysis of the linguistic elements that are used by British politicians, it should be pointed out that syntactic-semantic devices aim to convey a message, persuade and convince the audience. The choice of language units is explained by the speaker's intentions and results he/she is intended to achieve.

The lexical potential of politicians lies primarily in the use of emotive language. The objective world is evaluated by the politician on the basis of his/her subjective attitude towards it, from the point of view of the value character of the object of assessment. Thus, the use of emotionally coloured vocabulary is claimed to be useful.

The evaluative vocabulary is divided into two groups: the first one comprises evaluations based on axiological interpretation which involves two polar criteria - "good / bad" and the second one is based on the grading method and includes absolute assessment and comparative assessment. The superlative assessment was added to this classification because without it the classification would not be complete.

The analysis of such parts of speech as nouns, adjectives and verbs showed that they can be emotionally coloured, have positive or negative meaning, convey willingness of the speaker and perform the persuasive function. The use of lexical units with positive meaning prevails which can be explained by the politician's desire to create a positive image of him/herself.

Grammatical aspect of language profiles of politicians is presented in this research by the category of modality because it is the best way to express the person's intentions the degree of certainty with which something is said. The use of modal verbs enables politicians to express willingness, ability, possibility, promise. It is worth noticing that modal verbs are used mostly in their positive form in order not to create a negative image of the necessary actions made by the politician and thus not to build up a negative image of the politician.

Among stylistic means metaphor is one of the most effective means of influencing a recipient, which is used in political communication for the most part as a means of nomination and evaluating either positively or negatively a particular person, country or event.

Other stylistic peculiarities of speeches of British politicians include the use of rhetorical questions, syntactic parallelism and anaphora in order to make the speech more expressive, to make the audience remember the most important information or to perform the persuasive function when logical reasoning seems ineffective.

Grammatical and lexical potential together with expressive stylistic means and distinctive oratory skills enhances the effect of the abovementioned means of influence. The profound impact on the audience that is attained with the help of grammar, lexis and stylistic means may reinforce and support the politician`s ideas and his/her political strategy.

### 3. REALIZATION OF COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES IN THE SPEECHES OF BRITISH POLITICIANS

#### 3.1. Strategy of discrediting

Political sphere is one of the most influential spheres in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Word choice of politicians in the English language reflects the formation of a national character, the type of human relationship and the attitude of a person to the world, certain notion, idea or person.

The choice of lexical units while informing the audience, especially those that describe social and political processes, influences the perception of these processes by the audience. The strategy of discrediting is considered to be one of the means of verbal manipulation. The language of the speaker not only expresses the politician's ideas, but gives the possibility for the interpretation of his/her ideas.

The strategy of discrediting is represented by the tactics that are mentioned in the scientific works of linguists. The verbalization of these tactics was analyzed and certain peculiarities of their usage in British political discourse were distinguished. The first tactic is called "name calling". It is realized by using words with negative meaning to denote a certain notion, person, idea, etc. Such "names" ("labels") evoke emotionally negative attitude of the recipient and produce negative associations.

In the analysed speeches by Prime Minister Boris Johnson this tactic was used to create an image of an enemy with the help of lexeme "*terrorism*". Other negative statements that are used with it enhance the degree of negative perception. *It isn't global warming or terrorism or Rouhani's Iran or Putin's Russia – real though all those challenges are* [119]. Boris Johnson uses the range of negative items, including terrorism and Iran, the country which is considered to be one of the sponsors of terrorism around the world. They are described as *challenges* and inversion enhances the negative emotional colouring of the statement.

Although Prime Minister describes terrorism as a terrible phenomenon, more appalling for him is another one. *It's not the negotiating tactics of Jean-Claude Juncker – before or after lunch. It's not even the economic and political catastrophe*

*that would befall us in the event of a Corbyn government – horrifying though I find that idea. My friends, there is only one thing I really worry about in this critical autumn of 2018, and that is that after 200 years this oldest and most successful of all political parties should somehow lose confidence in its basic belief in freedom [119].* *Freedom* is an abstract notion with positive meaning but it is enhanced by word-group *lose confidence* which has a negative meaning. According to Boris Johnson, losing confidence also means losing freedom and it is the thing he is most worried about. The combination of lexical units with positive and negative meanings increases the audience's reaction towards certain ideas.

In the analysed speeches by Theresa May, ex-Prime Minister uses collocations with negative meaning “*chemical weapons*” and “*nuclear weapons*” to create the perception of actions of Syria and North Korea as unacceptable and therefore qualify them as hostile and aggressive: *The unforgiveable use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime against its own people and perhaps foremost in our minds today the outrageous proliferation of nuclear weapons by North Korea and a threat to use them.* Syria attacks not only other countries but also citizens of their own country which sounds outrageous. In this case North Korea might be an ally of Syria that proliferates nuclear weapons and therefore constitutes a threat to all European countries, including the UK.

One more country described by Theresa May whose actions “*threaten the international order on which we [Europe and GB] all depend*” [131] is Russia. *Since then, Russia has fomented conflict in the Donbas, repeatedly violated the national airspace of several European countries, and mounted a sustained campaign of cyber espionage and disruption. This has included meddling in elections, and hacking the Danish Ministry of Defence and the Bundestag, among many others* [131]. All the hostile actions were made by Russia and although they do not belong to the sphere of terrorism, they constitute a threat to all European countries, which is shown by using lexemes with negative meaning.

While using the language units that belong to the tactic of “name calling” and describe the notion “*terrorism*”, the negative perception of information intensifies.

But if these notions are used in the context of fighting terrorism, the message is regarded as positive and positive image of the addressor is built. *We can help lead the discussions on security, on counter-terrorism, on foreign and defence policy, as we always have* [117]. Boris Johnson emphasizes the fact that Britain and British government have always supported the fight against the spread of terrorism and Boris Johnson`s government will continue to do so even after leaving the EU. This statement forms a positive image of the politician and his political strategy in the conscience of the audience.

Boris Johnson is known as the most vocal proponent of Brexit sometimes presents the European Union as negative force of stagnation of the Great Britain. *No one has any proper control – which is why EU spending is persistently associated with fraud* [117]. The noun *fraud* belongs to lexemes with negative meaning and Boris Johnson point out at the criminal nature of receiving money by the EU. In the same speech he adds: *That is why there is such cavalier waste and theft of EU funds: because it is everybody`s money, it is nobody`s money* [ibid.]. In this statement monetary disorder is described by combination of adjective and two nouns with negative meanings. It can be concluded that the Prime Minister wants to have an independent market from the EU but at the same time free market for British goods around Europe. That is why the employment of negative emotional lexical units assists him to present the EU`s market negatively and form its negative image.

*The EU has done trade deals with the Palestinian authority and San Marino. Bravo. But it has failed to conclude agreements with India, China or even America.*

*Why? Because negotiating on behalf of the EU is like trying to ride a vast pantomime horse, with 28 people blindly pulling in different directions* [117]. This example presents the unsuccessful attempts to reach trade agreements with countries that do not belong to the EU. Simile is one of stylistic figures that is aimed at showing similarities between two different things and characterizing one of them either positively or negatively. In the last statement the EU is described negatively which creates negative perception.

In the following statement the EU is discredited as a union that does not care about its members and about Great Britain: *But it is notable that even when the EU has done a trade deal, it does not always seem to work in Britain's favour* [117].

In the analysed speeches by Theresa May, lexical units “terrorism”, “terrorist” are employed to form a negative image towards Islamic countries and to create a positive image of Britain as the country that fights terrorism: *The United Kingdom has led the world in developing a strategy for preventing violent extremism, and we are working with our allies to take on and defeat the ideology of Islamist Extremism. It is firmly in our national interest to defeat Daesh and the ideology of Islamic extremism that inspires them and many others terrorist groups in the world today* [130]. Verbs such as *to take on*, *to defeat*, *to prevent* show the actions of Great Britain to eradicate terrorism and even extremist ideologies that inspire terrorists and terrorist groups.

*We see the spillover effects of this instability in the challenge of mass migration and humanitarian crises in countries like Yemen. And we see it most starkly of all with the threat from Daesh and Islamist terrorism. Britain is at the forefront of international efforts in the fight against this terrorism - from the battlefields in Syria and Iraq to tackling the ideologues who fuel the hatred of Islamist extremism. And we will defeat it* [131]. In these statements Theresa May describes Syria and Iraq as countries-enemies that threat regional stability and peace. Great Britain is described as the country that fights with terrorism and it is intensified with the help of word-group “*at the forefront*”, which means that Britain is at the head of struggle against extremism. The last sentence enhances the positive image of Britain and Theresa May`s government because it expresses promise in defeating terrorism.

An ideology that is closely connected with terrorism is extremist ideology and in the statements by Theresa May it is presented as an evil force: *But ultimately, it is not just the terrorists themselves who we need to defeat, it is the extremist ideologies that fuel them. It is the ideologies that preach hatred, sow division and undermine our common humanity. We must be far more robust in identifying these*

*ideologies and defeating them across all parts of our societies* [122]. Negative representation of extremist ideologies is achieved with the help of the following lexical units: *preach hatred, division, undermine humanity*. Positive image of Theresa May's government is attained by verb *to defeat*, which shows that her government resists terrorists and urges European countries to do so.

Theresa May claims to fight terrorist actions of Iran: *As part of this, while we will stand firm in our support for the Iran nuclear deal, we are also determined to counter destabilising Iranian actions in the region and their ballistic missile proliferation, working with the US, France and Germany in particular* [131]. She supports the Iran nuclear deal framework, an agreement between Iran and the P5+1 and the EU on reducing Iran's nuclear facilities, but she disrespects its violent actions in the Middle East. Therefore, Great Britain is represented as a country that fights for peace and security around the world.

The political leader that may create problems around the world is Kim Jong Un, North Korean Leader. As Theresa May states: *Now we face an even more immediate, global danger in the activities of Kim Jong Un and his regime in DPRK. Time after time he's shown contempt for the international community of law-abiding states. Contempt for his neighbours and contempt for the institutions and rules that have preserved peace and security* [122]. Disrespect of Kim Jong Un towards other countries and undermining the preservation of international peace and security by developing and testing nuclear weapons is underpinned by a word with negative meaning *contempt* and the negative image of political leader is enhanced with the help of repetition of this lexical unit.

Tactic of hyperbolization is used to divert attention from the real existing problems. The artificial creation of sensationalism and urgency of the message is a manipulative tactic that helps to hush up the events the audience does not have to notice [21]. Sometimes in order to present an idea, phenomenon or event in a positive or negative way politicians use figures. Figures (faithful and not) make the message more argumentative and objective.

The following examples from Boris Johnson`s speeches were used to describe the tactic of hyperbolization. *We were told that goods would start pinging around the EEC as if in some supercharged cyclotron; and on the contrary, the rate of growth flattened again – 14.6 per cent lower than the previous 20 years when there was no Single Market* [117]. In this statement the figure of British goods is described as lower than during the time without Single Market. This figure may be not that critical for Britain but the audience does not know that because people are given only this information. The idea of negative effect of Single Market is supported by verb with negative meaning “*to flatten*” and the passive construction. In addition to this, the contrast between positive situation that was represented by the EU and the reality help to create a negative attitude towards Single Market and the EU in general.

The main advantage of using figures in political discourse is that they influence consciousness and imagination. When the politician mentions the exact figure, he/she creates the image of precise and objective political leader. Text with figures acquires a completely different value – people accept the information that is supported by figures. *Already this country is the single biggest spender in the EU both on aid and defence. Although we represent only 13% of the EU`s population, we contribute 20% of defence spending – and the RAF`s giant C17 transport aircraft represent 100% of the heavy lift capacity of the whole of Europe – as well as 25% of the overseas aid budget* [112]. The method of contrast is used in this statement and it is employed by using figures. The emphasis is concentrated on the fact that British people constitute a small part of the EU`s population, but they contribute more to its aid and defence, which implies that other EU member states which are more numerous, contribute less. The positive image of Britain in the EU is created with the help of the adjective *big* in superlative form and the adjective *single* which intensifies the meaning of the following adjective.

In the analysed speeches by Theresa May this tactic is implemented in the following examples: *150,000 further education places cut by the Nationalists. A cap on the number of Scottish students who can enter higher education* [131]. In these

statements the figure is used not to divert the attention from the negative events but to emphasize the negative actions made by the Nationalists. Education as one of the most important domains for future generations is in danger and Theresa May uses this figure to manipulate the audience's consciousness.

In some cases, the tactic of hyperbolization may be realized with the help of intensifying adverb and verb of negative meaning. *Since joining the EU, trade as a percentage of GDP has broadly stagnated in the UK. That is why it is time for Britain to get out into the world and rediscover its role as a great, global, trading nation* [123]. The percentage of GDP is not mentioned and it is done with the intention to emphasize the process of stagnation of British economics while it is a member of the EU. The figure is not announced and therefore the information about economic stagnation can't be reliable and trusted. It is done to insert into the recipients' minds the idea of detrimental effect of the EU.

Another example represents the limitations of selling British goods that occur in other countries. The reason for these limitations is high tariffs on products that are imposed by the EU. The message of ex-Prime Minister is to argumentatively support the idea of leaving the Common Market: *India, our Commonwealth partner, is one of the world's largest spirits markets. But within the EU, Scotch whisky faces a tariff of 150% for selling to India. And Scotch whisky, the world's preeminent spirit, has just a one per cent share of the Indian market* [130].

Certain data are exaggerated and therefore function as a hyperbole in the following examples: *Ten years ago, banks headquartered in Edinburgh and London, which employ tens of thousands of people and look after the savings of millions, were rescued by the UK Treasury. Action that was only possible because of the size and strength of the British economy. Tens of millions of children around the world immunised against preventable disease and given access to a basic education* [130]. The abovementioned substantivized numerals do not express the exact quantity; they may be specified but the first mentioning intensifies the meaning of big quantity. The context in which these substantivized numerals are used described Britain from the positive side.

### 3.2. Strategy of group identification

Strategy of group identification is based on the principle of contrast between “one`s own” and “other`s”. Manipulative tactics of inclusiveness and distancing are used to give the object or phenomenon certain positive or negative meaning. With the help of inclusive and distancing function of pronouns the speaker can achieve maximum effect without much effort.

The audience is given the idea that opinions or views of one group are faithful. Opinions of those who belong to another group differ either partly or completely. Moreover, the representatives of the first group are claimed to be better than the ones from the second group. Therefore, positive attitude is formed towards the first group and negative attitude is connected with the second one.

This method is based on the individual`s need to be a part of the social group. Personal pronouns of the first and the third person singular (*I, we*) and the third person plural (*they*) reflect this desire and are used in tactic of positive self-presentation and tactic of negative presentation of the opponent.

*It is we in the Leave Camp – not they – who stand in the tradition of the liberal cosmopolitan European enlightenment – not just of Locke and Wilkes, but of Rousseau and Voltaire; and though they are many, and though they are well-funded, and though we know that they can call on unlimited taxpayer funds for their leaflets, it is we few, we happy few who have the inestimable advantage of believing strongly in our cause, and that we will be vindicated by history; and we will win for exactly the same reason that the Greeks beat the Persians at Marathon – because they are fighting for an outdated absolutist ideology, and we are fighting for freedom [117].*

The division into “we” and “they” means that together with common humanist values people focus on collective interests and principles. In this example such value as *freedom* is considered to be faithful and better than the *outdated absolutist ideology* of members of other group. In this case the manipulation with general principles of people is observed and two groups, Leavers and Remainers, are confronted.

*It was this Conservative government that tackled the debt and the deficit left by the last Labour government. It was because we cleared up the wreckage they left behind [120].* Another example of contrast in the actions of previous government and the current one under the governance of Boris Johnson. Two opposing parties are described: Labour government is presented as the one that left a *wreckage* behind and is therefore acquires a negative attitude and Conservative government that is described as the one that cleared this wreckage up and is claimed to be a good government.

One more type of opposition “we” vs “they” is the opposition of Great Britain and the EU. *It is we who are speaking up for the people, and it is they who are defending an obscurantist and universalist system of government that is now well past its sell by date and which is ever more remote from ordinary voters [117].* In this statement Boris Johnson contrast good attitude of the UK towards its people, promoting their rights and the EU that retards the development of the UK and promotes outdated systems. Therefore, the EU is a hindrance for British thriving.

As a member of Conservative Party, Theresa May, as well as Boris Johnson criticizes Labour Party, which constitutes opposition in Scotland: *Because for too long a feeble and incompetent Scottish Labour opposition did nothing to scrutinise the SNP for their failures. With Ruth now leading the charge, the SNP’s holiday from democratic accountability has come to an end [130].* Adjectives feeble and incompetent that are used to describe Scottish Labour opposition completely undermine them in the eyes of their followers. The second statement praises Ruth Davidson, who is a member of Conservative party. By using this opposition, Theresa May stresses the division between the two parties.

In the analysed speeches by ex-Prime Minister the opposition *I/we* VS *they* is represented by description of Riad Mousa al-Asa'ad who is a former military commander of the Free Syrian Army and his supporters on the one side and Great Britain and the EU countries on the other one. *Clearly responsibility for the chaos and tragedy that we see in Syria lies firmly at the door of Asaad. He and his backers have continually frustrated the efforts of the UN to act as the broker of peace through*

*the Geneva Process. As responsible states, we must not abandon our support for the UN's attempts to secure peace and stability in Syria. And indeed, we must continue to call on all those with influence on the regime to bring them to the table [122].* Asaad and other terrorists will be associated with negative feelings in the perception of the audience, whereas the UK with positive ones because they are fighters with terrorism.

### 3.3 Strategy of image creation

In the speeches politicians always convey some ideas, represent notions and events and political leaders implement certain tactics to introduce them from positive or negative side. Therefore, ordinary people are manipulated and positive or negative images are created in their consciousness. Four tactics are applied within the strategy of image creation: tactic of substitution, tactic of self-presentation and tactic of repetition.

One of the tactics of manipulation on the lexical level is the tactic of substitution. Among the ways of its realization there is the use of neologisms that attract the addressee's attention due to their unusual nature. They are widely used to manipulate people's consciousness because with their help it is possible to form positive or negative emotions and attitude.

One of the most widespread neologisms is the word "*Brexit*" that means the scenario of Britain's exit from the EU. This lexeme is formed by a very productive way of contamination from *Britain/British* + *exit*. Thomas Docherty claims that "Brexit" itself is a neologism whose roots lie in foreign words and usage. It is like a German composite noun, rolling together "Britain" and "exit" [83, p. 53].

*And we have to get Brexit done because it is the best thing for our national mood, and the best thing to take our country forward, and by the way, it is the best thing for the economy because the worst thing now is the continuing economic uncertainty, people waiting to take on new staff or invest in new property or just to invest in this country [115].* Boris Johnson has always been in favour of leaving the

EU and in the abovementioned statement he explains the benefits this phenomenon will bring. To create a positive image of Brexit the superlative degree of the adjective *good* is used and the repetition of this adjective emphasizes the positive attitude that will be created in people`s minds.

The analysis of linguistic units used by the British Prime Minister Boris Johnson to create a positive scenario of Brexit in the cognitive perception of the British, key collocations of the scenario were identified, namely: *take advantage of economic freedoms, unite for something new, take back control of borders, restore national sovereignty of Britain, make the decision made by the entire British nation*. All of the aforementioned units have positive meaning and are used to create positive image of Brexit in the cognition of British people. In addition to an informative aspect of the language, it is a bright example of mood and intentions display of a person which has an influential effect on cognitive perception of the nation. Words of political leader of the country, especially those of the Prime Minister, emotional colouring of their speech contribute to the possibilities of using various linguistic levers in order to affect the cognitive-conceptual picture of the recipients' world.

The word “Brexit” was used by Theresa May and on the 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 she made her now famous announcements: *Brexit means Brexit - and we're going to make a success of it*. The statement has its rhyme and sounds like a political slogan. Some scholars claim that “it is the very semantic vacuity of the phrase that converts it into a slogan for enchantment” [83, p. 55].

Theresa May has been a proponent of Brexit, as well as Boris Johnson and she stated the beneficial effect from this phenomenon on British economics: *After Brexit, its potential for growth in exports across the world is immense* [130].

Another example of neologism that is used with manipulative purpose by Boris Johnson is the noun “*Brexchosis*”. It derives from the combination of two nouns *Brexit* and *psychosis* with the help of blending. *And in the current bout of Brexchosis we are missing the truth: that it is our collective job to ensure that when the history books come to be written Brexit will be seen as just the latest way in which the British bucked the trend, took the initiative – and did something that*

*responds to the real needs and opportunities that we face in the world today* [112]. While *Brexit* is considered to be positive by Boris Johnson, the lexeme *psychosis* has a negative meaning which means mental disorder. Thus, it is difficult to understand whether this lexical unit contains positive or negative manipulative effect.

In order to decrease the negative attitude, euphemisms are widely used in political discourse. It is the process whereby a distasteful concept is stripped of its most inappropriate or offensive overtones, providing thus a “safe” way to deal with certain embarrassing topics without being politically incorrect or breaking a social convention [85, p. 6]. The desire and need to be politically correct in modern world is the cause for people to look for new language units that do not hurt the feelings of other people. The most common euphemistic expressions that are used by politicians concern people`s age, gender, race, social status, health condition or appearance.

The use of euphemisms in political discourse may be explained by the need to hide an unsuccessful policy of government or to neutralize social problems of the society with the help of neutral vocabulary. Psychologically euphemisms reduce the feeling of anxiety, create the feeling of security. Therefore, they are regarded as manipulative means to manage the audience.

In the Theresa May`s speech various euphemisms are used: *The government I lead will be driven not by the interests of the privileged few, but by yours.*

*We will do everything we can to give you more control over your lives.*

*When we take the big calls, we`ll think not of the powerful, but you.*

*When we pass new laws, we`ll listen not to the mighty but to you.*

*When it comes to taxes, we`ll prioritise not the wealthy, but you.*

*When it comes to opportunity, we won`t entrench the advantages of the fortunate few [129]. Political leader uses euphemisms *the wealthy*, *the fortunate*, *the privileged* instead of politically incorrect lexeme *the rich* and euphemisms *the powerful*, *the mighty* instead of *people who have power*. In this case euphemisms decrease the negative perception of these notions and personal pronoun *you* is aimed at forming positive image of Theresa May`s government that will listen to the needs*

of ordinary people. This tactic improves perception of them in the minds of the listeners.

The third way of realizing the tactic of substitution is the use of glittering generalities. This method implies the substitution of the name of certain phenomenon with a more general name, which has a positive meaning and provokes recipients' positive attitude. It is based on evoking positive feelings and attitudes by lexical units that are called concepts. These concepts are highly valued, for instance *freedom, justice, democracy, choice, equality, hope, patriotism, prosperity*.

In the analysed speeches by Boris Johnson the following lexical units with positive meaning are used: *justice, protection, security, trust, prospect, freedom*.

The positive image is formed towards the EU: *Brussels now has exclusive or explicit competence for trade, customs, competition, agriculture, fisheries, environment, consumer protection, transport, trans-European networks, energy, the areas of freedom, security and justice, and new powers over culture, tourism, education and youth* [117].

*That is the prospect -- That is the prospect that this deal offers our country. It is a great prospect and a great deal, and I commend it to the House* [114]. These statements were made by the politician during Parliament Address with an appeal to "get Brexit done". Boris Johnson emphasized the anticipation of benefits.

The following statements are made in regard to Boris Johnson's government: *I want everyone to go about their Christmas preparations happy and secure in the knowledge that here in this 'people's government' the work is now being stepped up to make 2020 a year of prosperity and growth and hope and to deliver a Parliament that works for the people* [121].

*Success will depend now as ever on freedom, openness, and pluralism, the formula that not only emancipates the human spirit, but releases the boundless ingenuity and inventiveness of mankind and which above all the United Kingdom will strive to preserve and advance* [113]. Boris Johnson's government is described as the one that can ensure Britain's freedom, prosperity and success in the future.

Theresa May uses lexical units such as *unity, prosperity, growth, freedom, democracy, security*.

She creates a positive image of the UK: *The existence of our Union rests on some simple but powerful principles: solidarity, unity, family* [130].

*The broad shoulders of the world's fifth-largest economy provide enviable security for businesses and workers alike* [130].

*As a leading member of NATO, and the foremost military power in Western Europe, we are a guarantor of the freedom and democracy of our Euro-Atlantic partners, especially our allies in Eastern Europe.* [ibid.] Values such as freedom, democracy, security are the pillars of a free and prospering country and the politician urges people to feel that they are safe, protected and free in their own country.

*And let us set ourselves on a path to deliver prosperity and growth for the benefit of all our people, now and for generations to come* [127]. In the abovementioned statement the use of glittering generalities is aimed at representing Theresa May from a good perspective.

One more tactic that is used in British politicians' speeches is called tactic of reference to authority. The idea of this tactic is to present opinions of people in authority and with their help create a manipulative effect. *Now when the single market dawned, we were told that it was going to be a great dynamo of job and wealth creation – 800 billion euros, the Cecchini report said, of extra European GDP. We were told that it was going to send exports whizzing ever faster across borders* [117]. The Cecchini report is known as a report prepared by a group of experts, chaired by Paolo Cecchini, examining the benefits and costs of establishing a common market in the EU. It is inherently positive and all the predictions are positive: more working places, more affluent countries, the increase in export of goods. Boris Johnson continues his idea and states: *So what happened? Did Britain export more to the rest of the EEC 11, as a result of the Single Market? On the contrary, the rate of growth slowed, as Michael Burrage has shown this year* [117]. The reality is different and not as optimistic as Cecchini stated. Another authority Michael Burrage, a member of Economists for Free Trade concluded that the

situation with export of British goods around Single Market got worse. The contrast of authorities` statements is used by Boris Johnson to initiate the image of Single Market as a detrimental force for British economics and thus support his idea to have a special trade agreement with the EU which will be profitable for the UK.

Boris Johnson refers to his predecessor and member of the Conservative Party (as well as he is) Theresa May: *And as the PM has repeatedly said, we must take back control of our laws. And it would obviously be absurd, as Theresa May said in her Lancaster House and Florence speeches – which now have the lapidary status of the codes of Hammurabi or Moses – it would be absurd if we were obliged to obey laws over which we have no say and no vote. As the PM said at Lancaster House remaining within the single market “would to all intents and purposes mean not leaving the EU at all.”* [112]. These statements served as a background for Boris Johnson to present his ideas: *The British people should not have new laws affecting their everyday lives imposed from abroad, when they have no power to elect or remove those who make those laws* [112]. Both Theresa May and Boris Johnson pursued one and the same goal, to leave the EU, and the abovementioned statements represent not discrediting, but support of the previous government. In this example Boris Johnson`s ideas might be perceived as more trustworthy and proper.

The good image of Ruth Davidson, Leader of the Scottish Conservative Party and David Mundell, Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Scotland is created. Both politicians play a vital role in life of Scotland and Theresa May expressed the support of their actions: *Vote Scottish Conservative to shine a much needed light on the SNP`s record and to hold SNP ministers to account. Since last May, Ruth and her team at Holyrood have been doing just that. And at Westminster, Scotland has a strong and respected voice at the Cabinet table in David Mundell.*

*I have worked alongside David for years and I have seen first-hand what a champion he is for Scotland, for our Party and for our United Kingdom. He may be one man, but his hard work and determination have achieved far more for Scotland than the noisy antics of all the SNP MPs combined. While others fail to hold the SNP to account, Ruth and David`s job in doing so is ever more vital* [130]. People get the

idea that Ruth Davidson and David Mundell are politicians that work for the good of their country and therefore their actions will be supported.

In another example the reference to American President Donald Trump is manifested: *And President Elect Trump has said Britain is not "at the back of the queue" for a trade deal with the United States, the world's biggest economy, but front of the line* [123]. While speaking about Britain`s free trade with all countries around the world Theresa May mentions words of Donald Trump to support her words by the authoritative person.

In the abovementioned examples it is observed that tactic of reference to authority is not always implemented in order to discredit somebody`s authority and image, but also to find support and assistance of one`s ideas and beliefs.

The tactic of positive self-presentation was found only once in the analysed speeches by Boris Johnson. In the speech on the EU referendum the Prime Minister states: *I am a child of Europe. I am a liberal cosmopolitan and my family is a genetic UN peacekeeping force. I can read novels in French and I can sing the Ode to joy in German, and if they keep accusing me of being a Little Englander, I will. Both as editor of the Spectator and Mayor of London I have promoted the teaching of modern European languages in our schools. I have dedicated much of my life to the study of the origins of our common – our common European culture and civilization in ancient Greece and Rome* [117]. In the abovementioned statements Boris Johnson is forming a positive image of himself by claiming that he belongs to Europe and has always supported European languages. The description of his family as a genetic UN peacekeeping force and various lexemes with positive meaning emphasize the positive image of the politician. In this case, pronoun *they* means the Remainers who do not support Brexit and thus threaten those who voted Leave.

Unlike Boris Johnson, Theresa May does not represent herself as a European or British. The self-presentation lies in the statements of her actions for Great Britain. *And that is why I have set out a clear and ambitious plan for the negotiations ahead. It is a plan for a new deep and special partnership between Britain and the European Union... So Mr Speaker, in the letter that has been delivered to President*

*Tusk today - copies of which I have placed in the library of the House - I have been clear that the deep and special partnership we seek is in the best interests of the United Kingdom and of the European Union too [132]. Her actions describe her as a passionate and decisive Prime Minister, who has got her plan and certain objections for the future of the country. These manipulative statements will definitely create a positive image of her as a political leader.*

In the realization of tactic of self-presentation there is a vital constituent that contributes to constructing the profile of the politician. It is the notion of image. The politician`s image is established with the help of manners, appearance, deeds and linguistic features of speech. Usually each politician chooses a certain role for him/herself. Some of the most widespread roles are: a Patriot, an Ordinary Person, a Host, a Fighter. The analysis of politicians` speeches, their lexical units will enable to understand the role the politicians play.

In the analyzed speeches by Theresa May it might be noticed that she presents herself as a Devoted Supporter of Britain. When she was at the position of the Prime Minister, she always supported interests of British people, the whole British nation: *What would be cherry-picking would be if we were to seek a deal where our rights and obligations were not held in balance. And I have been categorically clear that is not what we are going to do [129]. Theresa May stands for the idea that British rights and obligations be respected and held in balance in the Free Trade Agreement. In her final speech as a Prime Minister she states that even after her resignation she will continue to work for good of the UK: I will continue to do all I can to serve the national interest. And play my part in making our United Kingdom – a great country with a great future – a country that truly works for everyone [124].*

*As Prime Minister of the whole United Kingdom, I am not going to let our departure from the European Union do anything to set back the historic progress that we have made in Northern Ireland – nor will I allow anything that would damage the integrity of our precious Union [ibid.]. For her Great Britain and its development are on the first place, but she does not forget about the EU because it is the organization that helps Britain thrive.*

As a political leader Theresa May has chosen a profitable tactic: on the one hand, she devotedly supports Britain and makes an effort to fulfil the needs of British people, on the other hand, she speaks well of the EU and its members, shows her favor towards them: *And this is why at every stage of these negotiations, I have put the interests of EU citizens and UK nationals at the heart of our approach* [124]. Therefore she is perceived well by both sides: British people and the EU members. She benefits from taking this “double” position.

Boris Johnson plays a different role. He is a Persuader. In the analysed speeches he persuades people that the future of Britain outside the EU is cloudless and bright: *I want to today to anatomise at least some of the fears and to show to the best of my ability that these fears can be allayed, and that the very opposite is true: that Brexit can be grounds for much more hope than fear* [112].

*And I will put an end to all that nonsense, and we will get Brexit done on time by the 31st of January, no ifs, no buts, no maybes. Leaving the European Union as one United Kingdom, taking back control of our laws, borders, money, our trade, immigration system, delivering on the democratic mandate of the people* [121]. In all speeches Brexit is the focus of Boris Johnson`s ideas and he constantly persuades British people that it will have only good consequences and British nation will benefit in all aspects of life.

Repetition as a semantic phenomenon is claimed to be useful linguistic tactic which is employed to create a marked structure with a special rhetorical effect. It can be used to give a logical emphasis to the utterance and/or to show the speaker's emotional state [62, p. 5]. Or it may be used to influence the subconscious level of human brain that the person is unable to control.

One of the examples of repetition is the use of repetition of one and the same word at the beginning of successive clauses, anaphora. *And the sad truth is that voters have more say over I`m a celebrity than they do over this House of Commons which refuses to deliver Brexit, refuses to do anything constructive and refuses to have an election* [120]. The use of verb with negative meaning *refuse* is used to criticize the government of that time that does not want to do anything as Boris

Johnson suggests. Thus, this lexeme becomes a persuasive tool and has an emotional impact on the audience.

Another type of repetition is the repetition of one and the same word at the end of one and at the beginning of another clause or sentence, which is called anadiplosis. *And that is why it is now so urgent for us to move on and to build a new relationship with our friends in the EU on the basis of a new deal -- a deal that can heal the rift in British politics, unite -- unite -- unite the warring instincts in us all* [114]. In the statement by Boris Johnson he uses the noun *deal* which means a new type of agreement between the UK and the EU. This lexeme is used to form a positive image of Brexit and the positive consequences that it will bring for Britain.

In order to achieve more long-lasting effect politicians may use repetition of slogans. The success of this method is grounded in the slogan itself. During the process of slogan creation, various psycholinguistic procedures are used. The word choice is based on the peculiarities of the audience it is bound to influence. Politicians` slogans are repeated frequently before the electoral campaign and sometimes even after it.

The slogan “Get Brexit done” was repeated on every billboard and pamphlet during the Conservative Party’s campaign for the UK election. It “obviously played a part” in Johnson’s victory, says Tim Bale, professor of politics at Queen Mary, University of London, “partly because it appealed to leavers but also because it appealed to some remainers who are sick to the back teeth of Brexit and want to get it over with” [89].

*We need to get Brexit done to end the uncertainty* [115] The construction *Get + object + past participle (get something done)*, which became the basis for the slogan has the same meaning as *Have + object + past participle (have something done)*, but is less formal. The construction presupposes that the subject caused the action to happen, but did not do it themselves. Boris Johnson urges and persuades other people to do it because without their support his party`s victory and after that the Brexit itself would be impossible.

The tactic of repetition is represented in Theresa May`s speeches by anaphora and parallelism.

*That is why, as I said in my speech on Tuesday, I want the UK to emerge from this period of change as a truly Global Britain – the best friend and neighbour to our European partners, but a country that reaches beyond the borders of Europe too; a country that gets out into the world to build relationships with old friends and new allies alike [125].* The emphasis in the statements is made upon the noun “country” which in the words of Theresa May obtains the meaning of “unity”, a Global Britain that is open to its European partners.

*For all these reasons - and because of our shared values and the spirit of goodwill that exists on both sides - I am confident that we will follow a better path. I am confident that a positive agreement can be reached [123].* In this example the use of parallel construction enhances the expression of confidence, which appeals to the audience`s perception of the speaker and is aimed to create a positive image of the politician who is sure about the positive outcome.

### 3.4. Strategy of persuasion

Strategy of persuasion means the realization of attempts to incline somebody to some actions or to make somebody do some action with the help of persuasion. The process of persuasion is the process of pressure on the person, luring him/her. Therefore, it is manipulation and forcible control over the recipient. The tactics that are employed within this strategy are: tactic of convincing and tactic of appeal to categories “Harm” and “Benefit”.

Tactic of convincing is based on person`s emotions and mind, as well as any social activity has its psychological basis. In the analysed speeches by Boris Johnson this tactic is realized by verbs that means to try to persuade somebody, thus it has the meaning of persuasion in its definition: *As we work together with the EU as friends and sovereign equals in tackling climate change and terrorism in building academic and scientific cooperation, redoubling our trading relationship, I frankly*

*urge everyone on either side of what – after three and a half years, after all – an increasingly arid argument, I urge everyone to find closure and to let the healing begin [118].*

This tactic is implemented by the verb *let us* which means an offer, an invitation to do something: *And I say to all Members, let us come together to end -- let us come together as democrats to end this debilitating feud. Let us come together as democrats to get behind this deal, the one proposition that fulfils the verdict of the majority but which also allows us to bring together the two halves of our hearts, to bring together the two halves of our nation. Let's speak now both for the 52 and for the 48 [114].*

Another way to realize this tactic is to use imperative mood: *Vote Leave on June 23, and take back control of our democracy [117].* Boris Johnson's slogan "Take back control" emphasizes the appeal to take actions.

In the analysed speeches by Theresa May the tactic convincing is implemented with the help of verb *let us*: *So together, let us renew our commitment to co-operation across governments, business, investors and society at large. And let us set ourselves on a path to deliver prosperity and growth for the benefit of all our people, now and for generations to come [127].* Furthermore, it is realized by verb which means to demand something from somebody: *And that is why today, as I talk about UN reform, I ask the Secretary General to make this fight against terrorists and the ideologies that drive them a core part of his agenda, at the heart of our development, peace building, and conflict prevention work. And to give this effort the prominence it surely requires. I'm calling on the Secretary General to make this a theme of next year's General Assembly and use this to harness the efforts of governments, the private sector, and civil society so that we can truly strike the generational blow against this vile evil in our world [122].* The persuasion lies in attempts to urge the UN Secretary General to defeat terrorism and ideologies that support it.

Another tactic that realizes the strategy of persuasion is tactic of appeal to categories "Harm" and "Benefit". The emphasis is made on the beneficial or

detrimental effect for the object. The category “Benefit - Harm” is one of the basic categories of speech influence, since it operates with value arguments.

It is worth mentioning that since the most topical theme in the analysed speeches of both politicians was topic of Brexit and both political leaders are proponents of it, the category of “Harm” is not represented. Moreover, it is not observed towards other topics that were outlined by politicians. The reason for that is the desire to focus on good consequences of certain actions. In the speeches politicians present mostly their further actions or political agenda and in order to be supported by the audience only positive categories should be implemented.

The category of “Benefit” is noticed in the following Boris Johnson statement: *If we master this challenge, and I have no doubt that we can, then we will not only safeguard our ideals, we will surmount the limits that once constrained humanity, and conquer the perils that once ended so many lives* [113]. The use of the first type of conditional structure is used to enumerate all the benefits that will be achieved under the governance of Boris Johnson and his government.

This category is present in the Theresa May`s statements: *And as we leave the European Union, the UK will continue to be a global advocate of free trade. Pushing for progress on WTO discussions; seeking to bring new partners to the table – and, of course, after we have left the EU, developing new bi-lateral deals with countries across the world* [127]. *This truly UK-wide strategy represents a new approach to government, stepping up to a new, active role that backs business and ensures people in all parts of the UK share in the benefits of economic success. Scotland stands to benefit from this new approach. Whether it is shipbuilding, oil and gas, or food and drink exports – Scotland has huge industrial potential* [130]. In the first example political leader describes the benefits of the whole UK after leaving the EU, whereas in the second one she points out the benefits of Scotland in various industrial spheres.

### 3.5. Strategy of evasion

Politicians often try to evade or reduce their apparent responsibility for their words or committed actions and therefore use the strategy of evasion which is represented with the help of epistemic modality and the use of modal verbs. Finite clauses belong to the lexical ways of expressing epistemic modality. These finite clauses usually have a 1<sup>st</sup> person pronoun subject and no subordinator and are used explicitly to mark a proposition as the speaker's opinion, or to convey some level of personal doubt or certainty. When these expressions are integrated into the clause structure, they usually occur as a main clause taking a that-complement clause [92].

Quirk et al. argue about comment clauses that have the ability to 'hedge' that means to express the speaker's tentativeness over the truth value of the matrix clause and offers his list of "hedging" expressions and expressions of certainty. "Hedging" expressions: I believe, I guess, I think, I expect, I feel, I hear, I hope, I presume, I assume, I understand, I suppose, I consider, I suspect, I can see, I may assume, I dare say, I venture to say, it is said, it is reported, it is claimed, it is rumoured, it has been claimed, it seems, it appears, etc. Expressions of certainty: I know, I claim, I see, I remember, I agree, I admit, I'm sure, I'm convinced, I have no doubt, it's true, it transpires, there's no doubt, it is clear, it is certain, I must say, I must admit, I must tell you, I have to say, it is probable, it is likely [102].

Modality constitutes the communicative intentions of the speaker in the process of communication. The use of expressions of certainty are perceived as more faithful and therefore increase the influence on the addressee.

Boris Johnson uses "hedging" expressions in the following examples: *And with this election, I think we've put an end to all those miserable threats of a second referendum* [121]. Labour Party was in favour of the second referendum which would define the Britain's future relationship with the EU. Conservative Party and Johnson in particular were against this idea and insisted on leaving the EU. Although this statement was made during Boris Johnson's victory speech on the elections, the use of construction with epistemic meaning expresses the politician's uncertainty about the second referendum.

*I hope* that we can reach an agreement on aviation, allowing cheap flights to continue [116]. In the speech in Greenwich Boris Johnson argues about free market and new relationship with the EU, which includes the agreement on aviation which the politician expects to be continued.

Certainty towards Brexit delivery is expressed by the Prime Minister during the Parliament Address: *Mr. Speaker, I am convinced --Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that an overwhelming majority in this House, regardless of our personal views, wishes to see Brexit delivered in accordance with the referendum* [114]. In this statement the expression of certainty is even repeated which creates the feeling of politician`s absolute certainty.

*And yes I admit I am a bit of a bus nut. I confess that I like to make and paint inexact models of buses with happy passengers inside* [120]. These statements eliminate the gap between Boris Johnson and ordinary people. They are used to manipulate other people and form the image of a politician who is close to the audience.

In Theresa May`s speeches examples of “hedging” expressions are represented in the following statements: *So I think we need to help them find a way. And I believe there is now one last chance to do that* [128]. Since the majority of MPs in the House of Commons wants to deliver the result of the referendum, Theresa May thinks that the only chance to do it is to make a new Brexit deal. The use of two “hedging” expressions emphasizes the need to do it.

To express certainty of her abilities Theresa May states: *I am confident about the future of our United Kingdom and optimistic about what we can achieve together as a country* [130]. This statement is determined to ensure the recipient that the political leader trusts him/her, in their abilities, plans and future ambitions that they can achieve together working in unity of the government and a people. It forms the feeling of need in the audience`s heart and therefore they can be easily manipulated.

The following statements have similar meaning: *And I am determined to ensure that as we leave the EU, we do so as one United Kingdom, which prospers outside the EU as one United Kingdom.... The Union I am determined to strengthen*

*and sustain is one that works for working people across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland* [130]. Expressions such as “*as one United Kingdom*”, “*the Union*” create the feeling of unity, togetherness in the people’s consciousness and as a result creates a positive image of Theresa May.

Politicians frequently say much less than they actually mean and in this way they are indirect. For that reason, they use modal verbs which express the assertability of their statements. Epistemic modality shows the speaker’s attitude towards past or present situations and use of modal verbs such as *may*, *might*, *could*, *would* help political leaders decrease their responsibility.

In the analysed speeches Boris Johnson uses modal verbs such as *may*, *might*, *could* to sound less assertively: *For decades deals with America have been blocked by the French film industry, and the current TTIP negotiations are stalled at least partly because Greek feta cheese manufacturers object to the concept of American feta. They may be right, aesthetically, but it should not be delaying us in this country* [117]. The politician does not state that Greek feta cheese manufacturers are absolutely right because he might not be so sure about that and he does not want to spoil the relationship with America. For that reason, he employs modal verb *may*.

*It would mean that UK business and industry – the entire UK economy – would be exposed perpetually to regulations that might have been expressly designed, at the behest of foreign competitors, to do them down* [119]. In this example by using modal verb *might* the Prime Minister wants to gain detachment from his assertions.

*Thanks to British technology there is a place in Oxfordshire that could soon be the hottest place in the solar system - the tokamak fusion reactor in Culham* [120]. In the example Boris Johnson expresses the future of Great Britain but he is not sure whether the place in Oxfordshire will be the hottest place in the solar system or not. The politician makes his assumptions about how the situation may develop.

In the analysed speeches Theresa May uses the following statements: *I have told other EU leaders that we could give people the certainty they want straight away, and reach such a deal now* [123]. In this example the use of modal verb *could*

denotes the speaker's evasion of responsibility. This is enhanced by the use of pronoun *we* that refers to the government in general, not to Theresa May in particular.

*In some cases, Parliament might choose to pass an identical law – businesses who export to the EU tell us that it is strongly in their interest to have a single set of regulatory standards that mean they can sell into the UK and EU markets [129]. In the abovementioned example ex-Prime Minister employs modal verb *might* and states that the Parliament might do the actions, not her. She lays the responsibility on the Parliament.*

*To harness for a new generation, the dynamism of open economies to deliver fair and equitable growth. And in doing so to build a new consensus in support of free markets and fair societies that may be the greatest long-term defence against division, tension and conflict [131]. In this statement the politician expresses low degree of certainty of the consequences of free market and states that the decisions may be beneficial for the UK and it demonstrates that she evades the responsibility.*

### CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 3

The analysis of British politicians' speeches has helped to identify the communicative strategies and tactics that are used to manipulate the audience. With the growth of importance of political discourse in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the realization of manipulative function became a crucial tool in political speeches. This function is used as one of the means of shaping the society and is realized with the help of linguistic units.

Political leaders intend at achieving certain communicative aims. One of the strategies that play a vital role in this process is the strategy of discrediting. Tactic of name calling and tactic of hyperbolization are employed in terms of this strategy and attack a public person, certain country or someone's actions with the intention to discourage the audience from believing this person or country and from supporting them. Tactic of name calling is utilized in terms of this strategy to create the effect of polarization of events and phenomena that occur in the society. Therefore, they are put on opposite sides of one axis and become either positive or negative. Tactic of hyperbolization is used to divert the audience's attention from the existing problems. If it contains figures, it means they might not be faithful and reliable, and therefore, are used for manipulation.

Strategy of group identification is realized with the help of tactics of inclusiveness and distancing that activate the principle of opposition "*I/we*" VS "*they*". This principle forms a positive attitude towards the members of the recipient's group or political party and negative attitude towards another group or party that he/she does not support.

Politicians usually describe other politicians, some phenomena and events either from positive, or from negative perspective. Therefore, they implement strategy of image creation so that people had a certain positive and negative images in their mind. Four tactics are applied within the strategy of image creation: tactic of substitution, tactic of reference to authority, tactic of self-presentation and tactic of repetition.

Within tactic of substitution neologisms are widely used to manipulate people's consciousness because with their help it is possible to form positive or negative emotions and attitude. The key notions of social sphere of British life constitute the politically correct vocabulary. The main aim of such euphemisms is to form a neutral attitude towards different people in the society and to perceive them as equal. As a result of use of glittering generalities, recipients' positive attitude is provoked.

Tactic of reference to authority can be used with two aims: the first one, to form a positive image of the person in authority; the second one, to create a positive image of the politician or his/her party by contrasting it with the negative image of the authoritative person.

Tactic of self-presentation is employed by politicians to design a positive image of themselves as patriotic, fair and ambitious leaders of the country. Words with positive meaning constitute the majority in this tactic. The tactic of repetition is realized on lexical and grammatical levels. Some clauses or words that are repeated, are used to show the speaker's emotional state or to make a logical emphasis in the speech.

The process of persuasion is the process of pressure on the person, luring him/her. The tactics that are employed within the strategy of persuasion are: tactic of convincing and tactic of appeal to categories "Harm" and "Benefit". Both tactics encourage the audience to some actions that are beneficial not only to people, but also to political leaders.

Speech modality is the category that influences the way the statements will sound during the speech delivery. For that reason, the strategy of evasion is applied. In the research it was investigated that the category of modality is realized with the help of modal expressions: "hedge" expressions and expressions of certainty. They reflect the degree to which the politician is sure or not sure about his/her future actions or they may enhance the illocutionary force. The use of modal verbs demonstrates that the politician tries to decrease their responsibility for future or past actions. To sum up, all strategies and tactics that are used by British politicians have

manipulative effect; political leaders` speeches are well-structured and reflect that aspect of information which has to be emphasized for their benefit.

## CONCLUSIONS

Language plays a crucial role as a rapidly and steadily evolving means of communication whose significance over the years has dramatically increased, especially in a globalized world where the borders between nations and states are becoming to blur.

Political sphere is one of the most influential domains in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. While watching the political debates, listening to politicians` speeches, people form their own cognitive spectrum of thoughts. Political discourse is a complex multidimensional linguistic and communicative phenomenon with a certain socio-cultural focus and pragmatic semantics, expressed by a complex of verbal means.

Foreign and domestic scholars of different times addressed the topic of the research, exploring new aspects of language profile, in particular, language profile of politicians. It remains relevant and is still considered by many scholars to this day. The analysis of theoretical material gave the possibility to substantiate the conceptual foundations of the research of political discourse; to investigate the notion "language personality" and to examine the current state in the theoretical background of this notion.

Language personality is studied comprehensively by various disciplines. In linguistics it is characterized by certain semantic and structural levels of its organization, three-layer structure of language usage and peculiar features of every individual. The description of language personality of politicians is possible through the analysis of speech of a certain political leader according to lexical, grammatical, stylistic and pragmatic aspects.

The realization of communicative needs and aims is the main factor in the choice of lexical units, grammatical constructions, stylistic tropes and figures of speech. Furthermore, the language personality is verbalized in political discourse through communicative strategies and tactics.

The lexical potential of politicians` speeches lies primarily in the use of emotive language. The objective world is evaluated by the politician on the basis of his/her subjective attitude towards it, from the point of view of the value character

of the object of assessment. In the analysed speeches by Boris Johnson and Theresa May it was noticed that vocabulary with positive connotation prevails in speeches of both politicians. The lexical classification is presented as divided into several groups. The first group comprises evaluations based on axiological interpretation and is based on two polar criteria - “good / bad”, the second group is the classification of grades based on the grading method and it includes absolute assessment, comparative assessment and superlative one, the third group is expressive ideological vocabulary which is presented by political clichés. Nouns, adjectives and verbs with positive connotation prevail in speeches of both political leaders which creates possibilities for manipulation with public consciousness, because it makes the text expressively marked that creates certain ideas for its perception.

Grammatical aspects of the British politicians` individual style is represented by epistemic and deontic types of modality. The category of modality is widely used by the politicians to express the concepts such as: possibility, necessity, impossibility, probability, improbability and their degrees — as well as presence or absence.

In the speeches by Prime Minister Boris Johnson and ex-Prime Minister Theresa May the extensive use of verb of deontic modality *will* is explained by the need to express volition or willingness and intention of the politicians and promises in which they commit themselves to future actions.

Stylistic tropes and figures of speech are the most multifunctional elements of British political discourse. At all levels of political language there is an effective interaction between its categories.

An important means of influencing the recipient is a metaphor that helps to reveal the emotionally expressive shades of what has been stated. It is usually combined with other elements of individual style, though in some speeches one may find stylistic figures that are realized as single expressions. Metaphors are used to describe the positive and negative characteristics of political, social, economic life.

In the process of research, the linguistic mechanisms of influence in political discourse were defined. A typology of communication strategies and tactics in British political discourse was created and described, and the verbal means of their realization were identified. Manipulative strategies and tactics that are used by British politicians were distinguished in order to analyse the speeches that contain language elements which influence the audience and define the language profile of British politicians.

The following tactics belong to the strategy of discrediting: tactic of name calling, and tactic of hyperbolization. Within the tactic of name calling politicians use vocabulary with negative meaning that is associated with negative emotions and attitudes. Tactic of hyperbolization displays the negative image politicians form towards certain phenomenon or idea.

Strategy of group identification is realized with the help of tactics of inclusiveness and distancing that activate the principle of opposition “*I/we*” VS “*they*”. In this case a positive attitude is formed towards the members of the recipient’s group or political party and negative attitude is created towards another group or party that he/she does not support.

Strategy of image creation that includes tactic of substitution, tactic of self-presentation, tactic of reference to authority and tactic of repetition enhances certain positive and negative images in minds of the audience. The positive images of Great Britain, the European Union, current government, politicians themselves are constructed. Tactic of self-presentation reveals that Boris Johnson performs a role of a Persuader and is constantly trying to convince British people to support his ideas that it will have only good consequences and British nation will benefit in all aspects of life Theresa May is described as a Devoted Supporter of Britain, interests of British people, the whole British nation.

Strategy of persuasion is realized through tactic of convincing and tactic of appeal to categories “Harm” and “Benefit”. Both tactics are means of convincing which is expressed by imperative mood, verb let and verbs which have meaning of appeal in its definition. Since both politicians are proponents of Brexit, the category

of “Harm” is not presented in the speeches. Category “Benefit” is employed to express positive consequences of British exit from the EU.

The strategy of evasion is represented with the help of epistemic modality. Politicians employ “hedging” expressions and expressions of certainty to present the degree of probability of some actions or events to take place. The use of modal verbs within this strategy demonstrates that the politician tries to decrease their responsibility for future or past actions.

To sum up, nowadays dynamic political life requires more and more efforts for conquering and retention of power. Public speaking is the most effective tool of manipulation with public opinion according to the practical purposes of the speaker. Therefore, the choice of linguistic means shapes the unique language profile of the political figures, expressing the individual style of the politician's speech. There are certain general verbal means, communicative strategies and tactics in political discourse, but each politician chooses and employs the ones he/she prefers.

The research does not exhaust all aspects of the considered topic. Subsequent way of investigation consists in a broader analysis of linguistic characteristics of a modern British politician, in the development of complex language portraits of different political leaders in Britain.

## REFERENCES

1. Арутюнова Н. Д. Метафора и дискурс / Н.Д. Арутюнова // Теория метафоры: сборник / пер. под ред. Н.Д. Арутюновой, М.А. Журиной. – М. : Прогресс, 1990. – 512 с. – С. 5-32.
2. Арутюнова Н. Д. Типы языковых значений: Оценка. Событие. Факт. М. : Наука, 1988. – 341 с.
3. Асташова О. И. Речевой портрет политика как динамический феномен : дис. на соискание ученой степени канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01 „Русский язык”. – Екатеринбург, 2013. – 245 с.
4. Баранов А. Н. Парламентские дебаты: традиции и новации / А. Н. Баранов, Е. Г. Казакевич. – М. : Знание, 1991. – 63 с.
5. Бацевич Ф. С. Основи комунікативної лінгвістики : [підручник] / Ф. С. Бацевич – К. : Академія, 2004. – 344 с.
6. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. – М. : Прогресс, 1974. – 448 с.
7. Березин Ф. М. История лингвистических учений: Учебник для филол. спец. вузов [2-е изд., испр. и доп.]. – М. : Высш. шк., 1984. – 319 с.
8. Богин Г. И. Современная лингводидактика: учебное пособие. – Калинин : Изд-во Калининского государственного университета, 1980.
9. Вайсгербер Й. Л. Родной язык и формирование духа [Электронный ресурс] / Й. Л. Вайсгербер. – Москва : Едиториал УРСС, 2004. – 232 с. – [Изд. 2-е, испр. и доп.]. – (История лингвофилософской мысли). Режим доступа: <https://textarchive.ru/c-1381971-pall.html>
10. Верещагин Е. М. Речевые тактики „призыва к откровенности”. Еще одна попытка проникнуть в идиоматику речевого поведения и русско-немецкий контрастивный подход // Вопросы языкознания. – 1992. – № 6. – С. 82–94.
11. Виноградов В. В. Проблема образа автора в художественной литературе / Виноградов В. В. // О теории художественной речи. М. : 1979. – 191 с.
12. Виноградов В. Проблема автора в художественной литературе / Виноградов В. // О теории художественной речи. – М. : 1971. – 118 с.

13. Вострякова Н. А. Коннотативная семантика и прагматика номинативных единиц русского языка: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Волгоград, 1998. – 271 с.
14. Гойхман О. Я. Речевая коммуникация : учебник / О.Я. Гойхман, Т.М. Надеина. [3-е изд., перераб. и доп.]. – Москва : Инфра-М, 2020. – 286 с.
15. Горбунова М. В. К истории возникновения термина «дискурс» в лингвистической науке // Известия Пензенского государственного педагогического университета им. В. Г. Белинского. – № 27. – 2012. – Р. 244-247.
16. Гром'як Р. Т. Літературознавчий словник-довідник : Notabene. – К. : Академія, 2006.
17. Дацюк С. В. Коммуникативные стратегии [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: [http://xyz.org.ua/russian/win/discussion/commpshshcative\\_strategy.html](http://xyz.org.ua/russian/win/discussion/commpshshcative_strategy.html)
18. Дейк Т. А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация: пер. с англ. / Т. А. ван Дейк. [Электронный ресурс]. – 2000. – Режим доступа: [https://www.academia.edu/12682742/%D0%A2.%D0%90.%D0%B2%D0%B0%D0%BD\\_%D0%94%D0%B5%D0%B9%D0%BA\\_%D0%AF%D0%97%D0%AB%D0%9A\\_%D0%9F%D0%9E%D0%97%D0%9D%D0%90%D0%9D%D0%98%D0%95\\_%D0%9A%D0%9E%D0%9C%D0%9C%D0%A3%D0%9D%D0%98%D0%9A%D0%90%D0%A6%D0%98%D0%AF](https://www.academia.edu/12682742/%D0%A2.%D0%90.%D0%B2%D0%B0%D0%BD_%D0%94%D0%B5%D0%B9%D0%BA_%D0%AF%D0%97%D0%AB%D0%9A_%D0%9F%D0%9E%D0%97%D0%9D%D0%90%D0%9D%D0%98%D0%95_%D0%9A%D0%9E%D0%9C%D0%9C%D0%A3%D0%9D%D0%98%D0%9A%D0%90%D0%A6%D0%98%D0%AF)
19. Демьянков В. З. Текст и дискурс как термины и как слова обыденного языка. – Язык. Личность. Текст: сб. ст. к 70 – М: Языки славянских культур, 2005. – с. 34-55.
20. Деренчук Н. В. Мовний портрет сучасного українського політика : дис. ... кандидата филол. наук: 10.02.01 – Українська мова. – Східноєвропейський національний університет ім. Лесі Українки. – Луцьк, 2018. – 228 с.
21. Дмитрук О. В. Маніпулятивні стратегії в сучасній англійській комунікації (на матеріалі текстів друкованих та Інтернет-видань 2000-

- 2005 років) : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.14 / Дмитрук Ольга Вікторівна. – Київ, 2006. – 224с.
- 22.Єрмоленко С. Я. Нариси з української словесності : стилістика та культура мови / С. Я. Єрмоленко. – К. : Довіра, 1999. – 431 с.
- 23.Єрмоленко С. Я. Українська мова : Короткий тлумачний словник лінгвістичних термінів / С. Я. Єрмоленко, С. П. Бибик, О. Г. Тодор. – К. : Либідь, 2001 . – 222 с.
- 24.Єрмоленко С. Я., Бибик С. П., Тодор О. Г. Українська мова. Короткий тлумачний словник лінгвістичних термінів / За ред. С. Я. Єрмоленко. – К. : Либідь, 2001.
- 25.Карасик В. И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. М. : Гнозис, 2004.
- 26.Караулов Ю. Н. Русский язык и языковая личность [изд. 7-е]. М. : Издательство ЛКИ, 2010. – 264 с.
- 27.Кириллов А. Г. Политический нарратив: структура и прагматика (на материале современной англоязычной прессы) : автореф. дисс. канд. філол. наук. – Самара : Самарский Гос. пед. ун-т, 2007. – 24 с.
- 28.Клименко І. В. Теоретичні засади лінгвістичного аналізу політичного дискурсу // Лінгвістичні студії : зб. наук. праць. Донецьк : ДонНУ, 2009. – Вип. 19. – С. 182–186.
- 29.Клюев Е. В. Речевая коммуникация : учеб. пособие для ун-тов и вузов. – Москва : ПРИОР, 1998. – 224 с.
- 30.Красных В. В. Виртуальная реальность или реальная виртуальность? (Человек. Сознание. Коммуникация) / Красных В. В. – М. : Диалог-МГУ, 1998. – 284 с.
- 31.Красных В. В. Свой среди чужих : миф или реальность? – М. : Гнозис, 2003. – 375 с.
- 32.Красных В. В. Этнопсихолінгвістика и лингвокультурология : курс лекций / В. В. Красных. – М. : ИТДГК „Гнозис”, 2002. – 284 с.

- 33.Лавриненко О. Л. Структурно-функціональні особливості мовної особистості студентів : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. псих. наук : спец. 19.00.01 „Загальна психологія, історія психології”. – Луцьк, 2011. – 19 с.
- 34.Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / под ред. В. Н. Ярцевой. Москва : Советская энциклопедия, 1990. – 685 с.
- 35.Матушевська Н. В. Мовна маніпуляція як різновид маніпулятивного впливу // Матеріали онлайн конференції [«Актуальні проблеми сучасної лінгвістики та методики викладання мови і літератури»]. [Електронний ресурс]. – 2016. – Режим доступу: <http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/20415/1/%D0%9C%D0%B0%D1%82%D1%83%D1%88%D0%B5%D0%B2%D1%81%D1%8C%D0%BA%D0%B0.pdf>
- 36.Мельник С. М., Корнієнко, В. О. Особливості політичної культури сучасної України [Електронний ресурс] / НТКП ВНТУ. Інститут соціально-гуманітарних наук. XLVIII Науково-технічна конференція Інституту соціально-гуманітарних наук. – 2019. Режим доступу: <https://conferences.vntu.edu.ua/index.php/all-hum/all-hum-2019/paper/view/7564/6258>. УДК 327
- 37.Михалевич О. В. Проблема изучения языковой личности в лингвистике: исторический аспект // Вестник КРАУНЦ. Серия «Гуманитарные науки». – 2011. – № 1(17). – С. 145–151.
- 38.Найденов О. Ю. Прагматические аспекты оптимизации речевого воздействия печатных средств массовой коммуникации (на материале торговой рекламы в российских печатных изданиях) : автореф. дис. на соискание учен. степени канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.19 «Теория языка» / Олег Юрьевич Найденов. – М., 2000. – 20 с.
- 39.Нерознак В. П. Лингвистическая персонология: к определению статуса дисциплины // Сборник науч. трудов Моск. гос. лингв. ун-та. – М., 1996. – Вып. № 426. Язык. Поэтика. Перевод. – С. 112-116.

40. Николина Н. А. Новые тенденции в современном русском словотворчестве // Русский язык сегодня: сб. статей. – 2003. – Вып. 2. – С. 376-387.
41. Осетрова Е. В. Речевой портрет политика: содержательная и коммуникативная составляющие // Лингвистический ежегодник Сибири. – 1999. – № 1. – С. 58–66.
42. Паршина О. Н. Стратегии и тактики речевого поведения современной политической элиты России : дисс. на соискание ученой степени докт. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01. „Русский язык”. – Саратов, 2005. – 325 с.
43. Різун В. В. Теорія масової комунікації : [підручник для студ. галузі 0303 «Журналістика та інформація»] / Володимир Володимирович Різун. – К. : Просвіта, 2008. – 260 с.
44. Русский язык. Энциклопедия [2-е изд., перераб. и доп.] / Гл. ред. Караулов Ю. Н. – М. : БРЭ, 1997. – 721 с.
45. Салахова А. Лингвоперсонологический подход в исследовании профессиональной языковой личности // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. Тамбов, 2015. – № 8 (50). – Ч. II. – С. 159–162.
46. Сафина А. Р. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики, реализуемые при экспликации эпистемической модальности в английском языке. [Электронный ресурс]. – 2000. – Режим доступа: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kommunikativnye-strategii-i-taktiki-realizuemye-pri-eksplikatsii-epistemicheskoy-modalnosti-v-angliyskom-yazyke/viewer>
47. Селіванова О. О. Основи теорії мовної комунікації : підручник. – Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю. А., 2011. – 350 с.
48. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика : термінологічна енциклопедія / Олена Олександрівна Селіванова. – Полтава : Довкілля – 2006. – 716 с.
49. Семенюк О. А. Основи теорії мовної комунікації : навчальний посібник. Київ : ІнЮре, 2009. – 276 с.

- 50.Словарь практического психолога [сост. С. Ю. Головин]. – Мн. : Харвест, 1998. – 554 с.
- 51.Ставицька Л. О. Про термін ідіолект // Українська мова. – Київ, 2009. – № 4. – С. 3–17.
- 52.Струганець Л. В. Культура мови. Словник термінів. – Тернопіль : Навчальна книга, 2000. – 88 с.
- 53.Теркулова Д. Р. Лингвостилистические и коммуникативнопрагматические особенности английского рекламного текста : автореф. дис. на соискание учен. степени канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 «Германские языки» / Дина Раильевна Теркулова. – М., 2004. – 24 с.
- 54.Тетова Л. В. Коммуникативные стратегии в политическом дискурсе. [Электронный ресурс]. – 2017. – Режим доступа: [https://pgu.ru/upload/iblock/ee3/uch\\_2010\\_iii\\_00019.pdf](https://pgu.ru/upload/iblock/ee3/uch_2010_iii_00019.pdf)
- 55.Філософський енциклопедичний словник / НАН України, Ін-т філософії імені Г. С. Сковороди; [редкол.: В. І. Шинкарук (голова) та ін.]. – Київ: Абрис, 2002. – VI. – 742 с.
- 56.Шейгал Е. И. Семиотика политического дискурса: дис. ... доктора филол. наук: 10.02.01 / Шейгал Елена Иосифовна. – Волгоград, 2000. – 440 с.
- 57.Шелестюк Е. В. Речевое воздействие: онтология и методология исследования : автореф. дис. на соискание учен. степени докт. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.19 «Теория языка» / Елена Владимировна Шелестюк. – Челябинск, 2009. – 43 с.
- 58.Шиманова О. Теоретичні основи дослідження політичної комунікації [Електронний ресурс] / О. Шиманова, 2007. – Режим доступу : [http://www.irbis-nbu.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis\\_nbu/cgiirbis\\_64.exe?C21COM=F&I21DBN=UJRN&P21DBN=UJRNsoc\\_gum/Unir/2007\\_19/30.pdf](http://www.irbis-nbu.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbu/cgiirbis_64.exe?C21COM=F&I21DBN=UJRN&P21DBN=UJRNsoc_gum/Unir/2007_19/30.pdf)

59. Язык и идеология: Критика идеалистических концепций функционирования и развития языка / А.А. Белецкий, И. Борисенко, Ю. А. Жлуктенко. – Київ : Вища школа, 1981 . – 242 с.
60. Яшенкова О. В. Основы теории мовної комунікації : навчальний посібник. Київ : Видавничий центр „Академія”, 2010. – 312 с.
61. Akinwotu S.A. Language and Style in Political Inaugurals: A Study of Inaugural Speeches of Governor Olusegun Mimiko of Ondo State, Nigeria. [Electronic source]. – Access mode: <http://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Language-and-Style-in-Political-Inaugurals-1.pdf>
62. Allen, W. Australian Political Discourse: pronominal choice in campaign speeches // In Mary Laughren & Ilana Mushin (eds.). Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society. – 2007.
63. Bagiyan, A. Y. Discourse versus text: differences and similarities // Science and Society 2-1. – 2014. – P. 19-26.
64. Baldick Ch. The concise Oxford dictionary of literary terms. – Oxford University Press, 1996.
65. Balogun S. A linguistic stylistic analysis of parallelism in inaugural speeches of presidents Barrack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan. – 2015.
66. Bartholomäus N. Posing Questions without Asking. [Electronic source]. – 2016. – Access mode: [https://www.zora.uzh.ch/id/eprint/171935/1/ZORA\\_NL\\_171935.pdf](https://www.zora.uzh.ch/id/eprint/171935/1/ZORA_NL_171935.pdf)
67. Bayram F. Ideology and political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of Erdogan`s political speech // Annual Review of Education, Communication & Language Sciences. – 2010. – № 7.
68. Bell V. Negotiation in the workplace: The view from a political linguist // A. Firth (Ed.). The discourse of negotiation: Studies of language in the workplace. – Oxford etc. : Pergamon, 1995. – P. 41-58.
69. Bloom P., Keil F. C. Thinking through language. [Electronic source]. – 2001. – DOI: 10.1111/1468-0017.00175

70. Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis. – Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 288 p.
71. Cabrejas-Peñuelas A. B. Manipulation as an ideological tool in the political genre of Parliamentary discourses. [Electronic source]. – 2017. – Access mode: <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/prag.27.2.02cab?crawler=true>
72. Cambridge Dictionary. [Electronic source]. – Access mode: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/ru/%D1%81%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0%D1%80%D1%8C/%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%B3%D0%BB%D0%B8%D0%B9%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%B9/modality>
73. Cambridge English Dictionary. [Electronic source]. – Access mode: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/>
74. Chilton P. A. Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice. [Electronic source]. – 2004. – Access mode: [https://www.academia.edu/2101364/Paul\\_Chilton\\_Analysing\\_Political\\_Discourse\\_Theory\\_and\\_Practice\\_2004\\_Routledge\\_18.99\\_xiv\\_226\\_pp.\\_ISBN\\_0-415-31472-0](https://www.academia.edu/2101364/Paul_Chilton_Analysing_Political_Discourse_Theory_and_Practice_2004_Routledge_18.99_xiv_226_pp._ISBN_0-415-31472-0)
75. Chilton P. A., Schäffner C. Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse. – Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing, 2002.
76. Chilton P. Political Terminology // In Karlfried Knapp and Gerd Antos (eds.). Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere. Handbooks of applied linguistics Vol. 4. – Berlin : Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co, 2008. – P. 226-42.
77. Collins English Dictionary. [Electronic source]. – Access mode: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/>
78. Cook G. The Discourse of Advertising. – London ; N. Y.: Routledge, 1992. – 250 p.
79. Dijk T. A. van. Discourse and Manipulation. [Electronic source]. – 2006. – Access mode: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>

80. Dijk T. A. van. Discourse Semantics and Ideology // Discourse and Society. – 1995. – Vol. 6. – № 2. – P. 243–285.
81. Dijk T. A. van. On the definition of discourse. [Electronic source]. – 1998. – Access mode: <http://psyberlink.flogiston.ru/internet/bits/vandijk2.htm>
82. Dijk T. A. van. What is political discourse analysis. [Electronic source]. – 1997. – Access mode: [https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/680a/8ba68935487bcb63aecc68b62be8fb216de0.pdf?\\_ga=2.165676030.1768819635.1578304873-484743753.1578304873](https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/680a/8ba68935487bcb63aecc68b62be8fb216de0.pdf?_ga=2.165676030.1768819635.1578304873-484743753.1578304873)
83. Docherty T. Political English: Language and the Decay of Politics. [Electronic source]. – 2019. – Access mode: [https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=-cecDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA53&lpg=PA53&dq=theresa+may+neologisms&source=bl&ots=pVihA8yd1M&sig=ACfU3U0zp4IW\\_R3mU8WF1r2xNnk3q9dFsw&hl=ru&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjowKLfmIHpAhXPUJoKHeHrDokQ6AEwFHoECAgQAQ#v=onepage&q=theresa%20may%20neologisms&f=false](https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=-cecDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA53&lpg=PA53&dq=theresa+may+neologisms&source=bl&ots=pVihA8yd1M&sig=ACfU3U0zp4IW_R3mU8WF1r2xNnk3q9dFsw&hl=ru&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjowKLfmIHpAhXPUJoKHeHrDokQ6AEwFHoECAgQAQ#v=onepage&q=theresa%20may%20neologisms&f=false)
84. Eisenhart C., Johnstone B. Discourse Analysis and Rhetorical Studies // Rhetoric in Detail: Discourse Analyses of Rhetorical Talk and Text. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing, 2008. – P. 3-21.
85. Eliecer C.-F. Euphemism and political discourse in the British regional press. [Electronic source]. – 2014. – Access mode: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287593086\\_Euphemism\\_and\\_political\\_discourse\\_in\\_the\\_British\\_regional\\_press](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287593086_Euphemism_and_political_discourse_in_the_British_regional_press)
86. Fairclough M. The Discourse on Language // The Archaeology of Knowledge & Discourse on Language. – New York: Pantheon Books, 1989. – P. 215-237.
87. Ferris G. R., Perrewé P. L., Daniels S. R., Lawong D., & Holmes J. J. Social Influence and Politics in Organizational Research // Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies. – 2016. – 24 (1). – P. 5-19.

88. Gass H. R. Social Influence. *Sociology of*. [Electronic source]. – 2015. – Access mode: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780080970868320748>
89. Get Brexit Done. The 3 Words That Helped Boris Johnson Win Britain's 2019 Election. [Electronic source]. – 2019. – Access mode: <https://time.com/5749478/get-brexit-done-slogan-uk-election/>
90. Giddens A. *The Constitution of Society*. Berkeley : University of California Press, 1984.
91. Griffiths P. *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. – Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
92. Gustova, I. The ways of expressing epistemic (extrinsic) modality in spoken English. [Electronic source]. – 2011. – Access mode: [https://www.academia.edu/2479658/The\\_ways\\_of\\_expressing\\_epistemic\\_extrinsic\\_modality\\_in\\_spoken\\_English](https://www.academia.edu/2479658/The_ways_of_expressing_epistemic_extrinsic_modality_in_spoken_English)
93. Harris R. A. *Handbook of Rhetorical Devices*. [Electronic source]. – Access mode: [https://www.academia.edu/5720185/Harris\\_RA\\_Handbook\\_of\\_Rhetorical\\_Devices](https://www.academia.edu/5720185/Harris_RA_Handbook_of_Rhetorical_Devices)
94. Harris Z. Discourse analysis // *Language*. – 1952. – V. 28. – № 1. – P. 1-30.
95. Kirvalidze N., Samnidze N. Political discourse as a subject of interdisciplinary studies // *Journal of Teaching and Education*. – 2016. – № 5.1. – P. 161-170.
96. Kulo L. Linguistic features in political speeches: How language can be used to impose certain moral or ethical values on people. [Electronic source]. – 2009. – Access mode: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1028973/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
97. Marascu E. Modality a concept of the English grammar. [Electronic source]. – Access mode: <http://www.diacronia.ro/ro/indexing/details/A25372/pdf>
98. Matthews P. H., Matthews P. H. *The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics*. – Oxford University Press, 2014.
99. Möijer K. *Propaganda: språk & påverkan*. – Ekelund, 1994.

100. O`Keefe D. J. Persuasion. [Electronic source]. – 2008. – Access mode: <http://www.dokeefe.net/pub/OKeefe04trends.pdf>
101. Okulska U., Cap P. Analysis of political discourse: Landmarks, challenges, and prospects. Perspectives in politics and discourse // In Okulska U., Cap P. (eds) Perspectives in Politics and Discourse. Amsterdam : John Bejamins Publishing, 2010. – P. 3–22.
102. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. A comprehensive grammar of the English language. – Harlow : Longman, 1985.
103. Renshon J., Dafoe A., & Huth P. Leader Influence and Reputation Formation in World Politics. [Electronic source]. – 2018. – Access mode: [scihub.tw/10.1111/ajps.12335](http://scihub.tw/10.1111/ajps.12335)
104. Stepanyan L. Stylistic Peculiarities of Political Speeches in English and Armenian. [Electronic source]. – Access mode: [http://publications.yasu.am/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Lilit\\_Stepanyan.pdf](http://publications.yasu.am/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Lilit_Stepanyan.pdf)
105. Titscher S., Meyer M., Wodak R., & Vetter E. Methods of text and discourse analysis. – London : Sage, 2000.
106. Utych S. M. Negative Affective Language in Politics. [Electronic source]. – 2017. – Access mode: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1532673X17693830>
107. Vi-Thong N. A Comparative Analysis on Metaphoric Strategies in Presidential Inaugurals of Barack Obama and Donald Trump. [Electronic source]. – Access mode: [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Vi\\_Thong\\_Nguyen/publication/326755818\\_A\\_Comparative\\_Analysis\\_on\\_Metaphoric\\_Strategies\\_in\\_Presidential\\_Inaugurals\\_of\\_Barack\\_Obama\\_andDonald\\_Trump/links/5b9a661b299bf13e602a6199/A-Comparative-Analysis-on-Metaphoric-Strategies-in-Presidential-Inaugurals-of-Barack-Obama-andDonald-Trump.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Vi_Thong_Nguyen/publication/326755818_A_Comparative_Analysis_on_Metaphoric_Strategies_in_Presidential_Inaugurals_of_Barack_Obama_andDonald_Trump/links/5b9a661b299bf13e602a6199/A-Comparative-Analysis-on-Metaphoric-Strategies-in-Presidential-Inaugurals-of-Barack-Obama-andDonald-Trump.pdf)
108. Von Wright, G. H. An Essay in Modal Logic. – Amsterdam : North Holland, 1951.

109. Wales K. A Dictionary of Stylistics. [3rd ed.]. – New York : Routledge, 2011. – 478 p.
110. Wodak R. Mediation between discourse and society: assessing cognitive approaches in CDA // Discourse and society. – 2006. – № 8. – P. 179-190.
111. Zhang J. A Semantic Approach to the English Modality // Journal of Language Teaching and Research. – 2019. – Vol.10. – № 4. – P. 879-885.

### **Analysed speeches**

112. Johnson B. Brexit speech, 13 February, 2018.
113. Johnson B. Brexit, Chickens and AI, 24 September, 2019.
114. Johnson B. Saturday Parliament Address on Brexit, 19 October, 2019.
115. Johnson B. Speech at the CBI Conference, 18 November, 2019.
116. Johnson B. Speech in Greenwich, 3 February, 2020.
117. Johnson B. Speech on the EU referendum, 9 May, 2016.
118. Johnson B. Speech on the steps of Downing Street, 13 December, 2019.
119. Johnson B. Speech to Conservative Party Conference, 2 October, 2018.
120. Johnson B. Speech to delegates at the 2019 Conservative Party conference in Manchester, 2 October, 2019.
121. Johnson B. Victory speech, 13 December, 2019.
122. May Th. Address to the UN General Assembly in New York, 20 September, 2017.
123. May Th. Brexit speech, 17 January, 2017.
124. May Th. Final speech as Prime Minister, 24 July, 2019.
125. May Th. Speech at Davos, 19 January, 2017.
126. May Th. Speech at Police Bravery Awards, 18 July, 2019.
127. May Th. Speech at the World Economic Forum, 25 January, 2018.
128. May Th. Speech introducing her “new Brexit deal”, 21 May, 2019.

129. May Th. Speech on our future economic partnership with the European Union, 2 March, 2018.
130. May Th. Speech to Scottish Conservative conference, 3 March, 2017.
131. May Th. Speech to the Lord Mayor's Banquet, 13 November, 2017.
132. May, Th. speech to the House of Commons, 29 March, 2017.

## SUMMARY

The Master`s thesis is devoted to the research of language profile of British politicians. The work reveals verbal means in the speeches of British politicians that form their language profile: lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and communicative strategies and tactics that are employed to achieve certain communicative aims.

Relevance of the research is conditioned by the need to conduct a comprehensive research of linguistic and communicative features of language profile of British politicians and identify the use of manipulative strategies and tactics. The processes of changes in the government of Britain are driven by people who are influenced by politicians` actions and what is more important, by their speeches. The detailed analysis of tendencies of the development of British political discourse will help to describe and define the peculiarities of language profiles of politicians, identify manipulative strategies and tactics that are used to influence the audience.

The object of the research is speech of British politicians which contains linguistic characteristics that are peculiar to political leaders and help to build up politicians` profiles.

The aim of the research is to create a generalized language portrait of a modern British politician and identify the specific features of his/her language style and methods of influence on an individual, his/her actions and decisions.

The aim of the research has necessitated the following tasks:

- to substantiate the conceptual foundations of the research of political discourse; to investigate the notion "language personality" and to examine the current state in the theoretical background of this notion;
- to define the linguistic mechanisms of influence in political discourse;
- to define lexical and grammatical aspects of the British politicians` individual style and determine the functional and stylistic peculiarities of linguistic units in the process of their language personality formation;

to create and describe a typology of communication strategies and tactics in British political discourse, to identify the verbal means of their realization.

The research is based on the transcribed speeches of British politicians, the total number of symbols was 305525. Speeches of two British politicians were analysed: Prime Minister Boris Johnson and ex-Prime Minister Theresa May.

The research paper consists of introduction, three chapters, conclusions and reference list, the total number of pages is 102.

The first chapter is devoted to the notion “political discourse” as a multi-faceted notion that is identified by its actors or authors, namely politicians. It is a complicated, socially determined, linguistic and extralinguistic phenomenon with its peculiar aspects. The notion “language personality” is vital for many sciences it has been investigated. In linguistics the peculiarities and linguistic ability of language personality is studied, the linguistic picture of the world and inherent speech features that distinguish this linguistic personality are defined. Nowadays modern linguistics is focused on communicative purposes and intentions of language personality.

Comprehensive analysis of language personality of a politician consists of three vital components: the first one is psycholinguistic (personal characteristics, psychological and cognitive characteristics); the second one is linguistic (linguistic means of politician`s speech) and the third one is communicative (various strategies and tactics used for attaining particular goals and pragmatic aspect of an individual`s speech).

As for mechanisms of influence, they are studied by sociology, psychology, behavioral studies and linguistics. For linguistics the interest lies in linguistic mechanisms of influence, namely verbal and non-verbal mechanisms. Scholars explain the importance of studying them by the fact that with proper use of linguistic means politicians may achieve political goals, shape people's opinions and persuade them to act in their interests of a certain political force.

The choice of communicative strategies and tactics is driven by the context of communication and intentions of the politician. Depending on the effect they want

to achieve, linguistic means (semantic, lexical) are chosen. But the encompassing analysis of political communication and language profile depends not only on formal-grammatical or semantic features, but also on pragmatic and cognitive elements.

The second chapter is devoted to the investigation of linguistic peculiarities of British politicians' language profiles. The lexical potential of politicians lies primarily in the use of emotive language. The objective world is evaluated by the politician on the basis of his/her subjective attitude towards it, from the point of view of the value character of the object of assessment. Thus, the use of emotionally coloured vocabulary is claimed to be useful.

Grammatical aspect of language profiles of politicians is presented in this research by the category of modality because it is the best way to express the person's intentions the degree of certainty with which something is said. The use of modal verbs enables politicians to express willingness, ability, possibility, promise. It is worth noticing that modal verbs are used mostly in their positive form in order not to create a negative image of the necessary actions made by the politician and thus not to build up a negative image of the politician. In the speeches by Prime Minister Boris Johnson and ex-Prime Minister Theresa May the extensive use of verb of deontic modality *will* is explained by the need to express volition or willingness and intention of the politicians and promises in which they commit themselves to future actions.

Among stylistic means metaphor is one of the most effective means of influencing a recipient, which is used in political communication for the most part as a means of nomination and evaluating either positively or negatively a particular person, country or event.

Other stylistic peculiarities of speeches of British politicians include the use of rhetorical questions, syntactic parallelism and anaphora in order to make the speech more expressive, to make the audience remember the most important information or to perform the persuasive function when logical reasoning seems ineffective.

In the third chapter a typology of communication strategies and tactics in British political discourse was created and described, and the verbal means of their realization were identified. Manipulative strategies and tactics that are used by British politicians were distinguished in order to analyse the speeches that contain language elements which influence the audience and define the language profile of British politicians.

The following tactics belong to the strategy of discrediting: tactic of name calling and tactic of hyperbolization. Within the tactic of name calling politicians use vocabulary with negative meaning that is associated with negative emotions and attitudes. Tactic of hyperbolization displays the negative image politicians form towards certain phenomenon or idea.

Strategy of group identification is realized with the help of tactics of inclusiveness and distancing that activate the principle of opposition “*I/we*” VS “*they*”. In this case a positive attitude is formed towards the members of the recipient’s group or political party and negative attitude is created towards another group or party that he/she does not support.

Strategy of image creation that includes tactic of substitution, tactic of self-presentation, tactic of reference to authority and tactic of repetition enhances certain positive and negative images in minds of the audience. The positive images of Great Britain, the European Union, current government, politicians themselves are constructed. Tactic of self-presentation reveals that Boris Johnson performs a role of a Persuader and is constantly trying to convince British people to support his ideas that it will have only good consequences and British nation will benefit in all aspects of life Theresa May is described as a Devoted Supporter of Britain, interests of British people, the whole British nation. Tactic of reference to authority is mostly employed to form an image of an authoritative person as unreliable or not trustworthy.

Strategy of persuasion is realized through tactic of convincing and tactic of appeal to categories “Harm” and “Benefit”. Both tactics are means of convincing which is expressed by imperative mood, verb let and verbs which have meaning of

appeal in its definition. Since both politicians are proponents of Brexit, the category of “Harm” is not presented in the speeches. Category “Benefit” is employed to express positive consequences of British exit from the EU.

The strategy of evasion is represented with the help of epistemic modality. Politicians employ “hedging” expressions and 3expressions of certainty to present the degree of probability of some actions or events to take place. The use of modal verbs within this strategy demonstrates that the politician tries to decrease their responsibility for future or past actions.

To sum up, nowadays dynamic political life requires more and more efforts for conquering and retention of power. Public speaking is the most effective tool of manipulation with public opinion according to the practical purposes of the speaker. Therefore, the choice of linguistic means shapes the unique language profile of the political figures, expressing the individual style of the politician's speech. There are certain general verbal means, communicative strategies and tactics in political discourse, but each politician chooses and employs the ones he/she prefers.

The research does not exhaust all aspects of the considered topic. Subsequent way of investigation consists in a broader analysis of linguistic characteristics of a modern British politician, in the development of complex language portraits of different political leaders in Britain.