

LINGUISTIC AND GENDER PECULIARITIES OF ENGLISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Nataliia SHKVORCHENKO
International Humanitarian University
nikolette@ukr.net

Formulation of the problem

The development of linguistics at the present stage is characterized by a rapidly increasing interest in comprehension of oral communication in general and in political oral speech, in particular. In the modern world, along with the global spread of democratic principles of the state system, political discourse and its various aspects have become particularly important.

As it is known, the precise use of language tools is a key factor in achieving the goals of any communication, and, in the case of professional politicians, linguistic resources become the main tool of success to gain mass support, political power, victory in public and parliamentary debates, important negotiations.

For many centuries, society has consisted of a peculiar set of interrelated, but also largely independent areas: economic, social, political and spiritual. Each of them has its own limits, its specifics. Political activity has always played a special role in the life of society and in the state as a whole. Thanks to the political leaders and their presentation method, we can outline the image of a state. With the help of speeches, politicians have the opportunity to appeal to the citizens of their country, as well as to the international community. Typically, political power in society was predominantly a sphere of men's activity, but as soon as women got the right to vote, they began to fight for their right to take a place in politics. The last 50 years in industrialized countries have established gender equality in politics – more and more women run and are elected to national parliaments and state structures.

Political discourse is a type of language related to the sphere of politics and to speaking in a certain situational context and aimed at implementing a particular pragmatic semantics using verbal or non-verbal means of expressiveness. Within this discourse, a new system of values – social, socio-political, as well as a system of diverse ideas and views – is created.

It is undeniable that among the languages that enrich the political vocabulary at the international level, the English language occupies a special place. English-language political discourse can be considered a speech-mental activity, which is limited to the institutional framework of political communication and is aimed at persuading the audience, which determines the specifics of its ultimate realization – the political text.

Analysis of recent research and publications

Thus, the notion of discourse is one of the main concepts of modern pragmatic linguistics and linguistics of the text. Modern concepts of discourse

reflect the entire course of linguistic science. In a broader sense, discourse is a complex unity of linguistic practice and extralinguistic factors that are necessary for understanding the text. Since discourse combines social requirements with language, it is considered to be a sociolinguistic phenomenon. This phenomenon has become the key to the scientific achievements of such domestic linguists as F. Batsevych, G. Pocheptsov, K. Serazhim, V. Zvegintsev, V. Karasyk, R. Vodak, N. Harutyunova, A. Aleksandrov, E. Kubryakov, V. Chervonyh, and foreign linguists such as Yu. Habermas, T. van Dijk, Z. Harris, V. Kinch, D. Shifrin, M. Foucault and others.

However, political discourse as a type of discourse is not understood well enough, is not clearly defined yet and is subjected to research in the context of various disciplines such as psychology, philosophy, and others. This circumstance predetermined the choice of the subject of the study, which analysed the linguistic phenomena that allow to understand the nature of political discourse.

From the linguistic point of view, political discourse is being studied relatively recently. Its linguistic interpretations encompass issues such as synonymy, argumentation, syntax, utterance, vocabulary, narrative functions, rhetoric, semiotics, grammar. Research in these areas was carried out by M. Pesochau, P. Henry, J. Poitou, T. True, J. Zeidel, E. Verona, P. Aschard, R. Munier, J. Commeret, R. Moro, J.-P. Fey, K. Gilomen, R. Bart and others.

Obviously, the link between politics and language is mainly seen in the fact that, without any communication, there can be no political regime. Policymakers use language for informing, guiding, carrying out legislative acts, and persuasion. The specificity of politics, which differs from other areas of human activity, is its mainly discursive character: most of the political actions by nature are speech actions. It is no accident that some scientists (D. Narizhniy, O. Bilous, V. Gur, L. Klimansky, V. Kolyadenko, M. Kravchuk, S. Naumkin, Yu. Pakhomov, V. Khramov, I. Shablinsky, D. Yakovlev) are of the opinion that political activity in general can be reduced to linguistic activity, and in modern political science there is a tendency to consider language not as a means of displaying political reality, but as a component of the political field.

Some scholars (V. O. Pavluts'ka, E. I. Sheigal and others) believe that political discourse is characterized by a direct dependence on its subject, that is, the tasks that arise before the subjects of political activity, the level of professionalism of politicians, the political and civil society culture. In this regard, the scientist V. O. Pavluts'ka considers the following: "Political formulations and expert opinions have a rather relative status, they become meaningful only in relation to other statements expressed by representatives of other positions. In addition, the political field itself is to some extent autonomous, it does not depend on other fields or social forces" (Pavluts'ka 2000).

Many researchers (O. Gryshchenko, S. Onufr, G. Zhukovets, etc.) consider political discourse as a phenomenon belonging exclusively to the public sphere. Political discourse is understood as the actual use of language in the socio-political

sphere of communication and, more broadly, in the public sphere of communication. This approach is followed by one of the leading researchers in the subject, the well-known Dutch scientist Teun van Dijk (Van Dijk 1998). He believes that political discourse is a class of genres, quite clearly limited by the social sphere, namely politics. Government debates, parliamentary debates, party programs, and politicians' speeches are genres that belong to the political area. Thus, political discourse is understood solely as discourse of politicians (Dem'yankov 2002). By limiting political discourse to the professional framework, the activity of politicians, the scientist notes that political discourse at the same time is a form of institutional discourse. This means that the discourses of politicians are those discourses that are delivered in such institutional environments as government meetings, parliamentary sessions, and the congresses of a political party. The statement should be pronounced in a prominent position in the political and institutional environment. Thus, discourse is political when it accompanies a political act in a political setting (Kondratenko 2009).

The purpose of this scientific research is to provide a theoretical substantiation of English-language political discourse as a special language education related to the sphere of politics and to speaking in a certain situational context and aimed at the realization of a specific pragmatic semantics using verbal or non-verbal means of expressiveness.

Presentation of the main research material

Political speech is one of the mechanisms governing society, and political discourse implements the functions of informing and socio-psychological influence on the public. In public speeches, carefully thought out and prepared in advance, politicians around the world use a variety of linguistic means to achieve their goals. As a rule, political speeches are aimed at providing ideological influence, forming in the audience a certain attitude to certain political life realities.

In defining the essence of political discourse, it should be determined that, on the one hand, discourse can be understood as the interaction of actors acting as repeaters, codes of meaning and interpretations, and on the other hand – as one of the most effective power resources through which political institutions present and legitimize themselves, construct a political reality.

Political discourse includes a focus on issues of power. After all, politics is a deliberate activity in the sphere of relations between different subjects of public life, directly related to the struggle for gaining and maintaining power. Separating the power component of political discourse, one can point out the definition of political discourse as “an institutionally organized and thematically focused sequence of statements realized in certain historical and social frameworks, the reception of which is able to maintain and change the relations of dominance and subjugation in society”.

Thus, there are following components allocated in the policy structure:

1. Political interest is a rationally conscious reason for implementing a policy that prompts individuals and social groups to formulate certain political goals and take concrete actions to achieve them.

2. Subjects of politics are individuals or social groups who have realized their interests and are ready for their implementation by taking part in the adoption of general decisions: 1) individuals or groups who carry out policies (directly or through institutional structures); 2) groups or social communities that make up a society in relation to which a policy is being implemented.

3. Political consciousness is a set of ideas, concepts, ideas, thoughts, judgments and attitudes of subjects of political relations, expressing awareness of social groups of socially significant interests.

4. Political relations, i.e. the expression of interactions and relationships between actors of politics, political institutions and government.

5. Political activity, i.e. the expression of politically motivated social activity of individuals and social groups.

6. Political institutions and organizations that represent the political interests of groups and social communities that make up society.

7. Political discourse, i.e. a set of textual and linguistic communication practices that express and broadcast political ideas, ideas, intentions, actions and relationships of policy makers.

Because of this, the important role of politics is due to its universality, its inclusive nature, its ability to influence practically all events of public life: from the scale of the state to the problems of the individual. Accordingly, it is intimately connected with economics, law, culture and morals.

The social purpose of political discourse is to incite recipients, that is, citizens, regarding the need for “politically correct” actions and assessments. In other words, the purpose of political discourse is not a description, but a belief, the motivation of the recipients of action, which determines the effectiveness of political discourse. Thus, political discourse is a method of communication mediated by a certain social and cultural tradition, based on the exchange, instigation and propagation of certain ideas, attitudes and attitudes of participants in political life, in order to achieve political goals that are mainly related to the issues of power.

Political discourse is analysed both in the oral form and in the written form. The oral form of political discourse generally comprises public speeches, political performances, radio and TV debates, interviews, press conferences etc. The written form of political discourse includes various documents: party programmes, manifests, agreements, treaties, posters, leaflets etc.

Political discourse performs seven main functions: informational, instrumental, predictive, normative, legitimate, persuasive and political propaganda. Let's consider each of them in more detail.

The information function is realized on the basis of interaction between the subjects of politics and the media. Political discourse always strives to objectify its

informational elements. The projection of the information field of discourse into the audience, which is carried out mainly through the media, is a prerequisite for gaining and retaining power. The process of informing is a prerequisite for the maintenance of power relations in society.

The instrumental function provides mechanisms for the reproduction of information of political discourse in the society, its basis is the relationship between the authorities and the media. In turn, the media has a significant influence on political discourse, exercising a monopoly on the instruments of maintaining and changing the balance of political forces in society. The central feature of the normalization function is the allocation of resources – the most important element of the content of the relations of domination-subjugation in the society. Another important feature of the normalization function is the authorities' legitimate right to use violence.

The functions of legitimation and forecast carry out a discursive internal connection of the past, present and future, providing support for certain relations in society.

One of the most important functions of political discourse is the function of persuasion and political propaganda. This kind of discourse, above all, is oriented towards the public consciousness, that is, it is a rather dangerous instrument of influence, since it is oriented toward all layers of society. It is important to understand that the specificity of political discourse lies precisely in the implementation of policies and the achievement of political goals, which, in the overwhelming majority, relate to the issue of government.

An important characteristic of any discourse is the presence of a special language. The direct participants in political discourse are politicians engaged in political activity in a certain subject-practical and symbolic space, therefore the possession of a professional political language requires communicators of specialized training and qualifications. When considering political discourse, scientists note that the main characteristic feature of this phenomenon is the struggle for power, and all possible language methods and means are used for its implementation of the policy.

Grammatical means play an important role in achieving the communicative goals of political discourse. Equally, frequency is marked by grammatical means, both morphological and syntactic.

Among the units of the morphological level in the political discourse it is important to highlight a frequent use of the personal pronoun *we*, a plurality that is widely used in tactics of unity, oppositionalization, contrast, identification, and so on. This technique creates some kind of blurring boundaries between the politician and the audience, which allows them to manipulate the consciousness of the addressee. As an example of using engagement in a political debate, an excerpt of a speech by B. Obama can be quoted: "So if you're willing to stand with me and work with me and knock on some I promise you *we* will finish what *we* started in 2008, and *we* will remind the world just why it is that the United States of America

is the greatest nation on Earth". At the same time, syntactic parallelism is accompanied by lexical replacements (Stand *with me*, work *with me*, knock on some doors *with me*, make some phone calls *with me*).

Among the frequent grammatical tools of the morphological level, which are used in political speeches, the use of affixes that give the word a positive or negative meaning is indicated. For example, they resort to the prefix *un-* for constructing a tactic of accusation, criticism, accentuation.

Thus, in a speech by George W. Bush (junior), the tactic of criticism is based on the rhetorical figure of contrast created by repeating the word steady with the prefix *un-*, which gives the word a negative meaning: "We have seen a steady erosion of American power and *unsteady* exercise of American influence". Among the features of the grammatical design of political discourse, in particular election speeches, researchers note the frequent use of abstract nouns.

Thus, in the following passage, a speech delivered by J. Kennedy on the occasion of the nomination by the Democratic Party of his candidacy for the presidency of the United States, includes, in one rather short sentence, eight abstract nouns (reservation, obligation, effort, mind, spirit, victory, nation, greatness), which allows politicians to give tactics a promise of emotional saturation. At the same time, the words nation / nation, victory / victory, greatness / majesty are repeated in this context as well as the word "duty / duty" that makes the statement of the meaning of the solemn oath of the American people to lead him to greatness and victory: "I accept it without reservation and with only one obligation, the obligation to dedicate every effort of my mind and spirit to lead our party back to victory and our nation to greatness".

Among the features of the pre-election discourse, researchers include the frequent use of adjectives in the comparative and superlative degrees. The following excerpts of speech can be illustrated: "We are running for *the most* important job in the world, and you cannot run away from a debate on national security ... even *the most* hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and keep that treaty obligations; ... our *most* basic common link is that we all inhabit this planet".

For political discourse, the widespread use of modal verbs is also characteristic. If the modal verb *should* is combined with a perfect infinitive, it conveys the value of the unfulfilled obligation, what should have been done, but was not done actually; it is often used to construct accusation and reproach tactics, for example: "You *should have answered* the first question".

A characteristic feature of modal words and phrases is their special status in the sentence. They do not belong to the main or minor members of the sentence, they are introductory words, grammatically separated from the members of the sentence. In the sentence which includes them and its members, they are related only semantically.

The political metaphor is becoming more and more manageable. The effectiveness of its application increases: it responds responsibly to events in the country and to linguistic fashion. Lately, political metaphors are increasingly used

in the media, which was previously inadmissible: youth slang, conditional argot, spontaneous words, etc. This is necessary, above all, to ensure an effective degree of linguistic influence on the reader. And, as everyone knows, the power of influence of the metaphor is great.

It should also be noted that thanks to the metaphor, the political text becomes more expressive. New expressions, new tricks appear. The reader gets a more complete picture of the world.

An important role in the English language pre-election discourse is played by the choice of tense forms. It is noted that the futuristic orientation, conveyed by the tense forms of Future Simple, Present Simple, Present Continuous, is used in the tactics of predicting the positive or negative effects of choosing one or another alternative.

In the pre-election speeches, other structures, including Future Continuous and the modal expression to be going to + infinitive with the Present Continuous timeline, are used to create prediction tactics. An example of using the modal statement to be going to + infinitive to express the future can be a fragment of the pre-election speech of D. Trump:

“If I become president, *we're going to* be saying “Merry Christmas” again. That I can tell you”.

It should be noted that in the aforementioned fragment of the speech of D. Trump, the tactic of forecasting is accompanied by rhetorical reception of the allegory, since the phrase *Merry Christmas* apart from its main meaning – the traditional greetings with Christmas – has an implicit significance – the beginning of a new happy life of Americans in the event of the victory of Donald Trump at the presidential election. At the same time, the expressiveness of the tactic of forecasting is amplified by inversion in the second sentence *That I can tell you*, which emphasizes the meaning in the previous sentence.

The functions of political discourse determine the active use of semantic repetitions in political communication, since their functional significance largely coincides with the intentions of political discourse. Mainly in political discourse there is a suggestive function, or a function of persuasion, influence. The significance of a semantic repetition in this case is associated with a general enhancing effect that occurs when repeating any linguistic units, and even more units of the content plan. Semantic (meaningful) repetition has different embodiments. First, it is implemented in tautological repetitions that arise from the repeated use of some of the same linguistic units – morphemes, words, phrases or sentences. Secondly, the semantic repetition of the linguistic units appears when used in a phrase, sentence or the closest section of the text of the linguistic units having a semantic commonality with differences in terms of expression, that is, realized in the phenomena of semantic equivalence.

Very often, the meaning of semantic repetition is enhanced by syntactic parallelism, which emphasizes semantic correspondences and parallels, as well as intonation, citation, the figure of a rhetorical question, the use of a metaphor, a

journalistic commentary on the words of political figures, and also graphic means of selection such as selection in italics.

Example:

Today *America speaks anew* to the peoples of the world ... Today, *I* also *speak anew* to my fellow citizens ... (The repetition is intensified by syntactic parallelism);

By our efforts we have lit *a fire* as well; *a fire* in the minds of men ... And one day this unsettled *fire* of freedom will reach the darkest corners of our world (repeated engagement in the implementation of the metaphor).

Characteristic features of political discourse are the widespread use of professional political terminology; the frequent use of “high”, that is, the words of the book (*to corroborate a statement, proponents, a vision, heterogeneous*), *clichés and stamps (last but not the least, boom and bust, apart from the fact that; in the absence of; to extent that; by the same token; take / hold the view that, strictly speaking, proceed from the assumption that, to summarize the above-mentioned, to bear in mind)*.

The features of the grammatical organization of political discourse clearly manifest themselves at the syntactic level.

In general, modern politics prefer the simple sentence in terms of the syntactic structure of sentences. Many complex sentences either have a formally simple form, or the main sentence does not carry a significant information load, but only introduces the subordinate clause. Such sentences are easier to perceive, create the appearance of reasoning with the following conclusion, have an appealing, affirmative character. Such a simplification of the syntactic structure of contemporary political speech is associated with general tendencies in the development of language and its influence on the media, the language of advertising. This has led to the widespread use of incomplete sentences. An important role in political speeches is played by questions and conditional sentences: they are often used in a parliamentary statement due to the debatable nature of such speeches, as well as the position of opposition representatives as a means of negative assessment of the party of power. All questioning sentences function either in the form of a rhetorical question, or the speaker himself answers the question immediately, that is, he uses the “question-and-answer”, which serves as an actualization of the topic, facilitates the transition to the addressee, and also serves as a of intimidation, since “the interlocutor” is an addressee, already presented already as a follower, a philanthropist, a spokesman for the common thought.

Among the most frequent syntactic structures, researchers singled out the following: sentences in an orderly manner; question sentences (usually rhetorical questions that sound like a call to action); elliptical sentences (contribute to the enhancement of emotional influence, eliminating grammatical redundancy);

inversion and emphatic structures; conditional sentences (in the tactics of the promise, indications on the future).

Imperative sentences: *Do not* give up hope. *Be* strong. *Have* courage.

Sequence of questions: *What kind of* peace do I mean? *What kind of* peace do we seek?

Elliptical sentences: But, in the end, to what end...?

Inversion structures: Now begins another long journey, taking me into your cities and homes across the United States ...

Emotional structures: ... it's time to do some nation-building here at home.

Conditional Offers: If you give me your trust, I will honour it.

The above described peculiarities of the grammatical organization of political speeches are manifested not only in free phrases, but also in connective word-phrases – in idiomatic language units, which encompass the functional units of different levels functioning in different kinds of discourse – where the nominal value is deduced – for purposes of this article. In accordance with the standard rules of semantic combinatorics, the value of its components does not coincide with the real meaning with which this unit is used in the language.

Often, in political discourse, idiomatic language units are used in conjunction with modal verbs. For example, in his speech to the Congress, Barack Obama uses the modal verb to create tactics for recruitment, urging Democrats and Republicans to avoid a break in the funding for the US Department of Homeland Security: “The men and women of the homeland security apparatus do important work to protect us and the Republicans and Democrats in Congress should not play politics with that”.

The peculiarity of idiomatic language units is their frequent use in an orderly manner, which determines the frequency of such units in tactics that implement strategies of persuasiveness, for example: “But you have to put your head down and fight, fight, fight. Never, ever, ever give up”.

Idiomatic language units are often used in conjunction with conditional sentences, in particular to provide more expressive tactics for pointing out prospects, for example: “We can save this most important part of the UK's industrial wealth ...”. It should be emphasized that grammatical tools that are used by politicians play an important role in building communicative strategies aimed at conquering and retaining power, contributing to the effectiveness of rhetorical methods of influencing the electorate in order to introduce the desirable installations in their mind and cause the necessary emotional reaction.

Political leaders in their speeches, speeches, interviews, debates verbalize both their own emotional states and the emotional states of ordinary people, like-minded people, opponents, and others like that, through direct and indirect denomination.

So, the emotional states of political leaders are expressed by the primary shouts of *ah, oh* and the derivatives of exclamations: *absolutely, god, hello, look, sorry, well, oh, well*: Cameron: “*Sorry, I couldn't see Nick in the audience. Can*

you put your hand up? Ah? ... Oh sorry, you're behind the ... Same problem, behind the camera”.

The most frequent are secondary interjections, among which *well* (25.8%) is used to indicate emotion of astonishment, admiration, doubt: *Well, it's great to be here. I've never sat on such a trendy stool in my life.*

The second most frequent use is the interjection *look* (21.0%), to denote an emotional state of irritation and dissatisfaction: *Andrew Marr: And you still want to join the euro? Nick Clegg: Look, I think there's absolutely no question of this country joining the euro – certainly not during this government. To call it an impossibility is to put it mildly.*

Another frequent interjection is *absolutely* (15.2%), conveying emotions of surprise: *I have said on both these points very clearly what I want to see happen. Of course we want India and Pakistan to discuss issues between them and it is better for them. Absolutely!*

The spoken vocabulary (*bunch, con, drivel, measly, phoney, sack, etc.*), conversational constructs (*for heaven's sake, how on earth, what is earth, why on earth, etc.*), swear words (*damn, damned hell, for the hello fit, etc.*), slang words (*nutters, top brass, etc.*) conveys various negative emotions in the speech of politicians.

In the implementation of political communication, it is necessary to pay particular attention to the impact of the gender factor on broadcasting politics, along with the study of the general problems of female and male verbal behaviour. Gender is a complex socio-cultural construct that reflects the differences in roles, behaviour, mental and emotional characteristics between men and women.

The peculiarities of broadcasting female, as well as male politicians, appear in the strategy of speaking, its thematic orientation and the way of organizing the statement.

Each state, aimed at asserting itself as a democratic, social and legal entity, produces a gender policy to ensure equal rights and opportunities. Gender policy is the definition by international bodies and states of political parties of the main gender priorities and fundamental values, principles and directions of activity, appropriate methods of implementation, aimed at the establishment of equal rights, freedoms, the creation of conditions, opportunities and chances, guarantees of equal socio-political status of men and women, on the development of gender democracy and the formation of gender culture in society. Gender policy is not self-sufficient. It needs to be combined with social and other policies. But gender policy can claim its original existence, because it has the interest of subjects – men and women – at its core.

The main elements of public gender policy are:

- policy on women, providing them with an equal social status with men by guaranteeing opportunities for their equal development as a socio-demographic group;

- policies on men, the formation of gender awareness in them, the culture of gender behaviour, the orientation towards parity of relations with women;
- state-legal regulation of gender relations;
- promoting the development of gender democracy and gender culture in society.

Linguistic studies show that the masculine and feminine styles of public communication are different.

The language of men is shorter than the language of women. In the context of mixed communication, men speak more, while women interrupt them, argue, ask the direction of conversation. Men's communication differs from the women's more emotional restraint. Women freely and fully express their feelings and emotions. Men have a predominant aspect of understanding others based on knowledge or intellectual similarity, while women do this based on compassion (Shkvorchenko 2018).

The gender characteristics of male politicians can be found in the stylistic, lexical, syntactic, cultural-social, grammatical characteristics of the elements of the text. Thus, regarding the speeches, interviews and appeals of Donald Trump, Mike Pompeo, Jeremy Corbyn, Barack Obama, John Kerry, we can identify markers of masculine political discourse such as:

– terminology and vocabulary:

Donald Trump: “... *it all goes back to the insurance policy*”, “... *I've been under investigation*”, “... *or not I'm really not a conspiratorial person*”, “... *we're making great deals*”.

Jeremy Corbyn: “... *That means a new settlement for business and a stronger say for the workforce where the government will drive higher rates of investment in infrastructure, education*”, “... *It also failed to guarantee environmental protection or workers' rights*”.

John Kerry: “... *to the discussion of our cooperation on the international arena*”, “... *we are going to transition from Assad's leadership*”.

Barack Obama: “... *health is too costly*”, “... *inflation was really negative*”, “... *if you have a health insurance ...*”, “... *it's going to be deficit neutral*”, “*My critics say everything is a tax increase*”.

Mike Pompeo: “*We ask our allies [and] partners to join our economic pressure campaign against the [Iran's] regime*”, “... *when Iran can try to foment terrorism, violence [and] instability in one of our countries next*”.

Having considered the given examples, it is possible to note the obvious tendency of men to use terminology and professional vocabulary. Such a vocabulary is devoid of emotionality, it seeks for unambiguousness and absolute certainty, which is inherent in men.

– abstract nouns:

Donald Trump: “*A free and independent Britain is a blessing to the world*”, “*It's a really great honour*”, “*You know, I hope, I hope to be able to call it one of, along with tax cut and regulations ...*”, “*And I've had many people ask me to*”.

release them. Not that I did not like the idea, but I wanted to wait. I wanted to see what, you know, where it was all going. And I think this whole, it's a hoax".

Jeremy Corbyn: *"They have an interest in the long-term success of your company ... Workers generate profits", "... a higher rate of investment in infrastructure, education, skills and the exciting new technologies of the future".*

John Kerry: *"I know many people are very hopeful...", "The bulk of our attention will be ...".*

Barack Obama: *"... as well as bringing peace and stability", "... this is a form of cooperation based on honesty, sincerity ...".*

Mike Pompeo: *"... we reaffirmed our support for the Syrian political process ...", "... the Trump administration dreams the same dreams for the people of Iran as you do and through our labour and God's Providence, that day will come true".*

Having worked out different speeches by male politicians, we find that they use nouns with the meaning of abstraction in their speeches much more often than women politicians, which proves the high degree of abstraction of their thinking. Thus, abstract nouns form a group of gender-marked speech units inherent in men.

– negative forms of sentence:

Donald Trump: *"I never even talked to the guy. I did not know who he was. And I did not know one thing I would say about Carter Page. He never went around saying he knew me. He never went around saying the president is my best friend". "... so I'm very disappointed, unless they do that, that they have not taken very strong action ...".*

Jeremy Corbyn: *"Giving workers a share in them is not just fair, it's good for business", "It could not be clearer. Business as usual is not working".*

John Kerry: *"We should not give up and leave because the clock strikes midnight ... We will not be rushed".*

Barack Obama: *"... there some people who do not like me because of my race", "... you do not – you do not get – you do not get time on the nightly news".*

Mike Pompeo: *"We do not know the right moment", he said. "We do not know the day that the behaviour of the regime will change".*

– short simple sentences:

Donald Trump: *"So, we have started the wall. We got 1.6 [billion dollars]. We got another 1.6. We've fixed a lot of existing, we've started an 80-mile stretch", "In other words, Buck, we got a majority of one. We got to get to 60. So, 10 Democrats are controlling the Senate. We should not have the filibuster rule. The first thing that Chuck Schumer would do if he ever took control of the Senate is to get rid of the filibuster rule".*

Jeremy Corbyn: *"They have an interest in the long-term success of your company ... Workers generate profits. Providing workers with a share in them is not just fair, it's good for business".*

John Kerry: *"We're working hard, but not rushed, to get the job done", "We will not be rushed".*

Barack Obama: *“They are serious and they are many”. They will not be met easily or in a short span of time. But know this, America – they will be met”*.

Mike Pompeo: *“We do not know the right moment”, “We do not know the day that the regime's behaviour will change”, “Together, we emphasize our continued commitment to the JCPOA. This agreement remains important for our shared security”*.

As a rule, men express their thoughts clearly, without using many stylistic means. The use of a large number of epithets, metaphors, or comparisons is more peculiar to women, as usually men, in most cases, speak rather “dry”. Therefore, the use of short, simple sentences appears in political leaders – men.

– verbs that indicate confidence and accuracy:

Donald Trump: *“Yes, it's accurate”, “I'm pretty sure this statement is Saudi Arabia First, not America First”*.

Jeremy Corbyn: *“We recognize the vast and vital business businesses make to our society...”*.

John Kerry: *“I've decided to stay and work tonight and tomorrow morning”*.

Barack Obama: *“I am sure that our schools are doing everything they can to give our kids ...”*.

Mike Pompeo: *“I know they have a lot of problems and their economies are collapsing ...”*.

As a rule, men, unlike women, do not use sloping phrases, fuzzy comparisons and veiled expressions; they have more distinctness, confidence and accuracy of statements. From this it can be concluded that men-politicians express their confidence and awareness about certain issues in their speeches.

The gender peculiarities of women-politicians can also be found in the stylistic, lexical, syntactic, cultural-social and grammatical characteristics of the elements of the text. Taking as examples speeches by Jill Stein, Condoleezza Rice, Prime Minister Theresa May, Hillary Clinton, Princess Diana, it is possible to identify the following markers of the feminine political discourse:

– political terms (names of parties, unions and community, political ranks, political committees).

Jill Stein: *“This work for democracy and justice is the antidote to the converging crises we face ...”*.

Theresa May: *“On defense and security cooperation, we are united in our recognition of NATO as the bulwark of our collective defense”. “I have today been able to convey Her Majesty The Queen's hope that President Trump and the First Lady would pay a state visit to the United Kingdom later this year”*.

Hillary Clinton: *“The use of immigrants as a political device and as a symbol of government has gone wrong, of the attacks on one's heritage, one's identity, one's national unity has been extensively exploited by the current administration here”*.

Political terminology is characteristic of any genre of political discourse. They often use multi-valued terms, terms-synonyms, shortened terms, names. For

example, the term “state” in the US may mean “state” and “state” as an administrative unit.

– comparative reversals:

Jill Stein: “... *this historic moment, as a movement for democracy and justice, is sweeping the planet*”, “... *the homeless to become a new political force in Baltimore as part of your mayoral campaign*”.

Condoleezza Rice: “*I’m as impatient as anyone ...*”, “*And that’s as good a basis as any ...*”.

Theresa May: “... *we are also discussing the importance of NATO continuing to ensure that it is equipped to combat terrorism and cyber warfare as it is to fight more conventional forms of warfare*”.

Hillary Clinton: “*The use of immigrants as a political device and a symbol of government has gone wrong ...*”.

Princess Diana: “*You see yourself as a good product that sits in a shelf and sells well*”, “*I was thick as a plank ...*”, “... *people used my bulimia as a coat on a hanger*”.

– fixed turnovers:

Jill Stein: “... *they are utterly incapable of getting us out*”, “... *political movement that does not sell out to corporate predators ...*”.

Condoleezza Rice: “... *who were trying to bring the system down*”, “*If by radical change people, is he going to drop that goal?*”

Hillary Clinton: “... *because if we do not deal with the migration issue it will continue to roil the body politics*”.

Princess Diana: “... *your self-esteem is at a low ebb*”, “*I was at the end of my tether*”, “... *my husband would hold more cards than I would*”.

– questioning, rhetorical, dividing sentences:

Condoleezza Rice: “*And do I really want to pay the price of an Iranian nuclear weapon?*”, “*You know, how would we do this?*”

Theresa May: “*I believe this is a deal that does that deliver that, which is in the national interest, and I will go see it through? Yes*”.

Hillary Clinton: “*How are we going to do it?*”, “*We’re going to do it by having rich people pay their fair share and closing corporate loopholes*”.

Princess Diana: “*But, who knows?*”, “*Our boys – that’s what matters, is not it?*”.

Suggestive sentences or rhetorical questions do not require a response from the addressee, although they are addressed to the interlocutor, influencing him in a certain way. Thus, by spelling out questionnaires, the speaker prompts the listener to find the answer himself and at the same time, convinces him that this is the correct answer.

– parallels:

Jill Stein: “... *so many others who realize that dreaming for change is not enough, hoping for change is getting nowhere ...*”, “*They do this not because they want to, they do it because they have to ...*”.

Condoleezza Rice: *"I suppose they'll act, I assume they'll do it", "We can help. We can support. We can do a lot of things ..."*

Theresa May: *"If you're black, you're treated more harshly by the criminal justice system than if you're white. If you're a white, working-class boy, you're less likely than anyone else in Britain to go to university. If you're at a state school, you're less likely to reach the top professions than if you're educated privately"*

Hillary Clinton: *"... of attacks on one's heritage, one's identity, one's national unity has been very much exploited by the current administration here", "I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future"*

Princess Diana: *"I sit here with hope, because there's a future ahead, a future for my husband, a future for myself and a future for the monarchy"*

The use of parallelisms is considered to be inherent in women's speech. Repetitions draw attention and enhance the pragmatic effect of speech.

– inserts:

Jill Stein: *"As a consequence, half of the world's species are expected to die off by 2100, putting the survival of humans ..."*

Condoleezza Rice: *"Now, be fair, ...", "... which has been, by the way, a demand ..."*

Theresa May: *"And in a further sign of the importance of that relationship ...", "And finally, the President and I have mentioned future economic cooperation and trade"*

Hillary Clinton: *"Of course, we are 5 percent of the world's population"; "In fact, it would be the most extreme version"*

Princess Diana: *"It was so, you know, if we're going ...", "Well, ...", "So, ..."*

– modal constructions:

Jill Stein: *"... the climate is heading (...) can be seen in India which has just had one of its worst heat waves in recorded history ..."*

Condoleezza Rice: *"You may have noticed that the Israeli Prime Minister ..."*

Theresa May: *"And so we are discussing how we can establish a trade negotiation agreement, take immediate, high-level talks, lay the groundwork for UK-U.S. trade agreement, and identify the practical steps we can take now to enable companies in both countries to trade ..."*

Hillary Clinton: *"And so what I believe is the more we can do for a middle class, the more we can invest in you, your education, your skills, your future ..."*

Princess Diana: *"... if you can have rampant bulimia ...", "I think every strong woman in history has had to walk down the same path"*

Women-politicians are inclined to use grammatical structures that show unrealistic conditions for the formation of the image of dreams as a form of speech influence on the addressee. In these examples we can observe that these modal structures are inherent in female politicians' speeches.

Conclusions

Consequently, political discourse is a method of communication mediated by a certain social and cultural tradition, based on the exchange, instigation and propagation of certain ideas, attitudes and attitudes of participants in the political life, in order to achieve political goals that are mainly related to the issues of power. The following linguistic features are distinguished. for political discourse:

– Clichés and stamps. They are meant to awaken the consciousness of the recipient's already existing stereotypes, as well as focus on the locality of the information for easier understanding.

– Estimated vocabulary, emphasizing and influencing the reader's consciousness.

– Terminological definitions. Targeted to create sophisticated definitions of terms and give new sense tones.

Political discourse has a number of peculiarities depending on the politician's gender. Thus, most female politicians are devoted to the style of cooperation in the process of linguistic communication, while male politicians use the style of competition. Women usually follow the turning point of speech whereas men tend to dominate and assert themselves. Accordingly, there are different language and speech styles for women and men in political discourse. The gender features of politicians can be traced in the stylistic, lexical, syntactic, cultural-social, grammatical characteristics of the elements of the text.

REFERENCES

- Borbot'ko, V. G., *Zagal'na teoriya diskursu (printsipi formuvannyata smysloporodzhennya)* [General discourse theory]: avtoreferat dis. d-ra filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.01 [Thesis manuscript], Kyiv, Edited by KubGU, 1998. (Borbot'ko 1998)
- Bush, George Walker, *Second Inaugural address* [E-source].
- Bush, George, *Acceptance Speech* [Электронний ресурс]. URL: <http://abcnews-go.com/Politics/story?id=123214&page=1> (дата звернення: 29.10.2018)
- Clinton, Hillary, *Excerpts of Remarks at a Rally in Fort Worth, Texas, March 1, 2008* [Электронний ресурс]. URL: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=96540> (дата обращения: 29.10.2018)
- Dautova, L. A., “Movni osoblivosti peredvibornogo diskursu (na materialy amerikans'kogo peredvibornogo diskursu)” [Language peculiarities of pre-election discourse], *Filologichni nauki, Pitannya teorii i praktiki*, [Philological issues], 2014, pp. 53-57. (Dautova 2014)
- Dem'yankov, V. Z., “Politichnij diskurs yak predmet politologichnoï filologii [Political discourse as an object of political philology]”, *Politichna nauka. Politichnij diskurs: istoriya i suchasni doslidzhennya* [Politics. Political discourse], Moscow, INION RAN, 2002, № 3, pp. 32-43. (Dem'yankov 2002)

- Edelman, M., *Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail*, N. Y., Academic Press, 1977. (Edelman 1977)
- Foley, Elise, *Obama to Congress: Don't Play Politics with DHS Funding* [Электронный ресурс]. URL: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/02/02/obama-dhs-funding_n_6594354.html (date of access: 11.11.2018) (Foley 2015)
- Gajkova, O. V., *Peredvibornij diskurs yak zhanr politichnoi komunikatsii (na materialii anglijs'koj movi)* [Pre-election discourse as a genre of political communication], avtoref. dis. k. filol. n. [Thesis manuscript], 2003, 19 s. (Gajkova 2003)
- General Assembly, Sixty-sixth Session, 11th Plenary Meeting: Official Records of United Nations*, N. Y., United Nations, 2011.
- Kennedy, John F., *Commencement Address at American University in Washington*, June 10, 1963 [E-source]. URL: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=9266> (date of access: 11.11.2018)
- Kennedy, John F., *Democratic National Convention Nomination Acceptance*. Address "The New Frontier", July 15, 1960 [E-source]. URL: <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/jfk1960dnc.htm> (date of access: 14.11.2018)
- Kondratenko. N. V., *Politichnij diskurs: sutnist', tipologiya, spetsifika funkcionuvannya* [Political discourse: sense, typology, specific functions], Reklama ta PR u masovoinformatsijnomu prostori [Advertisement and PR in mass media], [Monograph], edited by O. V. Aleksandrova, Odesa, Astroprint, 2009, pp. 21-26. (Kondratenko 2009)
- Langacker, R., "Discourse in Cognitive Grammar", *Cognitive Linguistics*, 12 (2), 2010, pp. 143-188.
- McCain, John, *Remarks in Dayton*, Ohio, October 27, 2008 [E-source]. URL: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=84604> (date of access: 14.11.2018)
- Merri, Lennart, *Address by the President of the Republic of Estonia at the Special Commemorative Meeting of the General Assembly on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations*, October 22, 1995, New York [E-source]. URL: <https://vp1992-2001.president.ee/eng/k6ned/K6ne.asp?-ID=9357> (date of access: 14.11.2018)
- Obama, Barack, *Remarks at a Campaign Rally in Sandusky*, Ohio, July 5, 2012 [E-source]. URL: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=101323> (date of access: 14.11.2018)
- Obama, Barack, *The President's Weekly Address*, June 2, 2012 [E-source]. URL: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=100944> (date of access: 14.11.2018)
- Obama, Barack, *The Third Presidential Debate*, Boca Raton, Fla. [E-source], The New York Times, 2012, October 22. URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/22/us/politics/transcript-of-the-third-presidential-debate-in-bocaratton-fla.html> (date of access: 14.11.2018)

- Oxford Dictionaries*, URL: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com>
- Pavluts'ka, V. O., *Politichnij diskurs: osoblivosti ta funktsii* [Political discourse: peculiarities and functions, Visnik Zhitomir'skogo derzhavnogo universitetu, Vipusk 39, Filologichni nauki. [Digest of Zhitimir state university], Zhitomir, 2000, pp. 218-221. (Pavluts'ka 2000)
- Shkvorchenko, N., *Business discourse: gender aspect*, International scientific conference "Scientific and innovative potential of nowadays", Poland, Opole, 2018, Volume 7, pp. 7-9. (Shkvorchenko 2018)
- Stots'kij, V. V., *Politichnij diskurs ZMI: sutnist' ta osnovni pidkhodi do analizu* [Political media discourse: idea and main approaches to its analysis], Visnik ONU: sotsiologiya i politichni nauki. [Digest of Odesa national Mechnikov university], Odesa, Astroprint, 2008, Volume 13, issue 5, pp. 691-695. (Stots'kij 2008)
- Trump, Donald, *If I become president, we're all going to be saying 'Merry Christmas' again* [E-source], Fox News, 2015, November 10. URL: <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2015/11/10/trump-if-become-president-were-all-going-to-be-saying-merry-christmas-again.html> (date of access: 16.11.2018)
- Trump, Donald, *Remarks by President Trump at United States Coast Guard Academy Commencement Ceremony* [E-source]. URL: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/05/17/remarks-president-trump-united-states-coast-guard-academy-commencement> (date of access: 16.11.2018)
- Van Dijk, T. A., *Discourse definition*, London, 1998. E-version: URL <http://www.nsu.ru/psych/internet/bits/vandijk2.html> (Van Dijk 1998)
- Widdowson, H. G., *Linguistics*, 3d ed., Series Editor H. G. Widdowson, Oxford, Oxford Univ. Press, 1997. (Widdowson 1997)
- Winstone, Steve, *We must stop the heart of steel being ripped out of Sheffield* [E-source]. URL: <http://mikehookem.org/news.php?id=25> (date of access: 17.11.2018)

ABSTRACT

Political discourse is a type of language related to the sphere of politics and to speaking in a certain situational context, and is aimed at achieving a particular pragmatic-semantic outcome using verbal or non-verbal means of expressiveness. Within this discourse a new system of values (social, socio-political), as well as a system of diverse ideas and views is created. One of the most important functions of political discourse is that of persuasion and political propaganda. Grammatical, morphological and syntactic means play an important role in achieving the communicative goals of political discourse. Political discourse has a number of peculiarities depending on the politician's gender, that can be traced in the stylistic, lexical, syntactic, cultural-social, grammatical characteristics of the discourse elements.

Key words: political discourse, male discourse, female discourse

REZUMAT

Discursul politic este un tip de limbaj asociat sferei politicului și actelor de vorbire realizate într-un anumit context situațional și vizează atingerea unui anumit rezultat pragmatico-semantic folosind mijloace de exprimare verbale și non-verbale. În cadrul acestui discurs se creează un nou sistem de valori (sociale, socio-politice), dar și un sistem de diverse idei și viziuni. Una dintre cele mai importante funcții ale discursului politic este cea de persuasiune și de propagandă politică. Instrumentele gramaticale, morfologice și sintactice joacă un rol important în atingerea obiectivelor de comunicare ale discursului politic. Discursul politic prezintă o serie de particularități, în funcție de genul politicianului, care pot fi decelate prin caracteristicile stilistice, lexicale, stilistice, culturalo-sociale, gramaticale ale elementelor discursului.

Cuvinte-cheie: discurs politic, discurs masculin, discurs feminin