УДК 811'111

IMAGE OF A LEADER'S LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY
IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE
L.L. Slavova   (Kyiv, Ukraine)

Л.Л. Славова. Образ языковой личности лидера в политическом дискурсе. В статье предложен новый поход к изучению языковой личности политического лидера с позиций политической лингвоперсонологии. Автор характеризует жанровые и дискурсивные черты языковой личности политиков; доказывает влияние пресуппозиции на дискурсивный статус языковой личности политиков. Языковая личность политика выступает в таких ипостасях, как 1) индивидуальная личность, наделенная возрастными, гендерными и статусными характеристиками; 2) коллективная личность – выразитель идей стартума или нации; 3) обобщенно-символическая личность – ярлык стартума или этнонационального сообщества в восприятии других; 4) виртуальная личность, сконструированная институтом спичрайтерства. Последняя детально освещается в статье.

Ключевые слова: политичский дискурс, пресуппозиция, речевые акты, фоновые знания, языковая личность.

Л.Л. Славова. Образ мовної особистості лідера у політичному дискурсі. У статті запропоновано новий підхід до вивчення мовної особистості політичного лідера з позицій політичної лінгвоперсонології. Авторка характеризує жанрові та дискурсивні риси мовної особистості політиків; доводить вплив пресупозиції на дискурсивний статус мовної особистості політиків. Мовна особистість політика виступає в таких іпостасях, як 1) індивідуальна особистість, наділена віковими, гендерними та статусними характеристиками; 2) колективна особистість – виразник ідей стратуму або нації; 3) узагальнено-символічна особистість – ярлик стратуму чи етнонаціональної спільноти в очах інших осіб; 4) віртуальна особистість, сконструйована інститутом спічрайтерства. Остання отримує детальне висвітлення у статті.

Ключові слова: мовна особистість, мовленнєві акти, політичний дискурс, пресупозиція, фонові знання.

L.L. Slavova. Image of a Leader's Linguistic Personality in Political Discourse. The article offers a new approach to studying the language personality of a political leader in different linguistic cultures from the perspectives of political linguistic personology. The author characterizes genre and discursive realization of communicative traits of politicians' linguistic personality; proves the influence of presupposition on the discursive status of politicians' linguistic personality. Linguistic personality of a politician can be manifested as 1) individual personality (age, gender and status characteristics); 2) collective personality representing the ideas of stratum or nation; 3) generalized symbolic personality – stratum label of national ethnic community in the eyes of others; 4) virtual personality constructed by the institute of speechwriting. The latter has been highlighted in a detailed way in the article.

Keywords: background knowledge, linguistic personality, political discourse, presupposition, speech acts.

Introduction

Ideas of political linguistic personology are based on the theory of linguistic personality [Bohin 1984; Vorkachov 2000; Karasik 2001; Karaulov 1987; Potapenko 2004; Susov 1989, etc.]; postulates of cognitive linguistics [Babushkin 1996; Boldyrev 2000, Zhabotynska 1999;

Kubryakova 2004; Lakoff 2003]; linguistic culture [Vorobiev 2008; Wierzbicka 1997, etc.], the theory of communication [Bacevych 2005; Pocheptsov 1998; Semenyuk 2010; Soloshhuk 2006; Shevchenko 2005]; theory of political discourse [Baranov 2004; Vodak 1997; Shejgal 2004; Chudinov 2006; van Dijk 1997, etc.]; theory of speech genres [Arutyunova 1999; Bahtin 2000; Krysin 1976, etc.], and the concept of communicative strategies [Dijk 1997; Issers 2006; Mihaleva 2009; Parshina 2007; Snytko 2007].

The theory of linguistic personality includes such directions as theoretical and methodological [Bohin 1984; Ivancova 2008; Karaulov 1987]; psycholinguistic [Frumkina 1992]; sociolinguistic [Alefirenko 2006; Krysin 1976]; linguocognitive [Babushkin 1996; Karasik 2001; Shahnarovich 1995]; communicative pragmatic [Sentenberg 1994; Suhih 1993; Shahovskij 2001], cultural space [Vorob'ev 2008; Karasik 2001; Kochetkova 1999; Thorik 2000], intercultural communication [Donec 2001; Grishaeva 2007; Leontovich 2007]; scientific humanitarian [Synycya 2007]; linguo-didatic [Bohin 1984; Prohorov 2006].

Yu.M. Karaulov presented a model of linguistic personality on verbal-semantic, cognitive and motivational levels. The last two are related to the cognitive and onomasiological nature of a linguistic personality, which can be revealed through the process of reconstruction. The notion reconstruction is treated much wider nowadays and is correlated with the issues of categorization and conceptualization of different fragments of reality, in particular a political one, often treated by scientists as political discourse. We define political discourse as the combination of thesaurus of precedent phenomena, models of typical speech actions and genres of communication focused on the sphere of political communication [Vodak 1997; Chudynov 2006; Shejhal 2004].

The central concept of political discourse is a linguistic personality as a cognitive-discursive phenomenon, the study of which in this perspective is a new theoretical and methodological problem. From these positions the linguistic personality of a political leader is defined as a generalized image that embodies the typical features of representatives of this sphere and specific features characteristic of a particular linguoculture.

Topicality of the research is predermined by the orientation of cognitive linguistics, discourse studies alongside with linguistic personology at the establishment of relationships between a language and discursive consciousness, reflecting specific national picture of the world of representatives of the certain society and outlining an individual portrait of a linguistic personality in a certain type of discourse.

The aim of the paper is to disclose the notion of the virtual image of a politician's linguistic personality and characterize the means of its representation in political discourse. **The object** is the linguistic personality of a politician. The subject is the procedure of reconstructing the virtual image of a politician's linguistic personality.

The material of the research is contemporary American political discourse taken from the Internet sources and periodicals of late XX – early XXI century. In particular the speeches of G. Bush (Ukraine, 1991) and J. Biden (Ukraine, 2015) have been analyzed.

Data and methods. To achieve the aim we used different linguistic methods at different stages of investigation. They are elements of quantitative analysis; the elements of conceptual analysis, symptomatic **statistical method; elements of discourse analysis; interpretive text-analysis.**

Discussion. Linguistic personality of a politician is the basic concept of linguistic personology and is the generalized image that reflects the typical features of the representatives of this profession and specific features characteristic of this linguoculture.

Linguistic personality of a politician can be manifested as 1) individual personality (age, gender and status characteristics); 2) collective personality representing the ideas of stratum or nation; 3) generalized symbolic personality – stratum label of national ethnic community in the eyes of others; 4) virtual personality constructed by the institute of speechwriting.

The **virtual image of a politician's linguistic personality** is reconstructed on the basis of speech acts analysis. They are differentiated according to the role in the communication process and are used in various genre forms of political discourse.

The positioning of the speaker as an authoritative narrator, messenger and as a decisive actor is crucial. Certain kinds of speech acts, for example orders, requests, advising, warnings, promises, commitments, etc., can only be performed "felicitously" on the basis of recognized powers [Chilton 2003: 219]

The most typical speech acts in the genre of political speech are representatives. They are presented by simple statements and claims:

Centuries ago, your forebears named this country Ukraine, or "frontier," because your steppes link Europe and Asia [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

But as history tells us and shows, and as we know, Ukraine's leaders proved incapable of delivering on the promise of democratic revolution [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

Directives are one of the most power-dependent linguistic expressions of coercion:

In your heart, you know what's right. You know. <u>*Do it*</u> [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

Commissives (promises, threats and offerings) are an indispensible part of a political speech:

<u>*We will determine our support*</u> *not on the basis of personalities but on the basis of principles* [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

As long as you remain on that path, as long as you honor the obligation to the Ukrainian people, you never have to worry or doubt America and <u>*the United States will be by your side*</u> [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

Promises are the inverse of threats (which are close to warnings), and in political discourse the boundary is fragile, since the future action referred to in both acts may be something desirable to some hearers and something undesirable to others powers [Chilton 2003: 221].

Political leaders represent themselves, their views on social and political phenomena, their citizens and their opponents through verbal and nonverbal means of communication.

Analysis of appropriate language and speech markers used by politicians to express their world views allows determining the background knowledge in the structure of the leaders' linguistic personality.

In the discourse of political leaders their background knowledge is represented by conceptual metaphors, phraseological units, allusions, metonymy, and precedent phenomena.

Background knowledge is an effective tool in the perception of the world. Their content includes facts of the past and present life in the life of linguistic culture that are verbalized in the form of allusions, phraseology, quotations, precedent phenomena, etc.

Usage of precedent phenomena can be explained by the links to certain social and political events, the ability of concise description of events and phenomena, appeals to the famous personalities, creation of image and the impact in terms of audience perception. Presenting some important information through the use of precedent phenomena helps reveal the essence linguocultural realities.

Usage of precedent utterances, famous quotations enable a linguistic personality to visualize clearly the image that he wants to create in the imagination of the audience.

G. Bush quotes the words of Olexander Dovzhenko in his speech, giving the metaphoric image of Kyiv:

This beautiful city brings to mind the words of the poet Alexander Dovzhenko: "The city of Kiev is an orchard. Kiev is a poet. Kiev is an epic. Kiev is history. Kiev is art" [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

Then he refers also to an old Ukrainian proverb, which says:

When you enter a great enterprise, free your soul from **weakness** [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

One of G. Bush's precedent utterances is based on the lines from Taras Shevchenko:

Only in your own house can you have your truth, your strength, and freedom [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

The American political leader refers to the words of the former President Theodore Roosevelt:

Theodore Roosevelt, one of our great Presidents, once wrote: To be patronized is as offensive as to be insulted. No one of us cares permanently to have someone else conscientiously striving to do him good; what we want is to work with that someone else for the good of both of us. That's what our former President said [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

J. Biden quotes both American and Ukrainian famous people in different contexts:

A great poet Taras Shevchenko wrote verse after verse declaiming the spirit of Ukraine, urging his fellow Ukrainians rise up and claim their liberty. His poem "The Testament" ends with this reflection. And I quote:

Then, in the mighty family
Of all men that are free,
May be sometimes, very softly
You will speak of me?

May be sometimes very softly you will speak of me (Applause.) [https://www. whitehouse. gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

The American Vice-President quotes the greatest Ukrainian poets and Ukrainian audience approvingly *(Applause.)* perceives it. It touches the soul of everyone present.

One of the quotations mentioned in Biden's speech is Thomas Paine's:

To quote an early American patriot, Thomas Paine, "These are the times that try men's souls." These are the times that try men's souls [https://www. whitehouse. gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

Citing the words of Edmund Burke, British statesman, parliamentary orator and political thinker, made significant impact on the audience and gave the vivid image of what the parliament is:

Edmund Burke said it best in 1774, speaking to his constituency in Bristol, England. Here's what he said: "Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one

interest – that of the whole; where not local purpose, not local prejudice ought to guide, but the general good" [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

Stylistic means and devices used in political speeches make them sound more convincing, brighter and more appealing.

A distinctive feature of American political speeches is the reference to the basic values of American society of democracy, freedom and equality.

We will support those in the center and the Republics who pursue <u>freedom, democracy, and economic liberty</u> [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

Their blood and courage delivering to the Ukrainian people a second chance for <u>freedom</u> [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

Most speeches of American political leaders include lexical units relating to religion:

And may I simply say, may <u>God bless</u> the people of Ukraine [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

May <u>God bless</u> our two great nations and may <u>God</u> protect our troops [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

The use of expressive means makes the political speech more emotional and appealing to the audience:

phraseological units (*death knell*):

And if the people resign themselves to exploitation and corruption for fear of losing whatever little they have left, that would be the <u>death knell</u> for Ukrainian democracy [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

metaphors:

We mean a system of government that derives its just power from the consent of the governed, that retains its legitimacy by <u>controlling its appetite</u> for power [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

For years, you had elections with ballots, but you did not enjoy democracy. And now, democracy has begun to <u>set firm roots</u> <u>in Soviet soil</u> [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

And the <u>bright flame of hope</u> for a new Ukraine snuffed out by the pervasive poison of cronyism, corruption, and kleptocracy. [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

Some of the source domains of conceptual metaphors to be distinguished are war and medicine. The frame WAR has 2 components:

1. Military actions (*a battle, fight, struggle*):

But the <u>battle</u> for our independence was underway well before the first shots were fired [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

But in addition, you also have a <u>battle</u>, a historic <u>battle</u> against corruption [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

They're watching you because their hopes for your success as you <u>fight</u> both the unrelenting aggression of the Kremlin and the cancer of corruption will

impact on them [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

We support the <u>struggle </u>in this great country for democracy and economic reform [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech].

2. Place of military actions (*battlefields*):

Because as all of you know the struggle for Ukraine's freedom is not confined to the <u>battlefields</u> of the east.

The frame "Medicine" is represented by its component decease, illness (*cancer*):

But I can tell you, you cannot name me a single democracy in the world where the <u>cancer</u> of corruption is prevalent [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

Metaphors are more than just colorful; they structure thought [Political Keywords 2005: 46].

Among syntactic stylistic devices repetition and parallel constructions help create emotionality of a speech:

<u>This is your</u> moment. <u>This is your</u> responsibility. <u>Each of you</u> – if you'll forgive me for speaking to you this way in your body – <u>each of you</u> has an obligation to seize the opportunity that the sacrifices made in the Maidan, the sacrifices of the Heavenly Hundred. <u>Each of you</u> has an obligation to answer the call of history and finally build a united, democratic Ukrainian nation that can stand the test of time [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

This stylistic device helps logically highlight those parts of statements to which the speaker wants to draw attention of the audience. Giving information in such a way contributes to the logical and balanced presentation of information. In political speeches all four types of repetition in combination with parallel structures are found, but anaphora is more widely used.

The use of repetition and syntactic parallelism makes the speech more convincing:

<u>No one should mistake saber rattling and bombast for strength</u>. Let me say that again, <u>no one should mistake saber rattling and bombast for real strength</u> [https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada].

Such stylistic coloring indicates an intended pragmatic orientation, which, according to V.A. Kuharenko "is the best way to involve the recipient on the side of the author and convince him that the author's concept is true" [Kuharenko 1988: 3].

The Ukrainian mass media qualified the speech of J. Biden in the Ukrainian Parliament as a lesson of parliamentary arts. His speech can be compared with speeches of American political leaders before elections [http://galinfo.com.ua].

Informative for the qualification of political speeches, inaugural ones including, in various linguocultures is the ratio of keywords. Each keyword contains a network of associations, calling up different memories and imaginings. Keywords are used to create momentum and to adjust to emerging political realities [Political Keywords 2005].

The length of J. Biden speech is 3918 words. In comparison with G. Bush's speech it is almost twice bigger. The length of G. Bush's speech is 2152 words. Key words are most informative, they disclose the picture of the world perceived by the speaker.

In Table 1 we show the statistic representation of speeches of G. Bush during his visit to Ukraine in 1991 and the speech of J. Biden during his visit to Ukraine in 2015.

Table 1

Statistic representation of G. Bush's speech (Ukraine, 1991)
and J. Biden's speech (Ukraine, 2015)

G. Bush's speech during his visit in Ukraine in 1991	J. Biden's speech during his visit in Ukraine in 2015
freedom – 20 – 16,1%	Ukraine – 32 – 14, 6%
people – 19 – 15,3%	people – 27 – 12,3%
democracy – 12 – 9,7%	Ukrainian – 22 – 10%
American (s) – 11 – 8,9 %	world – 16 – 7,3%
government – 11 – 8,9 %	country – 11 – 5%
liberty – 9 – 7,25%	corruption – 11 – 5%
Ukraine – 8 – 6,45%	the United States – 9 – 4,1%
Economic – 8 – 6,45%	reform(s) – 9 – 4,1%
free – 8 – 6,45%	American(s) – 8
support – 8 – 6,45%	opportunity – 8 – 3,7%
Ukrainian – 5 – 4%	president – 8 – 3,7%
enterprise – 5 – 4%	Support – 8 – 3,7%
	time(s) – 7 – 3,2%
	Russian – 7 – 3,2%
	election(s) – 7 – 3,2%
	America – 6 – 2,7%
	commitment – 6 – 2,7%
	dignity – 6 – 2,7%
	nation – 5 – 2,3%
	freedom – 5 – 2,3%
124 – 100 %	218 – 100%

On the basis of the carried out analysis we may state that certain key words have been repeated (*freedom, support, Ukraine, Ukrainian, people, Americans*) in these two speeches. In G. Bush's speech we come across 5 words that are mentioned more than 10 times, and in the speech of J. Biden there are 6. Keywords are so ultimately tied to what a society values and detests, what it inspires and what it fears [Political Keywords 2005: 258].

In different historical periods of Ukraine American political leaders focus their attention on different values and concepts that reflect the reality of the Ukrainian society from their standpoint. Freedom, democracy and ecomomic liberty are the key notions of G. Bush's speech. While J. Biden's message lies in the struggle against corruption, the necessity of further reforms, and fight against Russian's aggression, support and continuation of ideas of Revolution of Dignity.

Tomorrow's keywords may be different from today's, but some will persist. They persist because people persist and cultures persist and problems persist and opportunities persist and politics persists. For these reasons, too, we must give *peace* a chance [Political Keywords 2005: 261–262].

Conclusion

The virtual image of the politician's linguistic personality is reconstructed on the basis of analysis of different speech acts, which are differentiated according to the role in the communication process and used in various genre forms of political discourse. The influence of the presupposition on a discursive status of politicians' linguistic personality has been proved. Background knowledge is an effective tool in the perception of the world. Its content includes facts from the past and present of the life of a linguoculture that are verbalized in the form of allusions, phraseology, quotations, precedent phenomena, etc. Usage of the precedent phenomena is explained by certain socio-political events, the ability of concise description of events and phenomena, creating imagery and the impact on the audience in terms of perception. Presenting some important information through the use of precedent phenomena helps reveal the essence of linguocultural realities. Keywords proved to be informative for the qualification of political speeches.

LITERATURE

1. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Текст и дискурс в фокусе языковой личности / Н.Ф. Алефиренко // Языковая личность – текст – дискурс: теоретические и прикладные аспекты исследования : материалы Международной научной конференции : в 2 ч. – Самара : Изд-во «Самарский университет», 2006. – Ч. 1. – С. 6–10.

2. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека / Н.Д. Арутюнова ; [2-е изд., испр.]. – М. : Языки русской культуры, 1999. – I–XV. – 896 с.

3. Бабушкин А.П. Типы концептов в лексико-фразеологической семантике языка / А.П. Бабушкин. – Воронеж : Изд-во Воронеж. гос. ун-та, 1996. – 104 с.

4. Баранов А.Н. Предисловие редактора / А.Н. Баранов // Метафоры, которыми мы живем / Дж. Лакофф, М. Джонсон ; пер. с англ.; под ред. и с предисл. А.Н. Баранова. – М. : Едиториал УРСС, 2004. – С. 7–21.

5. Бахтин М.М. Проблемы речевых жанров / М.М. Бахтин // Автор и герой: к философским основам гуманитарных наук. – СПб. : Азбука, 2000. – С. 249–298.

6. Бацевич Ф. Лінгвістична генологія: проблеми і перспективи / Ф. Бацевич. – Львів : ПАІС, 2005. – 264 с.

7. Богин Г.И. Модель языковой личности и её отношение к разновидностям текстов : автореф. дис. на соискание учен. степени доктора филол. наук : спец. 10.02.19 «Общее языкознание, социолингвистика, психолингвистика» / Г.И. Богин. – Л. : Ленінград. гос. ун-т, 1984. – 31 с.

8. Болдырев Н.Н. Когнитивная семантика : курс лекций по английской филологии / Н.Н. Болдырев. – Тамбов : Изд-во Тамбов. ун-та, 2000. – 123 с.

9. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание / А. Вежбицкая ; [пер. с англ.]. – М. : Русские словари, 1997. – 416 с.

10. Водак Р. Язык. Дискурс. Политика / Р. Водак. – Волгоград : Перемена, 1997. – 139 с.

11. Воркачев С.Г. Сопоставительное описание языковых личностей (на материале немецкой и русской фразеологии) / С.Г. Воркачев, И.В. Мединцева // Лингвистические парадигмы: традиции и новации. – Волгоград : Перемена, 2000. – С. 68—72.

12. Воробьев В.В. Лингвокультурология : монография / В.В. Воробьев. – М. : Изд-во РУДН, 2008. – 336 с.

13. Гришаева Л.И. Особенности использования языка и культурная идентичность коммуникантов : монография / Л.И. Гришаева. – Воронеж : Воронеж. гос. ун-т, 2007. – 261 с.

14. Донец П.Н. Основы общей теории межкультурной коммуникации: научный статус, понятийный аппарат, языковой и неязыковой, вопросы этики и дидактики : монография / П.Н. Донец. – Харьков : Штрих, 2001. – 386 с.

15. Жаботинская С.А. Концептуальный анализ: типы фреймов / С.А. Жаботинская // Вісник Черкас. ун-ту. – Серія Філологічні науки. – Черкаси : Видавничий відділ Черкас. держ. ун-ту ім. Б. Хмельницького. – 1999. – Вип. 11. – С. 12–25.

16. Иванцова Е.В. Проблемы формирования методологических основ лингвоперсонологии / Е.В. Иванцова // Вестник Томск. гос. ун-та. – Серия: Филология. – Томск : Изд-во Томск. ун-та, 2008. – № 3 (4.). – С. 27–41.

17. Иссерс О.С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи / О.С. Иссерс ; [3-е изд., стереотип.]. – М. : КомКнига, 2006. – 228 с.

18. Карасик В.И. Аспекты языковой личности / В.И. Карасик // Языковая личность: проблемы когниции : сб. науч. тр. – Волгоград : Коллед", 2001. – С. 172–183.

19. Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность / Ю.Н. Караулов. – М. : Наука, 1987. – 263 с.

20. Кочеткова Т.В. Языковая личность носителя элитарной речевой культуры : автореферат дисс. на соискание учен. степени доктора филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01 «Русский язык» / Т.В. Кочеткова. – Саратов : Саратов. гос. ун-т, 1999. – 53 с.

21. Крысин Л.П. Речевое общение и социальные роли говорящих / Л.П. Крысин // Социолингвистические исследования. – М. : Наука, 1976. – С. 42–52.

22. Кубрякова Е.С. Об установках когнитивной науки и актуальных проблемах когнитивной лингвистики / Е.С. Кубрякова // Известия АН. – Серия литературы и языка. – 2004. – Т. 63. – № 3. – С. 3–12.

23. Кухаренко В.А. Интерпретация текста / В.А. Кухаренко. – М. : Просвещение, 1988. – 192 с.

24. Леонтович О.А. Введение в межкультурную коммуникацию : учеб. пособие / О.А. Леонтович. – М. : Гнозис, 2007. – 368 с.

25. Михалёва О.Л. Специфика манипулятивного воздействия / О.Л. Михалева. – М. : Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2009. – 256 с.

26. Паршина О.Н. Российская политическая речь: Теория и практика / О.Н. Паршина. – М. : Изд-во ЛКИ, 2007. – 232 с.

27. Потапенко С.І. Мовна особистість у просторі медійного дискурсу (досвід лінгвокогнітивного аналізу) : монографія / С.І. Потапенко. – К. : Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2004. – 360 с.

28. Почепцов Г.Г. Теория коммуникации / Г.Г. Почепцов. – М. : Центр, 1998. – 352 с.

29. Прохоров Ю.Е. Национальные социокультурные стереотипы речевого общения и их роль в обучении русскому языку иностранцев / Ю.Е. Прохоров. – М. : Комкнига, 2006. – 224 с.

30. Семенюк О.А. Основи теорії мовної комунікації : навч. посібник / О.А. Семенюк, В.Ю. Паращук. – К. : Академія, 2010. – 240 с.

31. Сентенберг И.В. Языковая личность в коммуникативно-деятельностном аспекте / И.В. Сентенберг // Языковая личность: проблемы значения и смысла : сб. науч. тр. / [под ред. И.В. Сентенберг, В.И. Карасика]. – Волгоград : Перемена, 1994. – С. 14–24.

32. Синиця І.А. Мовна особистість автора у науково-гуманітарному тексті ХІХ століття (комунікативний, культурологічний, образно-стилістичний аспекти) : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня доктора філол. наук : спец. 10.02.02 «Російська мова» / І.А. Синиця ; НАН України. Ін-т мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні. – К., 2007. – 36 с.

33. Снитко Е.С. Коммуникативная стратегия поощрения и речевые тактики ее реализации / Е.С. Снитко // Русистика. – Вып. 7. – К. : Киев. нац. ун-т, 2007. – С. 18–25.

34. Солощук Л.В. Вербальні та невербальні компоненти комунікації в англомовному дискурсі : монографія / Л.В. Солощук. – Харків : Константа, 2006. – 300 с.

35. Сусов И.П. Личность как субъект языкового общения / И.П. Сусов // Личностные аспекты языкового общения : межвузовский сборник научных трудов. – Калинин : КГУ, 1989. – С. 3–20.

36. Сухих С.А. Черты языковой личности / С.А. Сухих // Коммуникативно-функциональный аспект языковых единиц : сб. науч. трудов. – Тверь : Твер. гос. ун-т, 1993. – С. 85–91.

37. Тхорик В.И. Языковая личность в аспекте лингвокульторологических характеристик / В.И. Тхорик. – Краснодар : Кубан. гос. ун-т, 2000. – 196 с.

38. Фрумкина Р.М. Концептуальный анализ с точки зрения лингвиста и психолога / Р.М. Фрумкина // Научно-техническая информация. – Сер. 2. – 1992. – № 3. – С. 11–18.

39. Чудинов А.П. Политическая лингвистика / А.П. Чудинов. – М. : Флінта : Наука, 2006. – 256 с.

40. Шахнарович А.М. Языковая личность и языковая способность / А.М. Шахнарович // Язык – система. Язык – текст. Язык – способность : сб. статей. – М. : Ин-т русского языка РАН, 1995. – С. 211–223.

41. Шаховский В.И. Когнитивные ресурсы эмоциональной языковой личности / В.И. Шаховский // Языковая личность: проблемы когниции и коммуникации : сб. науч. тр. – Волгоград : Колледж, 2001. – С. 11–16.

42. Шевченко І.С. Когнітивно-прагматичні дослідження дискурсу / І.С. Шевченко // Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен : кол. монографія ; [під заг. ред. І.С. Шевченко]. – Харків : Константа, 2005. – С. 233–236.

43. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса / Е.И. Шейгал. – М. : ИТДК «Гнозис», 2004. – 326 с.

44. Chilton P. Discourse and Politics / P. Chilton, Ch. Schäffner // Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies : A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Vol. 2. [ed. by T.A. van Dijk]. – London, Thousands Oaks, New Delhi : SAGE Publications, 2003. – P. 206–230.]

45. Dijk T.A. van. The Study of Discourse / T.A. van Dijk // Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. – London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi. – 1997. – Vol. 1: Discourse as Structure and Process. – P. 1–34.

46. Galinfo [Electronic Resource]. – Mode of access: URL: http://galinfo.com.ua/news/portnykov_vystup_baydena_v_ukrainskomu_parlamenti__tse_urok_chesnosti_213765.html
47. Lakoff G. Metaphors We Live By / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson. – Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 2003. – 276 p.
48. Political Keywords: using language that uses us / [R.P. Hart, S.E. Javris, W.P. Jennings, D. Smith-Howell]. – New York, Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2005. – 279 p.
49. The White House. Office of the Vice President [Electronic Resource]. – Mode of access: URL: https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada.html
50. Wikisource [Electronic Resource]. – Mode of access: URL: https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech.

REFERENCES

Alefirenko, N.F. (2006). Tekst i diskurs v fokuse jazykovoj lichnosti [Text and Discourse in the focus of the language person] Proceedings from Mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii: *Jazykovaja lichnost' – tekst – diskurs: teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty issledovanija*. Ch. 1, – Proceedings from the International scientific conference: *Linguistic personality – text – discourse: theoretical and applied aspects of research*. Part 1. Samara: SSU, 6-10 (in Russian)

Arutyunova, N.D. (1999). *Yazyk i mir cheloveka. [Language and the world of man]*.Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kultury.

Babushkin, A.P. (1996). *Tipy kontseptov v leksiko-frazeologicheskoy semantike yazyka. [Types of concepts in lexical and phraseological semantics of the language]*.Voronezh: VGU.

Baranov, A.N. (2004). *Predislovie redaktora*. [Editor's preface] *Metafory, kotorymi my zhivem*. –Metaphors we live by Transl.; Moscow: Yeditorial URSS, 7-21. (in Russian).

Bakhtin, M.M. (2000). *Problemy rechevykh zhanrov* [Problems of speech genres] *Avtor i geroy: k filosofskim osnovam gumanitarnykh nauk]. – Author and hero: the philosophical foundations of the humanities*. SPb.: Azbuka.

Batsevich, F. (2005). *Lingvistichna genologiya: problemi i perspektivi. Linguistic genology: problems and perspectives*. Lviv : PAIS.

Bogin, G.I. (1984). *Model' jazykovoj lichnosti i ejo otnoshenie k raznovidnostjam tekstov: avtoreferat diss d-ra filol. nauk: model of linguistic personality and its relation to varieties of texts*. Leningrad: LSU (in Russian).

Boldyrev, N.N. (2000). *Kognitivnaya semantika: kurs lektsiy po angliyskoy filologii. Cognitive semantics: a course of lectures in English philology*. Tambov: TSU.

Chilton, P., & Schäffner, Ch. (2003). *Discourse and Politics. Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies*. In: T.A. van Dijk (Ed.). London, Thousands Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Chudinov, A.P. (2006). *Politicheskaya lingvistika. [Political linguistics]*. M. : Flinta: Nauka.

Dijk, T.A. van. (1997). *The Study of Discourse. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London, Thousands Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Donets, P.N. (2001). *Osnovy obshchey teorii mezhkulturnoy kommunikatsii: nauchnyy status, ponyatiynyy apparat, yazykovoy i neyazykovoy, voprosy etiki i didaktiki.* [*The general theory of intercultural communication: the scientific status, conceptual apparatus, linguistic and non-linguistic, ethics and didactics].* Kharkov: Shtrikh.

Grishaeva, L.I. (2007). *Osobennosti ispolzovaniya yazyka i kulturnaya identichnost kommunikantov. [Specific language use and cultural personality of communicators].* Voronezh: VGU.

Hart, R.P., Javris, S. E., Jennings, W.P., & Smith-Howell, D. (2005). *Political Keywords*: *using language that uses us.* New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press,.

Frumkina, R.M. (1992). Kontseptualnyy analiz s tochki zreniya lingvista i psikhologa [Concept analysis from the linguist and psychologist point of view]. *Nauchno-tekhnicheskaya informatsiya. – Scientific-and-technical information, 2* (3), 11-18 (in Russian).

Ivantsova, Ye.V. (2008). Problemy formirovaniya metodologicheskikh osnov lingvopersonologii. [Problems of forming methodological foundations for linguistic personology]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo un-ta. Seriya: Filologiya. Tomsk state university messemger. Series Philology. Tomsk: TGU, 3* (4.), 27-41.

Issers, O.S. (2006). *Kommunikativnye strategii i taktiki russkoy rechi. Communicative strategy and tactics of the Russian speech.* M.: KomKniga.

Karasik, V.I. (2001). Aspekty yazykovoy lichnosti. [Aspects of the linguistic personality]. In: *Yazykovaya lichnost: problemy kognitsii. – Linguistic personality: problems of cognition* (pp. 172-183). Volgograd: Kolledzh,.

Karaulov, Yu.N. (1987). *Russkiy yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost. Russian language and linguistic personality.* M. : Nauka.

Kochetkova, T.V. (1999). *Yazykovaya lichnost nositelya elitarnoy rechevoy kultury. Diss. dokt. filol. nauk. [Linguistic personality of a carrier of elite speech culture. Dr. philol. sci. diss].* Saratov. (in Russian).

Krysin, L.P. (1976). Rechevoe obshchenie i sotsialnye roli govoryashchikh.[Speech communication and social role of speakers]. *Sotsiolingvisticheskie issledovaniya. – Sociolinguistic studies.* Moscow: Nauka.

Kubryakova, Ye.S. (2004). Ob ustanovkakh kognitivnoy nauki i aktualnykh problemakh kognitivnoy lingvistiki [On cognitive science and actual problems of cognitive linguistics]. *Izvestiya Acadrmii Nauk. Seriya literatury i yazyka. Messenger of the Academy of Sciences. Literature and Language Series. 63* (3), 3–12 (in Russian).

Kuharenko, V.A. (1988). *Interpretacija teksta. [Text interpretation].* M. : Prosveshhenie.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leontovich, O.A. (2007). *Vvedenie v mezhkulturnuyu kommunikatsiyu [Introduction to Intercultural Communication].* M. : Gnozis.

Mikhaleva, O.L. (2009). *Spetsifika manipulyativnogo vozdeystviya. Specific manipulative influence.* M.: Knizhnyy dom "LIBROKOM".

Parshina, O.N. (2007). *Rossiyskaya politicheskaya rech: Teoriya i praktika. Russian political speech: Theory and Practice.* M.: LKI.

Pocheptsov, G.G. (1998). *Teoriya kommunikatsii [Communication theory].* Moscow: Tsentr.

Potapenko, S.I. (2004). *Movna osobystist` u prostori medijnogo dyskursu (dosvid lingvokognityvnogo analizu) [Linguistic personality in the sphere of media discourse (a linguocognitive study)]*. Kyiv: KNLU.

Prokhorov, Yu.Ye. (2006). *Natsionalnye sotsiokulturnye stereotipy rechevogo obshcheniya i ikh rol v obuchenii russkomu yazyku inostrantsev. [National socio-cultural stereotypes of verbal communication and their role in teaching Russian language for foreigners].* Moscow: Komkniga.

Semenyuk, O.A. (2010). *Osnovy teoriyi movnoyi komunikaciyi. [Basics of the theory of speech communication].* Kyiv: Akademiya.

Sentenberg, I.V. (1994). *Yazykovaya lichnost v kommunikativno-deyatelnostnom aspekte* [Linguistic personality in communicative-activity aspect]. In: I.V. Sentenberg, & V.I. Karasik (Eds.). *Yazykovaya lichnost: problemy znacheniya i smysla. – Linguistic personality: problems of meaning and sense*. Volgograd: Peremena.

Synycya, I.A. (2007). *Movna osobystist` avtora u naukovo-gumanitarnomu teksti XIX stolittya (komunikatyvnyj, kulturologichnyj, obrazno-stylistychnyj aspekty). Diss. dokt. filol. nauk [Linguistic personality of the author in the humanitarian research text of the 20th century (communicative, culturological, image-stylistic aspects. Dr. philol. sci. diss.].* Kyiv. (in Ukrainian).

Snitko, Ye.S. (2007). Kommunikativnaya strategiya pooshchreniya i rechevye taktiki ee realizatsii. [Communication Strategy of promotion and verbal tactics of its realization]. *Rusistika. – Russian studies. Kyiv: KNU, 7,* 18-25 (in Russian).

Soloshhuk, L.V. (2006). *Verbalni ta neverbalni komponenty komunikaciyi v anglomovnomu dyskursi [Verbal and non-verbal communiocation components in the English language discourse].* Kharkiv: Konstanta.

Susov, I.P. (1989). *Lichnost kak subekt yazykovogo obshcheniya.* [Personality as a subject of linguistic communication]. *Lichnostnye aspekty yazykovogo obshcheniya. – Personal aspects of linguistic communication.* Kalinin: KGU.

Sukhikh, S.A. (1993). Cherty yazykovoy lichnosti [language personality traits]. *Kommunikativno-funktsionalnyy aspekt yazykovykh jedinits. – Communicative-functional aspect of linguistic units.* Tver: TGU.

Shakhnarovich, A.M. (1995). Yazykovaya lichnost i yazykovaya sposobnost. [Linguistic personality and lainguiistic ability] *Yazyk – sistema. Yazyk – tekst. Yazyk – sposobnost. – Language – system. Language – text. Language – abilities.* Moscow: In-t Russkogo Yazyka RAN.

Shakhovskiy, V.I. (2001). *Kognitivnye resursy emotsionalnoy yazykovoy lichnosti* [Cognitive resources of the emotive linguistic personality]. *Yazykovaya lichnost: problemy kognitsii i kommunikatsii. – Linguistic personality: problems of cognition and communication.* Volgograd: Kolledzh.

Shevchenko, I.S. (2005). Kognityvno-pragmatychni doslidzhennya dyskursu. [Cognitive-pragmatic studies of discourse]. *Dyskurs yak kognityvno-komunikatyvnyj fenomen. – Discourse as a cognitive-communicative phenomenon.* Kharkiv: Konstanta.

Sheygal, Ye.I. (2004). *Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa. [Semiotics of political discourse].* M.: ITDK "Gnozis".

The White House. Office of the Vice President [Electronic Resource]. – Available from: https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/09/remarks-vice-president-joe-biden-ukrainian-rada.html

Tkhorik, V.I. (2000). *Yazykovaya lichnost v aspekte lingvokultorologicheskikh kharakteristik.* [*Linguistic personality in terms of linguocultural characteristics].* Krasnodar: KGU.

Vezhbitskaya, A. (1997). *Yazyk. Kultura. Poznani.* [Language. Culture. Knowledge] Moscow: Russkie slovari.

Vodak, R. (1997). Yazyk. Diskurs. Politika. [Language. Discourse. Politics] Volgograd: Peremena.

Vorkachev, S.G. (2000). *Sopostavitelnoe opisanie yazykovykh lichnostey* (na materiale nemetskoy i russkoy frazeologii). [Comparative description of linguistic personality (based on German and Russian phraseology)]. *Lingvisticheskie paradigmy: traditsii i novatsii. – Linguistic paradigms: traditions and innovations.* Volgograd: Peremena.

Vorobjev, V.V. (2008). *Lingvokulturologiya. Linguistic culturology.* M.: RUDN.

Wikisource [Electronic Resource]. – Available from: https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech.

Zhabotinskaya, S.A. (1999). Kontseptualnyy analiz: tipy freymov. [Conceptual analysis: the types of frames] *Visnik Cherkaskogo universitetu im. B. Khmelnitskogo. Ser. Filol. nauki. – B. Khmelnitsky Cherkassy University Messenger. 11,* 12-25.

Slavova Lyudmyla Leonardivna – Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Dept. of Theory and Practice of Translation from English (14, Taras Shevchenko Blvd., Kyiv, Ukraine, 01601); e-mail: slavova_l@mail.ru