Linguistic Dimension of Political Advertising: Analysis of Linguistic Means of Manipulative Influence

Olena Kuzmenko[1], Olha Kyryliuk[2], Tetiana Bublyk[3], Yuliya Boyko[4], & Vira Ruban[5]

[1] Ph.D, Assistant Professor of the Department of Cross-Cultural Communication and Foreign Language Education Zhytomyr State University named after Ivan Franko, Department of Cross-Cultural Communication and Foreign Language Education, 40, Velyka Berdychivska Str., Zhytomyr, 10008, Ukraine

[2] Ph.D., Associate Professor of Ukrainian Language and Journalism Department, Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State Pedagogical University, Shevchenka Street, 1, Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine

[3] PhD in Philology, senior lecturer Department English Philology Faculty of Foreign Languages Ivan Franko National University of Lviv University Street, 1, Lviv, Lviv region, 79000, Ukraine

[4] Doctor of Philological Sciences, docent Head of Department of Germanic Languages and Law, Faculty of International Relations and Law Khmelnitsky National University Instituts'ka Str., 7/1, Khmelnitsky, 29016, Ukraine

[5] PhD, Head of the Department of Romance Languages Faculty of Romance Philology and Translation Kyiv National Linguistic University, 73, Velyka Vasylkivska street Kyiv-150, 03150, Ukraine

Correspondence: Olena Kuzmenko, Ph.D, Assistant Professor of the Department of Cross-Cultural Communication and Foreign Language Education Zhytomyr State University named after Ivan Franko, Department of Cross-Cultural Communication and Foreign Language Education, 40, Velyka Berdychivska Str., Zhytomyr, 10008, Ukraine.

Abstract

The manipulative influence of speech is a constant subject of debate. Advertising as a reflection of social reality has manipulative potential. Studies of the linguistic means that form and enable the manipulative slogans of political advertising are studied in terms of sociolinguistics, language dynamics of political discourse, and in most scientific sources are revealed as a new conscious manifestation of the desire to influence the masses. Manipulative discourse is considered in the strategic field of didactics of language and culture. Political advertising is capable of generating a huge stream of individual and collective reflections that touch upon the most basic human features of linguodidactics. Not only is the contrast between "language" (bearing, reassuring, essential) and "manipulative" (obscure, threatening, dangerous) stark, but their juxtaposition is neither more nor less unnatural. The main purpose of political discourse is to promote understanding, communication, and dialogue between cultures and to have a manipulative effect. So, the main question is whether argumentation should be considered in the analysis of the manipulative influence of political advertising discourse. Subsequent directions of consideration of the concept are determined by the possibility of using the proposed model in the study of political speeches on the material of other languages. In further scientific searches, we will focus on other theoretical studios of discourse, focusing on those of that are aimed, among other things, at the analysis of political discourse, in particular, the most significant factors determining its essence, peculiarities of construction, and development in those or other socio-cultural conditions.

Keywords: advertising, slogan, linguistic sociality, political discourse, argumentation

1. Introduction

The development of modern society is an axiological and rapid process, and language is transforming along with these significant changes. Moreover, language is a key component in this process. The activity of mankind in all its manifestations, all social events highlighted in history are reflected in language. That is why, in modern linguistics, formal and structural analysis of language, all aspects of semantic and pragmatic, which realizes language in discourse, clearly hold their positions. The core in the study of language and the eternal source for scientific research is the means of communication, in particular political discourse. The study of political discourse directly raises the question of the relationship between language and politics. This linguistic aspect reveals linguistic usus as a manipulative tool, and the main object of political discourse in this context is argumentation. Argumentation, influence, and manipulation of language are an object of constant debate among linguists since power is the ultimate, desired motive of socio-political discourse.

1.1 Ideology of Political Discourse

Argumentation of political discourse and its ideology are integral components of language as a reflection of the activity of any society. None of these components exist outside the human community. Politics, as a representative of the totality of ideas, goals, and objectives of social classes, is not only the accumulation of thought material but also influences society in every possible way, accelerates or inhibits

its genesis. Politics as a social phenomenon is inseparable in the life process of human activity. Accordingly, all these processes are reflected in the language. Language and politics are complex and interdependent, so they can't be separated.

1.2 Specifics of the Study of Political Discourse and Manipulative Influence of Political Advertising (Speeches, Speeches, Campaigns)

The relevance of the study of the discourse of political advertising, which includes speeches, social commercials, political campaigns, lies in the specificity of the studied object since the question of scientific justification of the phenomenon of political discourse is still open and there is no methodological coherence among representatives of different schools of linguistics. The interest in political discourse is shown by representatives of different branches and directions.

The work aims to establish the peculiarities of the political advertising discourse with the elucidation of the lexico-semantic specificity. The task lies in accomplishing the following steps: analysis of the phenomenon of argumentation in various scientific searches; revealing the concepts of argumentative discourse, political manipulation; description of types of argumentation; analysis of the structure of language means, argumentative influences in political advertising; analysis of political discourse on the examples of French political figures' speeches

The object of this scientific exploration is the manipulative influence and argumentation of political speeches, that is, political discourse.

The scientific feasibility of this exploration is that the analyzed political discourse of French politicians is grounded in a wide range of theoretical issues and considered in the perspective of cognitive science and receptive mechanisms of perception of manipulation and argumentation.

Practical value - the proposed model in the study of political speeches can be used with other languages, in addition, the results of the study would be appropriate for lectures, seminars, and the following courses: communication theory; theory of speech activity, theory of speech influence, rhetoric, pragmatics, in the practical classes in French, stylistics, and linguistics.

1.3 Pragmatic Objectives of Political Discourse and Argumentation

The methodology of discourse research is quite varied. This phenomenon is characterized by unambiguity and specificity of interpretation, as it is used differently in different scientific currents. A rather fuzzy and contradictory view of the phenomenon of discourse is often the result of empirical polemics. Therefore, in the context of interpretation and methodology, we can talk about a large definition. Of course, this is associated not only with the interdisciplinary nature of the concept of discourse but also with its deep, multifaceted nature.

Linguistic classics in the perspective of the theory of political discourse are the works of T. van Dyk (Van Dyk, 2022). For political discourse, achieving a perlocutionary effect, namely, to influence the audience, to achieve its public response is the main goal. The main feature of the communication process in politics is its focus on the recipient to manipulate. Usually, the subjects and objects of political discourse perceive and respond to the clear socio-political positions of the politician, and the process of manipulation itself has clear pragmatic goals, that is, the discourse is intentional, or rather argumentative. Argumentation to manipulate the masses needs a careful selection and organization of linguistic means. It is a question of all levels of speech. Politicians use: political speeches, political advertising, slogans, slogans, social commercials to achieve their perlocutionary goal.

2. Evolution of the Analysis of the Manipulative Influence of Political Discourse

When studying the evolution of the analysis of the manipulative influence of political discourse conducted in the field of linguistic and communication sciences, it is necessary to realize that the study of linguistic means of manipulative influence does not occupy a central place, the main attention of scientists is focused on argumentation.

This state of affairs is explained by various reasons, the first of which stems from the state of the field: linguistics began to pay much attention to theories of rhetorical argumentation (as opposed to linguistic manipulation, which is closer to psycholinguistics). The theory of argumentation, though belatedly, penetrated into the analysis of discourse. But political discourse is a separate issue. Macagno (2022) analyzes slogans as words and minds and addresses the issues of feelings and manipulation. A more radical take on the issue is that of (Ferrara, Chang, Chen, Muric, & Patel, 2020), who denounce the power of the word and attribute its authority solely to institutional legitimacy. Despite the diverse points of view, during the last three decades, fruitful work has been done that, in different ways, returns to the question of argumentation, paving the way for more systematic research efforts.

First of all, it is important to define the meaning and perception of the concept of argumentation as well as the concept of political discourse. For (Kakisina, Indhiarti, & Al Fajri, 2022), as well as for many other researchers, political discourse is what politicians engage in while performing their functions. This is a focused and limited definition, which is contrasted with the broader and somewhat vague definition (Shkvorchenko, 2020) that political discourse is any statement that involves judgments about the organization of a society. Thus, the definition of political discourse ranges from the professional speech of politicians to speech in general, that concerns public affairs in public space through advertisements, social videos, and political campaigns (Charteris-Black, 2018). It is in this perspective that various works have been examined, exploring a variety of situations, ranging from the speaker's speech in front of an audience, from parliamentary or television debates, and from political journalism to social media sharing (Azoulay, 2018).

Regarding argumentation, it can be defined as sequential reasoning that leads to a conclusion by deduction or induction, as a logic of meanings and preferences inscribed in verbal means aimed at making the audience adhere to the thesis and at manipulating the audience

(Moten, 2020). In turn, (Blommaert, 2020) perceives the argumentation of political discourse as a discursive functioning that guides ways of thinking and seeing. In the first case, it is believed that only arguments and argumentative sequences belonging to a formal "theoretical" conception of reason should be taken into account. In the second case, a set of reciprocal influences is thought to take place in a verbal exchange that seeks agreement on what is reasonable; this play of influences is located in the discursive spaces of "practical reason". In the third possibility, the argument runs through the whole discourse in a way that ranges from polemic to manipulation. We support an inclusive conception that takes into account the practical reasons that guide political evaluation, decision-making, and action, that includes indirect methods of argumentation and gives equal importance to logos, pathos, and ethos. Political argumentation derives not only from the search for consensus since the purpose of argumentation is manipulation but also from the management of differences, which are at the heart of political life.

Among the works focusing on the argumentation of political advertising discourse, we can mention Terry (2019), who proposes the concept of political rhetoric, and studies based on new rhetoric the types of arguments (connection, dissociation, metaphor, etc.) used in the political field. (Talbi, 2019) explores the arguments of reason, combining causality theory and rhetoric to shed light on the "convenience bias". According to scientist, political authorities attribute their successes to rewards for internal causes, their failures to external causes. (Musi, & Aakhus, 2018), analyze peripheral argumentation or a set of linguistic means and discursive procedures that relate to political polemics by listing different types of political arguments - weathervane argument, Tartuffe argument, straw man argument, etc. (Ilie, 2021) makes a list of argumentative "fallacies" that indicate political bad faith, thus restarting the question of paralogisms and informal logic from a different angle.

2.1 Research Hypothesis and Methodology

Thus, this study hypothesizes that the analysis of the manipulative influence of political advertising discourse is impossible without taking into account the argumentation. The methodological basis is the following methods and techniques of linguistic analysis: discourse analysis, descriptive, contextual, distributive analysis, as well as descriptive-comparative, semantic-structural, structural-stylistic methods. The limitations of this paper are primarily manifested in the narrowness of the speech range of examples of politicians' speeches and their number. In addition, in the limitation of approaches to the definition of political discourse, which focus on its unequal elements: the word - as a political concept; the text - as a product of political communication; political discourse - as a worldview plane of its functioning.

3. Emotional Argumentation of Political Discourse (Speeches, Political Campaigns)

Emotional arguments appeal to the emotions and underlying motivations of the target audience. Emotional arguments appeal to feelings and sensibilities. Emotionally written speech elicits a lively reaction from the audience. Arguments of this type encompass different levels of language.

3.1 Semantic Strategies for Framing Political Discourse

At the level of style, the following semantic strategies are traditionally analyzed:

1) *Softenings* - Related to the familiarization strategy, designed to demonstrate understanding and patience, and serve to invalidate assessments or generalizations that cannot be justified. Softeners are used to block certain negative conclusions. For example:

Chers amis, chers camarades,

Merci d'abord pour **le bonheur** de votre présence.

Merci aux organisateurs de cette soirée, Eugène Caselli et Patrick Menucci, les artisans inlassables d'un soutien des premiers jours qui n'a jamais manqué

Merci pour la présence de nombreux élus d'ici, de ce département, et d'ailleurs, que je reconnais dans la salle [Ségolène Royal, Déclaration de candidature PS à Vitrolles (29/09/06)];

Monsieur le Président, Cher André DAGUIN,

Mesdames, Messieurs,

Mes chers amis,

Je veux vous dire tout d'abord **ma très grande joie d'être avec vous**, ici, à Marseille, dans cette ville à nulle autre pareille, colorée et chaleureuse. Chaque fois, à Marseille, c'est la même émotion pour moi et le même plaisir. Synthèse vivante de plusieurs mondes, Marseille c'est tout à la fois : une magnifique ville française, une ville de fierté, une ville de diversité et - qui pourrait en douter à quelques pas du stade vélodrome - une ville de passion. Pour le candidat à l'élection présidentielle de 2007 que je suis désormais, voilà de beaux symboles [Nicolas Sarkozy, Congrès de l'Union des Métiers et des Industries de l'Hôtellerie (01/12/06)].

2) Repetition has the same function as reinforcement, because it attracts attention, structures information, and emphasizes subjective evaluations:

Nous croyons, nous socialistes, que la globalisation financière appelle le renforcement de l'État : c'est la droite qui fait le choix de son désengagement et de la paupérisation des services publics.

Nous croyons, nous socialistes, que l'angoisse du lendemain et la précarité ne sont pas une fatalité : c'est la droite qui, par ses choix, fabrique de l'insécurité sociale.

Nous croyons, nous socialistes, que la société de la méfiance, des ghettos et des communautés rivales n'est pas une fatalité : c'est la droite qui affaiblit la République et porte atteinte au pacte social et à la laïcité

Nous croyons, nous socialistes, que l'arrogance de gouvernement, le mensonge d'État et le mépris des citoyens ne sont pas une fatalité : c'est la droite qui fait le choix de l'autoritarisme, de la confusion et de l'irresponsabilité des pouvoirs, attisant la crise démocratique [Ségolène Royal, Profession de foi PS (11/10/06)].

Droit d'être informé immédiatement que son enfant manque à l'appel.

Droit d'être alerté aussi vite que possible que son enfant décroche du reste de la classe, et non pas à la fin du trimestre comme c'est trop souvent le cas.

Droit d'être reçu par les enseignants et par le chef d'établissement.

Droit de connaître les performances de l'établissement et celles de son enfant par rapport au reste de la classe [Nicolas Sarkozy, Discours à Angers (01/12/06)].

3) Evaluative words, that is, words or phrases that carry an evaluative semantic load.

Mais, à l'Est de l'Europe, la perspective de rentrer dans l'Union européenne a joué un rôle décisif pour apaiser les vieilles haines nationales, toujours promptes à se réveiller, comme l'a montré le contre-exemple yougoslave. Aujourd'hui, on le voit au Liban, le monde a besoin de l'Europe, seule puissance pacifique capable de représenter une alternative à l'hyper puissance américaine

[Ségolène Royal, Conférence de presse "L"Europe par la preuve" (11/10/06)].

Je n'ai aucun doute sur le fait qu'Internet est devenu un instrument du débat politique, et un instrument important. Ça ne me donne pas pour autant le titre d'expert de l'Internet. Les spécialistes, c'est vous. Le politique, c'est moi [Nicolas Sarkozy, Discours au Web 3 (12/12/06)].

3.2 Implementation of Semantic Strategies of Political Discourse

At the level of local semantics, strategies are implemented, for example, using:

1. Explicit objection, which involves the use of missing positive evidence to justify one's view of a disputed case or issue.

Puis, le pacte de la réussite éducative, c'est refuser que la vie d'un adolescent soit déterminée à quatorze ans dans l'apprentissage. Ce que je veux, c'est insérer l'apprentissage dans le parcours scolaire, c'est initier tous les collégiens au travail manuel et à toutes les formes d'intelligence. Je crois, oui, que toutes les formes d'intelligence conceptuelle, concrète, sensible, manuelle s'imbriquent et se nourrissent l'une de l'autre. Ce que je veux, c'est repenser les mécanismes d'orientation dans ce qu'ils peuvent d'avoir d'irréversible et de brutal [Ségolène Royal, Discours à Dunkerque (15/02/07)].

Ceux qui donnent aux autres des leçons de morale qu'ils ne s'appliquent jamais à eux-mêmes. Ceux-là ne rendent service ni à la République ni à la démocratie [Nicolas Sarkozy, Discours au Futuroscope à Poitiers (26/01/07)].

2. Explicit concessions: "Our" negative actions are justified; their positive actions are not so positive:

Si je dis cela, ce n'est pas pour tomber dans je ne sais quelle polémique dont les Français sont fatigués, mais c'est parce que je crois que la morale politique, à un moment, c'est de savoir rendre compte sur ses actes. Et comme c'est très difficile pour le candidat de la droite sortante de rentre des comptes sur ses actes, alors il préfère fuir, s'échapper, s'évaporer du gouvernement, tout en gardant tous les avantages de l'appareil de l'État [Ségolène Royal, Discours à Rennes (20/02/07)];

Nous pouvons être fiers de la France. Elle a parfois commis des fautes mais elle n'a jamais renoncé, elle n'a jamais cédé au totalitarisme et elle a fait plus que toute autre nation pour la liberté et la dignité de tous les hommes [Nicolas Sarkozy, Discours à Perpignan (23/02/07)].

3. Transference, when a negative experience from one cognitive area is transferred to the experience of another cognitive area.

Je ne veux plus qu'on entende parler pour les jeunes Français de première, de deuxième génération, de troisième alors qu'on ne le fait jamais pour les jeunes issus des pays européens. Nous sommes tous ensemble dans la République qui nous rassemble, et nous devons accorder à chaque enfant le pouvoir de réussir dans les mêmes conditions à l'école [Ségolène Royal, Discours à Rouen (24/02/07)];

Roger Salengro fait honneur à la ville de Lille, à la région Nord-Pas-De-Calais et à la République française. Ce qui m'intéresse chez lui, ce n'est pas qu'il fut ministre socialiste, mais un serviteur de l'État Français injustement calomnié Il fait partie de notre Panthéon des grands hommes. Voilà la différence entre une gauche sectaire et une droite qui rassemble [Nicolas Sarkozy, Discours à Lille (28/03/07)].

Vocabulary for building arguments is key. This linguistic tool uses the possibility of political manipulation and is an informative implicator. The argumentation with the help of vocabulary, stylistic means such as metaphor, simile, figurative expression, etc. enables the manipulative potential of the speech.

Pronouns play an important role in building a truly argumentative political discourse. Politicians use pronouns to create a connection with the audience.

*J'ai besoin de **vous**, de **vos** intelligences, de **vos** exigences, de **vos** générosités pour construire une France qui se ressemble et qui se rassemble. Avec moi, plus jamais la politique ne se fera sans **vous** !* [Ségolène Royal, Discours à Villepinte (11/02/07)];

*Ces dernières années, j'ai eu de très nombreuses occasions de parcourir le monde. Au cours de tous ces déplacements, **j'ai** évalué l'influence de mon pays, **j'ai** mesuré bien des rapports de force, **j'ai** sondé les espoirs de certains peuples et les désillusions de certains autres, **j'ai** vu les problèmes tels qu'ils se posent* [Nicolas Sarkozy, Conférence de presse sur la politique internationale (28/02/07)].

3.3 Linguistic Dimension of Manipulative Influence of Political Speeches

Keywords, with the help of which the speaker focuses the attention of listeners on certain concepts that are particularly important for the audience, are also a frequent phenomenon in the analyzed political speeches:

*Souvenons-nous de la colère de Mirabeau contre ceux qui ne respectaient pas le mot de **Peuple**, la substance même de la **République**, contre ceux qui le prononçaient avec mépris dans les chambres de l'aristocratie : lui, il voulait l'annoblir et le rendre cher au coeur de tous les Français* [Ségolène Royal, Discours à Paris à la Halle Carpentier (06/02/07)];

*Respecter la **démocratie**, respecter les **Français** c'est dire ce que l'on veut faire pour eux, pour leurs **enfants**, pour la **France**. C'est expliquer quelle vision on a de l'**avenir**, quelle **politique** on veut conduire, comment, par quels moyens on veut la mettre en oeuvre* [Nicolas Sarkozy, Discours au Futuroscope à Poitiers (26/01/07)].

Politicians often use certain stylistic devices in their speeches, such as *metaphors*:

*Aujourd'hui, voici venu le jour de vous dire comment j'entends répondre à ces crises qui minent notre société et qui instillent dans ses veines **le terrible poison du doute**, de la résignation et parfois de la colère, mais aussi comment permettre à la France de saisir toutes ses chances, et elles sont nombreuses, de libérer tous ses talents et toutes ses énergies* [Ségolène Royal, Discours à Villepinte (11/02/07)];

*Si certains veulent **tirer** la campagne **vers le caniveau**, je ne les suivrai pas* [Nicolas Sarkozy, Discours au Futuroscope à Poitiers (26/01/07)].

Comparison is also an effective lexical means to strengthen the argumentative power of a speech:

Nous vous avons tous écoutés, les plus vulnérables comme les plus forts, ceux qui ont parlé et ceux qui sont simplement venus assister et qui ont écrit après coup, ceux qui vont bien comme ceux qui décrochent ou qui ont peur de décrocher, ceux qui sont nos partisans depuis toujours et ceux qui ne le sont pas, mais qui ont tout simplement envie, profondément envie de changement et qui attendent désespérément une autre façon de voir les choses et une autre façon d'agir [Ségolène Royal, Discours à Rouen (24/02/07)];

Je revendique le droit de dire que je les admire et que pour moi, à leur manière, ce sont des résistants. Des résistants contre la disparition d'un type de civilisation et d'un type d'homme qui respectent le travail comme une condition de la liberté, qui pensent que l'honneur c'est toujours s'efforcer de faire le mieux possible ce qu'on a à faire, que la dignité c'est de ne rien devoir qu'à soi-même et que le premier devoir d'un homme c'est de transmettre ses valeurs à ses enfants [Nicolas Sarkozy, Discours à Villebon-sur-Yvette (20/03/07)].

Figurative statements are used to attract attention, for a more effective presentation of the idea:

Alors, il ne l'aimait pas, la France, Péguy qui disait : c'est parce que nous sommes bien français que les massacres coloniaux nous donnent comme un remord personnel ?

Alors, elle ne l'aimait pas, la France, Simone Weil, philosophe et Résistante, qui disait : l'amour de la patrie doit avoir les yeux ouverts sur les injustices, les cruautés, les mensonges, les crimes de notre passé, sans dissimulation ni réticence et sans en être diminué ?

Alors, il ne l'aimait pas, la France, Camus qui disait : il est bon qu'une nation soit assez forte de tradition et d'honneur pour trouver le courage de dénoncer ses propres erreurs ? Mais, ajoutait-il à juste titre, elle ne doit pas oublier les raisons qu'elle peut avoir de s'estimer elle-même [Ségolène Royal, Discours à Paris à la Halle Carpentier (06/02/07)];

Je me sens l'héritier de Jaurès quand il dit à la jeunesse : "le courage c'est de choisir un métier et de le bien faire quel qu'il soit (...). Le courage c'est de dominer ses propres fautes, d'en souffrir mais de ne pas en être accablé et de continuer son chemin (...). C'est de se donner aux grandes causes sans savoir quelle récompense réserve à notre effort l'univers profond [Nicolas Sarkozy, Discours à Saint-Quentin (25/01/07)].

Thus, the linguistic means of implementing emotional arguments are analyzed mainly at the level of style, semantics, and vocabulary. Taken together, they serve to strengthen the argumentativeness of a political speech.

4. Analysis of Manipulative Rhetoric in Linguistics

Among the works focusing on political rhetoric is (Gal, 2019), who identifies three arguments that have fueled reactionary discourse for two centuries in the arena of political debate: the argument of perverse effect (what should allow progress actually creates the opposite), futility (change is impossible), and threat (change threatens achievement). In this way, he defines the arguments that found "manipulative rhetoric," offering a model for a cross-sectional study of other political rhetoric (liberal, progressive, etc.). (Krzyżanowski, 2020) notes themes of discourse that are studied in the perspective of the long temporal axis and calls manipulative language means, fighting words

that are beyond logic enter into positions of infinite "dialogue of the deaf." (de Moraes, 2022) explores the sources of demagogic discourse through the "rhetoric of national-populism" that manipulates society by reducing uncertainty, accumulating simple assertions, and accumulating pseudo-evidence. (Khajavi, & Rasti, 2020) explore the specific modalities of the argumentative language tools of political journalism. A more sociological approach (Vaccari, & Chadwick, 2020) explores the manipulative impact of argumentation on the "average" citizen. The growing body of work on political advertising in cyberspace speaks to this. Criticism of civil society destabilizes the credibility of representative political institutions and challenges them. Thus, the Internet allows its Internet users, to interfere in the management of the ethos, to criticize the candidate, subjecting his discourse to criticism (Helberger, 2020). The author also sheds light on such a classic Perelmanian notion as a specific audience sheds light on issues of the illusion of intimacy (Macagno, 2022). Internet forums are becoming an alternative place for a critical clash of viewpoints, they are establishing a new kind of participatory democracy. So-called interactive monologues, in the absence of genuine listening and discussion, according to (Bradshaw, Howard, Kollanyi, & Neudert, 2020), show conversely that the Internet, advertising, and social videos promote great interactivity, preferring short exchanges and "gradual elaboration of argument and manipulation, refined and clarified in contact with other participants". (Fitzpatrick, 2018) identifies the linguistic features of such digital discourses (atomization, fragmentation, reframing, construction of the discursive ethos of Internet users, disguised pseudonyms, etc.). The rest of the analyzed works focus on the manipulative rhetoric of political actors. (Kilby, 2018) analyzes bullying weapons as a mixture of humor and aggressiveness in political discourse. In this context, it is worth noting (Davis, Love, & Killen, 2018), touching on the analysis of discursive materiality.

Different perspectives confirm that there is no consensus integrative conception of argumentation, much less of political manipulation. However, what unites the critical method-course of the various approaches is the linguistic means. In the course of this scholarly rose, the basic features of political discourse are identified. First of all, discourse is a communicative activity, a social phenomenon, a linguistic process that takes place in different forms, has different manifestations (oral, written), occurs within a certain stratum of society, has different strategies and tactics. Of course, discourse is impossible without a synthesis of cognitive, linguistic, and extra-linguistic (social, mental, psychological, etc.) factors. These are all individual and situational. Political speeches, in turn, are discourse that takes place in the social sphere, in politics proper: in government, during debates, in party programs, in politicians' speeches, etc. (Saul, 2018). So, political discourse is the discourse of politicians.

5. Conclusions

Political discourse is characterized by a high degree of argumentation to emphasize one's own points of view, to justify or refute facts, or to manipulate the audience (Valentino, Neuner, & Vandenbroek, 2018). The research conducted has shown that political speeches use a number of rational or psychological arguments because political speech texts are designed for public speeches and are designed to immediately capture the listener's attention and influence their minds, feelings, and emotions. This paper presents examples from the 2007 electoral speeches of Nicolas Sarkozy and Ségolène Royale. The analyzed texts of political speeches are saturated with logical arguments, including logical proofs, enumerations, reasoning with reliance on factual-statistics, and informative, with reference to authorities, etc. The investigated political speeches methodically use linguistic and stylistic means, which are characterized by great argumentative potential. Having analyzed the speeches of Nicolas Sarkozy and Ségolène Royale, we concluded that for manipulative effect and in order to influence the public, politicians use different means of argumentation. Thus, we showed through examples that argumentation and manipulation are realized in the context of different linguistic means. The results of the search showed the following argumentation tactics present in political speeches: 1) the use of rational arguments (appeal to authority, emphasis on obviousness and media publicized facts, appeal to traditional values, oppositionist slogans, self-justification, discrediting appeals to the opponent); 2) stylistic (mitigation, repetition); 3) semantic (explicit denial, explicit concession, transference) and 4) lexical. By analyzing the speeches, it is possible to determine the position of the politician, identify the methods of manipulation on the listeners, and to reveal the structure of the argumentation of the discourse itself, which influences the consciousness of the audience in a certain way.

Acknowledgements

References

Azoulay, V. (2018). *Xenophon and the Graces of Power: A Greek Guide to Political Manipulation*. ISD LLC. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvb93879

Blommaert, J. (2020). Political discourse in post-digital societies. *Trabalhos em Linguística Aplicada*, *59*, 390-403. https://doi.org/10.1590/01031813684701620200408

Bradshaw, S., Howard, P. N., Kollanyi, B., & Neudert, L. M. (2020). Sourcing and automation of political news and information over social media in the United States, 2016-2018. *Political Communication*, *37*(2), 173-193. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2019.1663322

Charteris-Black, J. (2018). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Bloomsbury Publishing. Retrieved from https://www.perlego.com/book/2996564/analysing-political-speeches-rhetoric-discourse-and-metaphor-pdf

Davis, J. L., Love, T. P., & Killen, G. (2018). Seriously funny: The political work of humor on social media. *New Media & Society*, *20*(10), 3898-3916. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12842

de Moraes, R. F. (2022). Demagoguery, populism, and foreign policy rhetoric: evidence from Jair Bolsonaro's tweets. *Contemporary Politics*, 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2022.2126155

Ferrara, E., Chang, H., Chen, E., Muric, G., & Patel, J. (2020). Characterizing social media manipulation in the 2020 US presidential election. *First Monday*. https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v25i11.11431

Fitzpatrick, N. (2018). *Media manipulation 2.0: the impact of social media on news, competition, and accuracy.* https://doi.org/10.30958/ajmmc.4.1.3

Gal, S. (2019). Making registers in politics: Circulation and ideologies of linguistic authority. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *23*(5), 450-466. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12374

Helberger, N. (2020). The political power of platforms: How current attempts to regulate misinformation amplify opinion power. *Digital Journalism*, *8*(6), 842-854. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2020.1773888

Ilie, C. (2021). Discussion, dispute or controversy? Paradigms of conflict-driven parliamentary practices. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, *9*(2), 237-270. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.00047.ili

Kakisina, P. A., Indhiarti, T. R., & Al Fajri, M. S. (2022). Discursive Strategies of Manipulation in COVID-19 Political Discourse: The Case of Donald Trump and Jair Bolsonaro. *SAGE Open*, *12*(1), 21582440221079884. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221079

Khajavi, Y., & Rasti, A. (2020). A discourse analytic investigation into politicians' use of rhetorical and persuasive strategies: The case of US election speeches. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *7*(1), 1740051. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1740051

Kilby, A. (2018). Provoking the citizen: Re-examining the role of TV satire in the Trump era. *Journalism Studies*, *19*(13), 1934-1944. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2018.1495573

Krzyżanowski, M. (2020). Discursive shifts and the normalisation of racism: Imaginaries of immigration, moral panics and the discourse of contemporary right-wing populism. *Social Semiotics*, *30*(4), 503-527. https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2020.1766199

Macagno, F. (2022). Argumentation profiles and the manipulation of common ground. The arguments of populist leaders on Twitter. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *191*, 67-82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.01.022

Moten, A. R. (2020). The politics of manipulation: Malaysia 2018-2020. *Intellectual Discourse*, *28*(2), 387-408. http://journals.iium.edu.my/intdiscourse/index.php/islam

Musi, E., & Aakhus, M. (2018). Discovering argumentative patterns in energy polylogues: A macroscope for argument mining. *Argumentation*, *32*(3), 397-430. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-017-9441-y

Saul, J. (2018). Dogwhistles, political manipulation, and philosophy of language. *New work on speech acts*, *360*, 84. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198738831.003.0013

Shkvorchenko, N. (2020). Linguistic and gender peculiarities of english political discourse. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Seria Ştiinţe Filologice. Lingvistică*, (1-2), 398-416. Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=975118

Talbi, C. (2019). *L'argumentation et l'analyse du discours politique français dans les débats présidentiels-le cas du débat présidentiel de l'entre-deux-tours de 2012*. https://doi.org/10.53418/1726-016-004-016

Terry, A. (2019). Fanny Domenec, Catherine Resche (dir.), La Fonction argumentative de la métaphore dans les discours spécialisés. https://doi.org/10.4000/asp.5662

Vaccari, C., & Chadwick, A. (2020). Deepfakes and disinformation: Exploring the impact of synthetic political video on deception, uncertainty, and trust in news. *Social Media+ Society*, *6*(1), 2056305120903408. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120903

Valentino, N. A., Neuner, F. G., & Vandenbroek, L. M. (2018). The changing norms of racial political rhetoric and the end of racial priming. *The Journal of Politics*, *80*(3), 757-771. https://doi.org/10.1086/694845

Van Dyk, S. (2022). Post-truth, the future of democracy and the public sphere. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *39*(4), 37-50. https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764221103514

Copyrights