

УДК 811.112

## PRAGMATIC VIEW ON FEMININE POLITICAL RHETORIC

**ANNA LYASHUK (Kirovohrad, Ukraine)**

*Стаття присвячена прагмо-риторичному аналізу лінгвістичних засобів найчастіше асоційованих з чоловічою риторичною практикою (конфронтація, агресивність та владність), яким Хіларі Родем Клінтон кидає виклик, успішно розширюючи можливості жінок у політичній риториці.*

*Ключові слова: політична риторика, риторичний засіб, мовний засіб, повтор, правило трьох.*

*The paper focuses on pragma-rhetoric analysis of the linguistic features most often associated with masculine rhetorical practices (confrontation, aggressiveness, and authority) which Hillary Rodham Clinton challenges, successfully empowering a woman's position in political rhetoric.*

*Key words: political rhetoric, rhetoric device, linguistic means, repetition, List of Three.*

The aim of this paper is to propose a pragmatic view in socio-political feminine rhetoric analysis, chaining both disciplines in order to explicate the deliberate phenomena that come about in most communicative uses of language, namely, for the persuasive purpose. The topic is motivated by the growing interest for research on political rhetoric and mainly focusing on presidential debate campaign speeches, one of its major subgenres. The distinctive features of inauguration practices are of crucial interest to scholars who are concerned with exploring various traditions and rhetorical discourse styles in European and particularly American presidential rhetoric (see, e.g., Campbell & Jamieson 1990; Hart 1984; Snyder & Higgins 1990; Stuckey 1989; Thompson 1987e; Windt 1983, 1990; Бутова І. 2012; Маслоva В.А. 2008; Петлюченко Н.В. 2009; Чернякова В.А. 2014). A large number of linguistic studies have centered their attention on the analysis of the kinds of language techniques used by politicians to reinforce ideologies in the masses and to achieve specific goals.

The vast bulk of studies of political discourse concerns the importance to study language as a tool used by politicians to convince the audience with their assertion of power and ideology to support their interests. They use linguistic strategies including linguistic manipulation as an influential instrument of political rhetoric to persuade public for a definite political movement. To argue in favour of their political ideologies and goals, political leaders deploy a broad range of manipulative and rhetorical devices at the phonological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, pragmatic and textual levels in their political discourse [4]. Through an indirect manipulation of language, persuasive speakers have traditionally been able to influence the preconceptions, views, ambitions and fears of the public, to the extent of causing people to accept false statements as true postulates, or even to support policies conflicting with their interests [6; 8].

Merriam-Webster English Dictionary gives the following definition of rhetoric as “the art or skill of speaking or writing formally and effectively especially as a way to persuade or influence people; also: insincere or grandiloquent language”. This proves that politicians tend to convince their audience of the authority of their assessment with a careful use of eloquent and credible language means. Wareing (2004) also specifies that words can also have a strong influence on our attitudes; which word is chosen affects people’s perception of the others and of themselves.

Since politicians are still subject to the limitations of engendered language, here is a stereotype that a woman in the public sphere must embrace the masculine image of the politician, while still identifying herself as a woman in order to gain respect and social acceptance [5]. Therefore that is relevant to analyze the ways a female politician advances her confidence to speak up her voice asserting validity of her position.

This paper makes an attempt to see rhetoric devices in action, observing the speech of Hillary Clinton, who announced her presidential campaign online, but her first speech was held at the Women in the World Summit in New York City, an annual feminist meeting about improving women's rights around the world, which signal itself that Clinton intended to run a woman-centric campaign [10].

The material for the analyses is the speech of Hillary Clinton on declaring her candidacy in the 2016 presidential election on April 12, 2015, which we consider a positive example of a persuasive inspirational speech of a successful female politician. The speech is a rewarding basis for analysis not because of a feasible feminist approach but because it enables a closer look at the way Hillary Rodham Clinton's speech addresses her use of language to renovate the vision of women in political discourse.

The speech has a classical trichotomy structure with a rather short clear polite introduction containing a compliment to the audience. For example: *Thank you so much. Oh, what a wonderful occasion for me to be back here, the fourth Women in the World conference I've been privileged to attend, ... the great team ... It's been such an honor to work with all of you.*

The main topic related to the goal of the speech is openly pointed out in the key words of the introduction: *advancing the great unfinished business of the 21st century – advancing rights and opportunities for women and girls*. The statement thesis of the introduction is repeated through the speech and is supported in the concluding section: *Now, I want to conclude where I began, with the unfinished business we face here at home. This truly is the unfinished business of the 21st century.*

The final section encloses explicit calls for action, which are emotional and expressive: *Lets keep fighting for opportunity and dignity, let's keep fighting for freedom and equality, let's keep fighting for full participation. And let's keep telling the world over and over again that yes, women's rights are human rights and human rights are women's rights once and for all.*

Atkinson (2005) points out that political speech writers consistently rely on a range of powerful techniques such as alliteration, allusion, asking questions and suggesting answers, three items lists, metaphor, parallelism and repetition. In the speech under analysis, we can follow the usage of such rhetoric device as allusion. Clinton uses allusion in the concluding abstract quoting a powerful phrase that the audience may already know from her own famous speech of 1995 in China: *women's rights are human rights and human rights are women's rights once and for all.*

The Three item List in which new ideas or information is presented in three parts helps to make the ideas contained in the speech sound natural to the public. This type of repetition emphasizes and persuades the public to accept the ideas that the politician tries to induce, for example: *It is no coincidence that so many of the countries that threaten... It is no coincidence that so many of the countries where the rule of law... It is no coincidence that so many of the countries making the leap... None of these are coincidences.*

Repetition is one of the most effective rhetoric tools to activate the mental schemes which create an “ideology” and persuades the public to willingly accept it as their own. The first part is supposed to initiate an argument, the second part emphasizes or responds to the first and the third part is a reinforcement of the first two and assign that the argument is completed assisting the audience by prompting when it is apt to give a round of applause and show their support and appreciation.

The speech is abundant in the use of Three part List and may be seen as main rhetoric devise used by Hilary Clinton who repeats key words or themes throughout a speech in the form of anaphora and epiphora: *Because if America is going to lead we expect ourselves to lead, we need to empower women here at home to participate fully in our economy and our society, we need to make equal pay a reality, we need to extending family and medical leave benefits to more workers and make them paid, we need to encourage more women and girls to pursue careers in math and science. We need to invest in our people so they can live up to their own God-given potential. That's how America will lead in the world.*

The main body of the speech shows a variety of the political manipulation means of syntactic style, such as the use of pronouns, variations of word order, the use of active and passive constructions, and sentence complexity. For example, it stands out that the more emotional is the appeal to the public the shorter become the sentences: *The extremists understand the stakes of this struggle. They know that when women are liberated, so are entire societies. We must understand this too. And not only understand it, but act on it. And the struggles do not end. Think about it.*

A clear paradigmatic pair denoting political polarization *I vs We; We vs. THEY* can be followed in the examples: *to control the women in their lives and their reach... I have always believed that women are not victims, we are agents of change, we are drivers of progress, we are makers of peace.* They can be used both for the purpose of elucidation and disguise of elements in a situation. For example the use of the first person singular pronoun “I” declares who is responsible. In the speech under consideration, we follow the tendency to base the arguments to ethos to convince an audience of the speaker's credibility so the usage of personal pronoun *I* is inevitable: *I want to conclude where I began ... I think of the extraordinary sacrifices my mother made... I'm very proud of my own daughter and I look at all these young women I'm privileged to work with.*

But in the speech the usage of the pronoun *WE* prevails, what can explained by the specificity of the speech given and the wish to make herself sound fair and unbiased, a part of the society. Principles of exclusion and inclusion become a specific technique here to reflect the prejudiced strategies of power in the political process where Clinton positions herself included: *we have work to do... we've seen in recent months, we're still asking age-old questions about how to make women's way in male-dominated fields. We are the richest and most powerful country in the world;* and excluded: *They nod, they smile and then they relegate these issues once again to the sidelines.*

Mainly the speech is built using active sentences which associate responsible agency with topical syntactic subjects (e.g. *As Malala said, “If this new generation is not given pens, they will be given*

*guns.”), while passive sentences make emphasis on victims of sexual discrimination and defocus responsible agency by putting agents last, or leaving it implicit, as: Concerning the young 23-year-old woman, brutally beaten and raped on a Delhi bus last December she was from a poor farming family...*

Communicative style is a matter of language in the broadest sense with the use of verbal language as well as other aspects contributing to the complex bodily performance that constitutes political style. A successful leader’s communicative style is not simply what makes him or her attractive to voters in a general way; it conveys certain values which can powerfully enhance the political message [6: 4]. Hillary Clinton can be acknowledged as a rather persuasive authoritative speaker who manipulates with rhetoric questions (e.g. *How many of us here today would have that kind of courage? You know what?*). She reformes her role of social benefactor (e.g. *I look forward to being your partner in all the days and years ahead*) in order to create a voice for women's rights (e.g. ***Lets keep fighting*** for opportunity and dignity, ***let’s keep fighting*** for freedom and equality, ***let's keep fighting*** for full participation). In this way, the feminine language is not limiting but balanced of gendered language, image, and audience that has the potential to produce powerful force.

To exercise the power of arguments to pathos Hillary Clinton uses Antithesis: *poverty vs prosperity, best vs worst, men vs women, rise vs fall, women’s way vs men’s dominating field*. Then we follow that powerful metaphors are widely used by the speaker to create a more dynamic and authoritative atmosphere: *to climb that economic ladder... the dust settles... The culture of rape... they prayed the devil back to hell... the clock is turning back. ... abuses that dehumanize women and corrode society.*

At the same time, the speech is built on remarkable data (true names from the latest news: *Malada, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf Inez McCormic*; solid figures: *30000 Pakistanis, 5 million children, 14 percent*), which emphasizes the thoughtful speech writing and pragmatic intention to influence the public with attention-grabbing scale of the important issues not only for America but for the whole world. For example: *to advocate for equality and dignity for all Egyptians, Tunisians, and Libyans... Ellen Johnson Sirleaf as the first woman president in Africa. ... In Northern Ireland, Catholic and Protestant women... young Pakistani women.*

Consequently, in the analysis we may name **repetition** operations at the level of sounds (alliterations and assonance), sentence forms (parallelisms) and meaning (semantic repetition), as one of the major strategies used by Hilary Clinton. The technique is used to draw attention to selected ideas and to enhance structuring of such meanings in conceptual models with a pragmatic intention of continuing persuasion process.

A woman, unlike a man in politics, must balance addressing her gender with a masculine and powerful rhetoric. If a female politician upsets the balance by coming across as too forceful, then she risks been seen untrustworthy, and in contrast, if she is too ‘feminine’ then she is deemed unfit to lead [5]. Though the analysis shows that Clinton’s use of rhetoric can be associated with masculine aggressiveness and authority, Hillary Clinton positively encounters these linguistic features, empowering women and altering public perceptions of female politicians.

Hillary Rodham Clinton makes public view her as a female politician, therefore, she is successfully renegotiating a woman's role in politics. The speech under analysis advocates that Clinton is “running an aggressively feminist campaign and she is not downplaying her gender, but holding it up as an asset” [10]. Still Clinton’s position is in openly sharing a vision of feminism that is optimistic (e.g. *Renewing America’s vitality at home and strengthening our leadership abroad will take the energy and **talents of all our people, women and men**... And **let's keep** telling the world over and over again that **yes, women’s rights are human rights and human rights are women’s rights once and for all**.) and pro-family (e.g. *I think of the extraordinary sacrifices my **mother** made to survive her own difficult childhood, to give me not only life, but opportunity along with love and inspiration. And I’m very **proud of my own daughter** and I look at all these **young women** I’m **privileged** to work with).* Nevertheless, in a man’s world of politics, for a woman to be accepted and respected as a politician, she is to some extent eliminate her feminine self from the physical as well as verbal sphere. Yet Clinton manages to exercise the combination of masculine and feminine rhetoric. What is more she benefits using masculine rhetoric to tribute women’s powers and conventionally draw attention to gender.*

#### REFERENCES

1. Arnold, T. C. (1993). *Thoughts and deeds. Language and the practice of political theory*. NewYork, Lang.
2. Atkinson, M. (2005). *Lend me Your Ears: All You Need to Know about MakingSpeeches and Presentations*. Oxford University Press.

3. Bayram, F. (2010) Ideology and political discourse: a critical discourse analysis of Erdogan's political speech. ARARECLS vol.7, 23-40.
4. David, M.K. (2014). Language, Power and Manipulation: The Use of Rhetoric in Maintaining Political Influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, vol.5(1), 164-170.
5. Griswold, D. (2007) *The politics of speech: engendering the public sphere*. Carnegie Mellon University. Available at: <http://repository.cmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1086&context=hsshonors>
6. Fairclough, N. (20/12/2006) Tony Blair and the language of politics. Available at: [http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-blair/blair\\_language\\_4205.jsp](http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-blair/blair_language_4205.jsp)
7. "First Lady Biography: Hillary Clinton." National First Ladies' Library. Online. <http://www.firstladies.org/biographies/firstladies.aspx?biography=43>
8. Wareing, S. (2004) "What is language and what does it do?", in Thomas, L.(ed), *Language, society, and power*. New York: Routledge.
9. van Dijk, T. A. (2006) "Politics, ideology, and discourse" in Brown, K.(ed), *The Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Vol. 9 Oxford ; New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 728-740.
10. [www.slate.com/blogs/xx\\_factor/2015/04/24/hillary\\_clinton\\_s\\_first\\_campaign\\_speech\\_it\\_s\\_all\\_about\\_feminism.html](http://www.slate.com/blogs/xx_factor/2015/04/24/hillary_clinton_s_first_campaign_speech_it_s_all_about_feminism.html)

#### **ВІДОМОСТІ ПРО АВТОРА**

**Анна Ляшук** – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри практики германських мов Кіровоградського державного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Винниченка.

*Наукові інтереси:* лексична семантика, лінгвопрагматика, зіставні дослідження.