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Introduction. The argumentative discourse is a linguistic principle of social interaction that contains the system of language, which consists of the code (in terms of the theory of information), the participants of the discourse and some events. The argumentative discourse is divided into the following types: political, legal, advertising, religious and common ones. The center of interest of our research is in the point where all three parameters of political discourse intersect, reflected through the prism of intentionality. The understanding of political discourse as the speech-representation of the interaction of individuals allows us to observe the correlation of the logical, emotional and common.

Political discourse is the most value-oriented of other types of discourse. The most compelling political arguments during the presidential campaigns include four key criteria: democracy, moral persuasion, social questions and ideological problems.

The current political discourse presents characterizations of events from the standpoint of individual values, party values, and personal interests. In this case, the concept of political/ideological characterizations is associated with a system of values, which determine the position of the subject of speech. We can find this system in the consciousness of the speaker and in his or her conceptual world. Nowadays, argumentation is studied by a special method – the theory of argumentation, but at the same time it becomes an interest for linguistic research, because argumentation exists only in one of the forms of speeches.

The aim of this paper is to characterize the specific linguo-stylistic features of political speeches, identify the argumentation tools in the politicians’ speeches and analyze the ways and peculiarities of their translation, which help translators to preserve the completeness of the content and transmit the argumentation tools into the translation of political texts from English into Ukrainian. To achieve this aim, the following tasks were set:

1) to analyze the structure of political speech;
2) to conduct an analysis of political speeches in linguo-stylistic aspect;
3) to determine the means of translation of linguo-stylistic features of political speeches;
4) to clarify various types of argumentations in political speeches;
5) to determine the strategy of argumentation in political discourse;
6) to characterize the concepts of translation and political translation;
7) to identify tools of preservation of the argumentation in translation of political speeches.
To solve these tasks, we use such methods over the course of this work: descriptive, comparative, analysis, experiment and the method of linguistic interpretation of the results obtained.

**Research methods and methodology.** In our study, we used both general scientific and linguistic research methods. They are closely connected, while others depend on them and even undergo changes under their influence. Among the general scientific methods, which we used, there were: deduction (hypothetical-deductive method) and induction; analysis and synthesis. The following linguistic research methods were used in our study: descriptive method to describe the characteristics of argumentation tools and their equivalents, which were studied. First of all, it is worth mentioning this method, because it is the most widely used in the history of linguistics. This method is used to describe the studied linguistic phenomena and units and highlight their features of structure and functioning; structural method aims to study the language structure in the projection of the definition of language phenomena based only on the relationships and connections between the elements of language; comparative method to make comparisons between argumentation tools in source and target languages.

**Results and discussion.** The functional specificity of political discourse in relation to other types of discourse is manifested in its basic instrumental function (the struggle for power). At the same time, political discourse, along with religious and advertising, is included in the group of discourses for which the regulatory function is leading, since it emphasizes the role of language in regulating the behavior of the addressee (by inducement to action or an answer to a question, by prohibiting an action or message of information in order to change the intentions of the addressee to perform a certain action, etc.).

The social function of political discourse is to inspire the addressees – members of society – the need for politically correct actions and / or assessments. In other words, the purpose of political discourse is not to describe, but to convince or form the basis for persuasion and encourage action (Vozniuk, 2011).

The main function of political discourse is to use it as an instrument of political power. Political communication performs the function of an intermediary link, often replacing physical violence itself and makes possible changes in society towards ordering, paves the way for compromises, making facts and arguments well-known for public (Zinkovska, 2020).

The discourse can be characterized with the help of such communicative-functional parameters as:

1) limitation and simultaneous absence of structural restrictions. Discourse can include any number of units of language activity: from a sequence of two or more language acts to a set of language events;

2) systematic character, which consists in compliance with the laws of production of any discourse and its components in regular ways of language activity (sigmatic, semantic, pragmatic, syntactic);

3) functional completeness and communicative certainty of a particular discourse. This parameter is actually functional and serves as the main sensory differentiation in real communication and in research practice, the criterion for the transition of units of language activity in a particular discourse of the language person (Zhybak, 2016).

Next question to study is some special features of political discourse, which make it different from other types of discourse. First of all, the difference between political communication and other types of institutional communication lies in the fact that the recipient in political communication, as a rule, is massive (a big group of people) and very seldom – individual, while in medical, legal, administrative, trade, pedagogical and other professional and organizational spheres – predominantly individual, and very often massive.

The second special feature lies in the fact, that many researchers of political discourse note that values prevail over facts, influence and evaluation dominate over information and emotional aspect is more prominent than rational one.
The third feature shows us, that in political discourse, there is a conflict of two tendencies – to conceptual accuracy and to semantic uncertainty. On the one hand, the language of politics is the same kind of professional sublanguage as, for example, the language of doctors, lawyers, athletes, soldiers, and, as such, it should strive for the accuracy of designation. The accuracy of the nomination is noted as a condition for the professionalism of political communication, in particular the parliamentary speech (Pavlutska, 2008). On the other hand, nominative accuracy as a property of a special sublanguage in the language of politics is suppressed by its pragmatically conditioned semantic ambiguity.

The attitude to the word is a manifestation of the magical function of language (Fesenko, 2015), it is due to such a characteristic of political discourse as irrationality, reliance on the subconscious. According to the observations of psychiatrists, the spheres of politics and religion for most of us are much less susceptible to rational processes than any other areas of value systems and beliefs that are under the control of consciousness.

The political language is between two poles – functionally conditioned by a special language and jargon of a certain group with its characteristic ideology. Therefore, the political language «must fulfill contradictory functions, be understandable (in accordance with the tasks of propaganda) and focused on a specific group (for historical and social reasons). This option often contradicts the availability of political language. Politicians, like no one else, know how to avoid a direct answer to a question, they know how to say a lot and at the same time say nothing» (Trusov, 2010).

A feature of political discourse at the present stage is its mediation by the mass media. The media is the most important participant in political communication, and the exclusion of media materials from the analysis would significantly impoverish and distort the picture of modern political discourse.

Thanks to the media, citizens appear as witnesses, observers of political events, but they are subject to such analytical pressure that the interpretation of events often becomes more significant than the event itself. Powerful status requires maintaining a certain distance in communication.

Effective policy implementation has always been carried out across a symbolic chasm. Politics has always presupposed the separation of the ruler and the people; the psychological distance between them was significant in all social systems, beginning from the shaman to the president as a representative person of the highest power. In modern political discourse, the distance between the leader and the masses is being destroyed by media intervention (Hydolii, 2018).

The media can not only narrow the gap between the people and the ruler, but also, on the contrary, make it bigger by maintaining the authority of the leader. It is unthinkable, for example, to imagine public profanation of the authoritarian word in repressive (totalitarian) regimes. Thus, political distance determines the authoritarianism of a political word / text, which implies the unconditional authority of its author. The greater the distance, the higher is the authoritarianism of the discourse.

Theatrical feature of political discourse is connected with the fact that one of the sides of communication – the «client» (we mean the whole nation) – plays the main role of not a direct addressee, but an addressee-observer who perceives political events as some kind of action being played out for him.

One of the features of the political language is the constant variability of the most relevant and the most commonly used part of the political vocabulary. This is connected to the relevance and topicality of the referential area, which is the object of reflection in political discourse.

The typology of political discourse that remains to be a debatable issue in political linguistics proposes to distinguish the following types of political discourse depending on various factors.

1. According to the form – oral and written. Oral includes monologues (speeches of politicians, addresses to the people, official statements) and dialogic (interviews, press
conferences, debates), and written – published through the media or addressed personally. Ritual political discourse functions both in oral (speeches by politicians on the occasion of celebrations) and in written forms (official congratulations on public holidays).

2. According to the speaker, there are direct and indirect forms of political discourse. Direct words are spoken or presented on behalf of a particular politician, and indirect ones have hidden authorship. The specificity of ritual genres of political discourse in this indicator is that, on the one hand, all texts are spoken on behalf of a particular politician, however, on the other hand – these politicians are not authors of these spoken texts, because press service writes it for them.

3. According to the addressee factor – personally addressed (direct mail) and mass addressed (all television messages). Ritual discourse is mostly mass-addressed, with the exception of letters, which are written by politicians, dedicated to holiday events and sent to specific addresses of potential voters.

4. According to the purpose, the scientist defined informative, motivating, image, motivational and expressive forms of discourse. Texts of ritual political discourse mainly belong to the image, but may contain elements of motivation and expressiveness.

5. According to the field of functioning – television, newspaper and magazine, radio, advertising or PR discourses. The main means of spreading ritual discourse is a television channel, the Internet and newspapers (Zhybak, 2016).

Political discourse analysis is a complex system of working with text that allows you to prepare the discourse at different levels. Moreover, political discourse can be analyzed with the help of different approaches (discourse pragmatics, gender approach, conversational analysis, study of the structure of argumentation, etc.) (Darwish, 2001).

Despite all the variety of approaches to the research of political discourse, it is appropriate to choose two main ones. Proponents of the first approach understand discourse as fragments of reality that have a temporal length, logic of unfolding (plot) and which create a finished work. The task of analysis here is to understand the internal logic of the phenomenon and identify ways and methods by which the plot is constructed.

Representatives of the second narrower approach treat discourse as a special kind of communication. They say that Discourse is a communicative event, which occurs between those who speak and listen in the process of communicative action in a particular temporal, spatial, and other context (Chan, 2015). Using this approach, political discourse is not a language event, but a social dialogue, which takes place with the help and through social institutions between individuals and groups.

Rhetorical argumentation is a verbal activity of the subject of argumentation, aimed at logical proof, and, first of all, at the emotional conviction of the audience in the acceptability / implication of which are intended to correct or refute this opinion or judgment. Pathological vocabulary and numerous linguistic and stylistic methods of different levels give a special emotionality to the rhetorical argumentation.

The structure of logical and rhetorical argumentation includes: a thesis or a judgment, which express the opinion of the candidate; arguments, which are used by the speakers to explain and prove their opinions; conclusion – the ideas, to which the candidate brings his or her potential voters.

Every politician has own linguistic characteristics, which are manifested in political speeches. American politicians use expressiveness to gain trust, mention in their speeches important historical events, religion.

Political discourse is a text defined by the subject of affirmation and expression of interests of political subjects in the process of their activity, struggle for political power, and considered in the situation of appropriate communication. At the same time, we can define politics as a system of relations between people, who operate in various government institutions in order to get benefits from mutual contacts and redistribution of power resources. The current understanding of politics is defined by the intensity of the struggle for power as the central motive for political activity.

There are following essential characteristics of political discourse:
1) thematic fronting of the text, its determination of the topic;
2) affirmation of interests of political subjects, struggle for political power as the main intention of political discourse;
3) presence of a communication situation, in which the peculiarities of the genre of political discourse are manifested (Zinkovska, 2020).

Political activity can be defined as a kind of social activity which is characterized by the usage of political power and aimed at making certain decisions.

To successfully achieve its intention, the addressee—politician must anticipate people’s reactions, this allows them to properly construct the composition of the discourse, take into account the type of information and the evaluation aspect. A politician who wants to achieve the desired pragmatic effect should carefully consider the composition of the speech and its content.

Political language is a special subsystem of the national language, designed for political communication and propaganda of certain ideas, emotional impact on the citizens of the country. Politicians encourage the audience to take political actions, to develop public consensus, make and substantiate socio-political decisions. In political communication, the sign of communicative reality is a political speech, which is perceived by the electorate and gives the opportunity to form the image of the politicians.

Modern studies of political leaders’ speeches are presented by two methods: discourse analysis (the widest possible research of the paradigm) and semiotic analysis (narrower approach, which doesn’t take into account the socio-historical conditions the object of analysis operates in, but focuses only on characteristics of the speeches).

The correctness and completeness of the transmission of information actually lays in the difference between translation and retelling or brief presentation, from any kind of so-called adaptations. Therefore, it is clear that the ability to correctly convey the presentations of the things, mentioned in the source language and the images associated with them, requires knowledge of the reality depicted in the original text (regardless of either this knowledge is acquired through direct acquaintance with it, or taken from books or other sources). We talk about general knowledge and understanding of the ideas that make up the background of people’s life in other countries. In modern processes of intercultural communication, translation plays an important role, and translation is understood more and more often as a mechanism of representation of other cultures. The translator acts not only as a verbal transcoder, as well as an interpreter of the semantic code embedded in the source text. The translator not only transmits a unit of the original language using a unit of the language of translation, in fact he or she transmits the functions of the original units of language, with the help of units of the target language of translation that perform similar functions.

The process of translation, no matter how fast it is carried out in favorable or unfavorable conditions, is divided into two parts: to translate, you must first understand and clearly explore what you translate, analyze (if the original text causes difficulties), and after that critically evaluate it. Next, you should choose the appropriate means of expression in the target language. All translations of positive or negative attitudes require the selection of linguistic means of the lexical fund. If the translator works consciously, not mechanically, then he or she is interested in a certain choice of language tools. The task of objective display of the original text facilitates the selection of appropriate means of translation. The translated discourse must influence the foreign listener or reader in the same way as the original discourse influences the listeners, who speak the source language. The dominant aspect of the political discourse is the concept of value, which must be reproduced in the translated political text, taking into account the value hierarchy of different cultures. Translation of the facts of speeches doesn’t cause too many problems, unlike translations of those parts of speeches that express emotional arguments. This is because linguistic units that express rational facts usually have direct meanings (sometimes they are even monosemantic).

That is, in order to achieve adequate translation, the following aspects play an important role:
1) linguistic aspect, which includes the translator’s knowledge of linguistic and linguistic realities, customs, traditions, historical events;

2) cognitive aspect, which is formed depending on the translator’s knowledge of the topic and subject of the speech;

3) situational aspect, which means the translator’s ability to understand the situation (context) even without a keyword;

4) pragmatic aspect, which is based on the subjective translator’s knowledge.

Political speeches are not characterized by logical harmony. That is why very often translators replace awkward expressions by conditional ones or even by those that mean nothing at all. Political language in speeches also prefers commentary rather than information. An important feature is the focus of arguments mainly on the senses and not on the mind.

That is why, taking into account all the peculiarities of political speeches and applying translation strategies, we can identify a number of ways to translate such texts:

1) literal translation;

2) usage of translation transformations (they take approximately in 50% of cases of translation of stylistic figures and tropes.) Generally, they are divided into grammatical (omission, addition, transposition, change of grammatical forms, etc.), stylistic (loss-of-meaning compensation, sense development, description, etc.) and lexical (concretization, generalization, antonymic translation, transliteration, transcription, etc.);

3) comprehensive (complex) translation.

There are three types of translation equivalence: formal (full) equivalence – similar content, structure and semantic components of the sentences in the target language; partial equivalence – some differences may be found at the lexical, grammatical or stylistic levels. Equivalence of this level is achieved through various translation transformations (lexical and grammatical substitution, addition, omission, paraphrase, compensation); situational equivalence (description) – the same phenomenon in the source language and in the target language is described from different points of view due to the mismatch of linguistic pictures of the world. This type of equivalence includes the translation of clichés, orders, phraseological units, regular expressions, and so on.

There are various techniques of translations, which we used to properly transfer the linguistic units into target language. We can mention borrowing (using the same word or expression in original text in the target text), literal translations (word-for-word translation), transposition (moving from one grammatical category to another without altering the meaning of the text), substitution (a cultural element replaces the original text). We have identified the most frequent transformations for translation of tools of argumentation: omissions, generalization. The frequency of transliteration, concretization and implication is much lower.

The English political discourse has its own linguistic and stylistic features. such, characteristic features regarding the vocabulary are the very wide use of professional political terminology, the frequent use of high, i.e. bookish words, clichés, unimaginative stable phrases. It is possible to note numerical borrowings in the dictionary of the English language, which mainly entered it from the Latin and French languages. They contribute to the creation of a solemn, conservative-elevated image. Greek, German and Italian loanwords are less common in the English language. Attention is drawn to the wide use of unassimilated French words and expressions in the English political language - the so-called barbarisms. For political language, characterized by a high density of information, the types of presence of generally accepted and author's abbreviations. References and quotations often appear in political discourse (as a rule, with an exact indication of the source). In the political language, there are many proper names (personnel, names of peoples, countries, geographical objects, names of institutions, periods of publication, cultural and historical objects), adjectives formed by names. They either point to a specific person, or generally characterize some phenomenon or object. In the language of politics, attention is drawn to the variety of stereotyped motives. The language of political texts, articles, and reports in terms of vocabulary is usually dry (as a result of the use of numerous clichéd...
phrases), abstract, lofty, with a high level of generalization. Author's artistic and creative elements are observed in the political discourse, which boil down to the creation of new terms.

New vocabulary attracts special attention. Scientific research of political processes and trends involves the emergence of new discoveries, the introduction of new concepts and new terminology. Many neologisms proposed by politicians appear in the political language. A separate linguistic and stylistic feature of political texts is emotional and evaluative vocabulary. After all, evaluative vocabulary, namely evaluative information represented by evaluative lexical units, is a way of implementing the main functions of political discourse – informative and influential. At the same time, the influential potential of lexical units is realized only in the conditions of the context in accordance with the intention of the sender of the message. An aspect of emotional impact on political speech is various tropeic and arranging means of expression, especially epithets, metaphors, idioms, antithesis, parallel constructions. Periphrasis, rhetorical question, gradation are also distinguished. Politicians' speeches acquire great expressiveness and persuasiveness with the help of lexical repetition, which is the repetition of the same word or speech construction in a sentence. The use of this language technique in English-language political discourse contributes to the process of political manipulation, and also contributes to the creation of the image of a politician that meets role expectations. Ideologemes are often used in English-language political discourse because they are an effective means of managing mass consciousness. Thus, the following linguistic-stylistic features are characteristic of political discourse: – professional political terminology; – numerous borrowings, mainly from Latin and French; – exalted bookish words, clichés and clichés, non-figurative persistent phrases; – generally accepted and author's abbreviations; – links and citations; – proper names; adjectives formed from surnames are often found; author's artistic and creative elements, which are reduced to the creation of new terms; a neoplasm in the vocabulary; introduction of new concepts and new terminology; neologisms; emotional and evaluative vocabulary; various tropical and arranging means of expression; acceptance of lexical repetition; ideologues.

Political activity is a very important component of our society and very often it determines the role of the country in the international level. Politicians face a difficult task: to convey information and present their country in the best possible way. Of course, a well-prepared speech is necessary for every negotiations, discussions and public speeches. Almost all political speeches are prepared in advance, because they contain certain views, opinions, beliefs, affirmations of ideas, defending of some positions. It is very important for politicians to be the masters of public speaking, because the cost of failure is very high. This is a real challenge to successfully hide the objection of other people’s views and at the same time defend your own ones in your speech. We can make a conclusion, that not only the speaker, his or her intonation and gestures are vital, but also the speech itself has a great influence on the public’s perception.

In the current geopolitical situation and post-information society, political discourse is invariably at the center of many researches. There are a lot of scientific discussions about the conceptual aspects of political discourse as a complex, multidimensional phenomenon, which is peculiar to different sciences.

Political discourse is a text defined by the subject of affirmation and expression of interests of political subjects in the process of their activity, struggle for political power, and considered in the situation of appropriate communication. At the same time, we can define politics as a system of relations between people, who operate in various government institutions in order to get benefits from mutual contacts and redistribution of power resources. The current understanding of politics is defined by the intensity of the struggle for power as the central motive for political activity.

Political language is a special subsystem of the national language, designed for political communication and propaganda of certain ideas, emotional impact on the citizens of the country. Politicians encourage the audience to take political actions, to develop public consensus, make and substantiate socio-political decisions. In political communication, the sign of communicative reality is a political speech, which is perceived by the electorate and gives the opportunity to form the image of the politicians.
Modern studies of political leaders’ speeches are presented by two methods: discourse analysis (the widest possible research of the paradigm) and semiotic analysis (narrower approach, which doesn’t take into account the socio-historical conditions the object of analysis operates in, but focuses only on characteristics of the speeches).

Introduction to political speech is one of the most important elements and it defines how successful a speech will be and set the high standard for the speaker. A lot of researches showed that after meeting or listening to the speech, watching the game, the brightest moments, which people remember, are the beginning and the end of the speech. The introduction helps to set contact with people. This element is an important aspect of speech because, for example, expressing gratitude at the event is essential, especially when the audience is waiting for it.

Certain problems and issues usually are revealed in details, discussed and supported by arguments or facts in the main part. The task of the main part is to reveal the topic, present your opinions, support them with evidence and prepare the audience for the conclusion. If it is enough to declare a problem in the introduction, it is necessary to make a decision in this part.

In order to organize all the information and trace the thoughts of the speaker, there is a smaller, informative, semantic unit which is called microtheme. Microtheme – a complete in its content and structure fragment of language, which includes individual judgments obtained as a result of the division of the thesis, and arguments for their defense.

The researcher also notes that the scope of the microtheme is not limited, the division into microthemes may not coincide with the division into sentences or paragraphs (for example, one microtheme may cover more than 5 paragraphs). Each microtheme usually has a construction similar to logical reasoning and consists of 3 parts: judgment, arguments, ending. And such a construction is truly reasonable, because every statement of the speaker must be supported by arguments.

In the end the speaker summarizes the opened topic, comes to a certain conclusion, overs the idea and conversely, leaves for people with their own thoughts (there are cases when the last part is absent or not expressed at all). The main task of the end is to reinforce everything said before (3). However, it is necessary to strengthen and at the same time to enclose in the conclusion the main thesis of performance with which the audience will finish listening of reading the speech. A well-formed conclusion will be stored in the memory of the recipients for a long time, especially if it summarizes everything what has been said before.

Thus, the structure of political speech consists of individual details, which can be combined into one mechanism and in the hands of the skillful speaker turn into powerful speech.

To our mind, it is important to start learning the analysis of political speeches in linguo-stylistic aspect with clarifying the essence of linguo-stylistics.

We have chosen more than 25 political speeches of two ex-presidents of the USA, who made a significant impact on the history of the USA, George W. Bush (the 43rd U.S. President) and Barack Obama (the 44th U.S. President) and studied them from the linguo-stylistic point of view. Let’s consider three main lexico-stylistic devices, which are quite frequently presented in their political speeches.

1. Colloquial vocabulary. A noticeable lexical and stylistic feature of all modern political speeches, not only Barack Obama’s and George W. Bush’s is the active usage of colloquial vocabulary. The current political situation is characterized by sharp clashes of political positions, frequent aggressive behavior and uncompromising expression of different points of view. It is not surprisingly, that in such situations we can find colloquial vocabulary very often. For instance, And one of the unique things I find now as I talk to representatives of governments from the region is they’re all pretty much in agreement on that proposition – greater agreement if you will among the folks in the region that I can recall on most other propositions in recent years (George W. Bush) or My parents shared not only an improbable love, they shared an abiding faith in the possibilities of this nation (Barack Obama) prove us, that even presidents see themselves at the same stage with common people.
2. Slang vocabulary and jargon. In modern political communication, slang vocabulary is extremely actively used, especially dating back to the speech practice of criminals and drug addicts. In recent years, politicians and journalists willingly use such jargon from the criminal sphere. For example, *A dumb war, We can have an idea and start our own business without paying a bribe. Now they are having to compete with their own children for jobs that pay seven bucks an hour.* The president talked about workers in Galesburg, Illinois and said, that there are so few well-paid jobs, which could give a great level of life. And such a slang word as *Bucks* shows the nothingness of such salary. A man, *who butchers his own people to secure his own power.* Barack Obama was talking about Saddam Hussein and his rude behavior and used expression, which brightly describe this negative character trait. Or one more example of slang vocabulary from the court vocabulary: *They are prohibited from telling anyone about it and they’re even prohibited from challenging this automatic gag order in court.*

From the functional point of view, it helps the speaker and his companion to build trusting relationship and become closer. It is noteworthy, that very often slang vocabulary is permeated with conceptual vectors of anxiety, danger, aggressiveness, unnaturalness of the current state of affairs, a sharp opposition of our and foreign, which apparently meets the needs of modern political speech.

However, at the same time, we suppose, that not every usage of jargon in political speech deserves undoubted condemnation. The usage of such words often gives opportunity to define of the phenomenon for which a stylistically neutral one-word definition has not yet been created. In addition, in some cases, the usage of jargon contributes to the achievement of expressiveness, helps to express an emotional attitude to the problem.

3. Composite words. At the beginning of the last century, experts noted the active use of compound words and abbreviations in political speeches. For example, *Let’s fight to wean ourselves off Middle East oil, through an energy policy that doesn’t simply serve the interests of Exxon and Mobil* (Barack Obama). *Middle East oil* means Iran, Iraq and Saudi Arabia, which are the hugest oil producers in the Middle East. «*Exxon and Mobil*» is the name of the biggest American private oil company. Both compound words and abbreviations make the politician’s speech more clear and formal.

But we should not forget that these lexico-stylistic devices work only in the case, when they are not very frequent and they are only the assistants, which make successful accents in important places in the text or attract attention. In most cases speakers use neutral words, terms, book words, which indicate the purity of their speech, professionalism, assonances (repetitions of identical vowel sounds), alliterations (repetitions of identical consonants) and, of course, such pronouns as we, our and us. For instance, alliteration in one of the George W. Bush’s speech: *Never tiring, never yielding, never finishing, we renew that purpose today, to make our country more just and generous, to affirm the dignity of our lives and every life.* We see the repetitions of pairs of consonants n and g. It not only makes the speech more melodic, but, as we suppose, creates the sounds of working machines.

On the base of quantitative analyses we found more than 530 instances of alliteration in the investigated speeches. It turned out, that Barack Obama employs alliteration much less obviously than George W. Bush (approximately two hundreds). However, at the same time, we found out, that alliteration in Barack Obama’s speeches is not so clear to determine and is cleverly hidden. *Our celebration of initiative and enterprise; our insistence on hard work and personal responsibility, are constants in our character.* We see in this example how greatly consonant clusters with each other. It is not a piece of news, that alliteration becomes more and more popular among modern politicians. If overused, it may invite ridicule from the intellectual elite, but if used sparingly, it lends auditory power to one’s rhetorical appeal.

But undoubtedly, all their speeches contain terms and first-person pronouns: *America has stood down enemies before, and we will do so this time.* (George W. Bush). We counted more than three hundreds first-person pronouns in his researched speeches and more than four hundreds – in Barack Obama’s ones: *We craft the kind of legislation that would make us proud.*
It would be appropriate to show some terms, which were used in the politicians’ speeches: quadriplegic, skin grafts, etc. They show the speaker’s awareness of what he or she is talking about. These mentioned terms were taken from George W. Bush’s speech at the National day of Prayer.

It turned out, that such tropes as metonymies, euphemisms, comparisons were used in observed political speeches less often than other tropes. To our mind, it may be caused by the fact, that they don’t transfer great additional meanings. Whereas in contrast metaphors, epithets, hyperboles, synonyms and antonymous constructions are the most widely used among them in the researched speeches, since they are easier to perceive and they leave a greater effect.

To realize the main goal of political public speaking – influence, it is important to consider in detail both the lexical and stylistic and grammatical aspects. In the study of grammatical characteristics of political texts by frequency of use we can identify such features as the widespread use of grammatical frameworks, constructions with verbs-conjunctions in the compound noun predicate, parallel syntactic constructions and active use of modal verbs of necessity.

In the study of grammatical features of political speeches, we noticed the advantage of simple sentences with several homogeneous members over complex ones in George W. Bush’s speeches. For example: «This work continues. The story goes on. And an angel still rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm» or «I can hear you! The rest of the world hears you!». However, the 44th U.S. President, Barack Obama used complex sentences more often: You want to talk to a lawyer about whether or not your actions are going to be causing you to get into trouble. or That was her husband's advice to her – that when you are willing to make sacrifices for a great cause, you will never be alone.

To our mind, it can be explained by the fact, that simple, logical and consistent presentation of information and systematization of arguments plays an important role in agitation and persuasion.

**Conclusion.** Various lexico-stylistic devices, figures and tropes emphasize the language of a political leader and have a direct impact on the image of politicians. It turned out that the main ones are: extensive usage of colloquial and slang vocabulary and composite words. We discovered the following stylistic figures: antithesis, inversion, ellipsis, parceling, repetitions and rhetorical questions. The most frequently used among them were repetitions, rhetorical questions and parceling. We studied such tropes as metaphors, metonymies, epithets, hyperboles, euphemisms, synonymous pairs and antonymous constructions. Metaphors, epithets, hyperboles, synonyms and antonymous constructions were the most widely used among them in the researched speeches, since they are easier to perceive and they leave a greater effect. The most frequent ways, which helped us to translate tropes, stylistic figures and lexico-stylistic devices were the method of regular correspondences (equivalents), omissions, transposition, change of grammatical form. The frequency of using, loss-of-meaning compensation, transliteration, concretization and generalization methods was much lower.

Political speeches are characterized by a high degree of influence, persuasion, and sometimes have aggressive and critical character. That is why politicians have various tools of persuasive influence. Trying to convince listeners of the fairness of their opinions, the truth of the positions, the speaker does not always rely only on logic and fairness. Politicians also try to arouse interest in their own positions, to attract listeners’ attention with their brightness and emotional amusement, which can be gained with the help of intonation and linguistic units, which we studied.

The dominant aspect of the political discourse is the concept of value, which must be reproduced in the translated political text, taking into account the value hierarchy of different cultures. Translation includes several stages: first translator should understand and clearly explore what he/she translates, analyze (if the original text causes difficulties), and after that choose appropriate means of expression in the target language.

The investigation of different lexico-stylistic devices, types of preservation of argumentation in the translation of political speeches of American politicians is not exhaustive and requires further study by structural, grammatical and morphological analysis.
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СТРАТЕГІЇ АРГУМЕНТАЦІЇ В ПОЛІТИЧНИХ ПРОМОВАХ

Анотація

Постановка проблеми. Політичний дискурс є найбільш ціннісно-орієнтованим серед інших типів дискурсу. Найвагоміші політичні аргументи під час президентських кампаній включають чотири ключові критерії: демократичність, моральне переконання, соціальні питання та ідеологічні проблеми. Сучасний політичний дискурс представляє характеристику подій з позицій індивідуальних цінностей, партійних цінностей та особистих інтересів. У цьому випадку поняття політико-ідеологічної характеристики асоціюється із системою цінностей, які визначають позицію суб’єкта мовлення. Нині аргументація вивчається особливим методом – теорією аргументації, але водночас вона стає цікавою для лінгвістичних досліджень, оскільки аргументація є частиною іншої форми вислову.

Метою є охарактеризувати специфічні лінгвостилістичні особливості політичних промов, виявити засоби аргументації у промовах політиків та проаналізувати способи й особливості їх перекладу, які допомагають перекладачам зберегти повноту змісту та передати засоби аргументації в іншу мову, розглянути переклад політичних текстів з англійської на українську.

Методи дослідження. У нашому дослідженні були використані такі лінгвістичні методи дослідження: дескриптивний метод для опису характеристик інструментів аргументації та їх еквівалентів, і порівняльний метод для визначення інструментів аргументації англійською та українською мовами.

Основні результати дослідження. Функційна специфіка політичного дискурсу по відношенню до інших видів дискурсу проявляється в його основній інструментальній функції (боротьба за владу). При цьому політичний дискурс, поряд з релігійним і рекламним, входить до групи дискурсів, для яких регулятивна функція є провідною, оскільки підкреслює роль мови в регулюванні поведінки людей. Основною функцією політичного дискурсу є використання його як інструменту політичної влади. Політична комунікація виконує функцію проміжної ланки, часто замінює собою фізичне насильство і робить можливими зміни суспільства в бік упорядкованості, пропонує шляхи до компромісів, роблячи факти та аргументи заслуговуючими. Різноманітні лексико-стилістичні прийоми, фігури та тропи підкреслюють основні засоби політичного лідера, роблячи факти і аргументи заслуговуючими. Різноманітні лексико-стилістичні прийоми, фігури та тропи підкреслюють основні засоби політичного лідера та безпосередньо впливають на імідж політика. Виявилося, що основними з них є: широке використання розмовної, сленгової лексики та сполучних слів. Виявлене такі стилістичні фігури: антитеза, інверсія, еліпсис, парцеляція, повтори та риторичні запитання. Серед них найчастіше використовувались повтори, риторичні запитання та парцеляції.

Висновки і перспективи. Домінуючим аспектом політичного дискурсу є концепція цінності, яка має бути відтворена в перекладному політичному тексті з урахуванням цінності і її іерархії різних культур. Переклад включає кілька етапів: спочатку перекладач має зрозуміти та чітко вивчити те, що він/она перекладає, проаналізувати (якщо оригінальний текст викликає труднощі), а потім вибрати відповідні засоби вираження цільовою мовою. Дослідження різних лексико-стилістичних засобів, способи збереження аргументації у перекладі політичних промов англомовних політиків не є вичерпним і потребує подальшого вивчення їх структурних, граматичних та морфологічних особливостей.

Ключові слова: політичний дискурс, політична промова, доповнення, опущення, описовий переклад, стилістичні засоби, компенсація.
Abstract

Background. Political discourse is the most value-oriented of other types of discourse. The most compelling political arguments during the presidential campaigns include four key criteria: democracy, moral persuasion, social questions and ideological problems. The current political discourse presents characterizations of events from the standpoint of individual values, party values, and personal interests. In this case, the concept of political/ideological characterizations is associated with a system of values, which determine the position of the subject of speech. Nowadays, argumentation is studied by a special method—the theory of argumentation, but at the same time it becomes an interest for linguistic research, because argumentation exists only in one of the forms of speeches.

The purpose. Is to characterize the specific linguo-stylistic features of political speeches, identify the argumentation tools in the politicians’ speeches and analyze the ways and peculiarities of their translation, which help translators to preserve the completeness of the content and transmit the argumentation tools into the translation of political texts from English into Ukrainian.

Methods. The following linguistic research methods were used in our study: descriptive method to describe the characteristics of argumentation tools and their equivalents, which were studied and comparative method to make comparisons between argumentation tools in source and target languages.

Results. The functional specificity of political discourse in relation to other types of discourse is manifested in its basic instrumental function (the struggle for power). At the same time, political discourse, along with religious and advertising, is included in the group of discourses for which the regulatory function is leading, since it emphasizes the role of language in regulating the behavior of the. The main function of political discourse is to use it as an instrument of political power. Political communication performs the function of an intermediary link, often replacing physical violence itself and makes possible changes in society towards ordering, paves the way for compromises, making facts and arguments well-known for public. Various lexico-stylistic devices, figures and tropes emphasize the language of a political leader and have a direct impact on the image of politicians. It turned out that the main ones are: extensive usage of colloquial and slang vocabulary and composite words. We discovered the following stylistic figures: antithesis, inversion, ellipsis, parceling, repetitions and rhetorical questions. The most frequently used among them were repetitions, rhetorical questions and parceling.

Discussion. The dominant aspect of the political discourse is the concept of value, which must be reproduced in the translated political text, taking into account the value hierarchy of different cultures. Translation includes several stages: first translator should understand and clearly explore what he/she translates, analyze (if the original text causes difficulties), and after that choose appropriate means of expression in the target language. The investigation of different lexico-stylistic devices, types of preservation of argumentation in the translation of political speeches of American politicians is not exhaustive and requires further study by structural, grammatical and morphological analysis.

Keywords: political discourse, political speech, addition, omission, descriptive translation, stylistic devices, compensation.