

UDC 808.51-057.177.11(439)(043.2)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/59-3-26>

Maiia YURKOVSKA,
orcid.org/0000-0003-0002-4144
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of English Philology
Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University
(Vinnytsia, Ukraine) m.iurkovska@donnu.edu.ua

RHETORIC DEVICES IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE (ON THE MATERIAL OF VICTOR ORBAN'S SPEECH "YOU ARE CONDEMNING HUNGARY")

The referred study aims to analyze the argumentative strategy used in the speech of the Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán «You are condemning Hungary» on 11 September 2018, in particular to identify and analyze the rhetorical techniques used by him for the purpose of persuasion. The selected speech is of interest for linguistic diagnostics in the field of rhetorical argumentation, and is a characteristic textual unit in the discourse of such type.

At the beginning of the article, in order to better understand the extralinguistic context, information is briefly provided about the circumstances that caused the Hungarian Prime Minister's indignation and forced him to make an emotional speech accusing the European Union in the European Parliament.

Thus, the object of the article is the argumentative discourse, in particular the speech that is a part of this discourse. The subject of the article is rhetorical techniques used by the author of the speech.

The relevance of the article is argued by the need to expand and deepen the empirical research base in this field.

It has been established that in his speech in order to influence the audience, the author mainly relies on the argumentative strategy based on appeals to listeners' emotions, values and historical facts. It was found that in this particular case, the Hungarian Prime Minister uses "pre-emptive assertions", "balancing" constructions (no X, but Y), figures of speech (metaphor, metonymy) to frame his argument, which adds pathos to the statement; intentional errors in logic, acceptance of common expectations due toclusivity. The important role of the "unspoken" as an argumentative technique is noted.

At the end, a conclusion is made about the decisive role of rhetoric in the design of the necessary argumentation.

Key words: argumentation, rhetorical techniques, political discourse, figurative speech.

Майя ЮРКОВСЬКА,
orcid.org/0000-0003-0002-4144
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри англійської філології
Донецького національного університету імені Василя Стуса
(Вінниця, Україна) m.iurkovska@donnu.edu.ua

РИТОРИЧНІ ПРИЙОМИ У ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ ПРОМОВИ ВІКТОРА ОРБАНА "YOU ARE CONDEMNING HUNGARY")

Реферована стаття присвячена аналізу промови угорського прем'єр-міністра Віктора Орбана "You are condemning Hungary" на предмет використаних у ній риторичних засобів та прийомів у лінгвопрагматичному аспекті. Обрана промова становить інтерес для лінгвістичної діагностики у галузі риторичної аргументації, і є характерною текстовою одиницею у дискурсі такого типу.

На початку статті з метою кращого розуміння екстралінгвістичного контексту, стисло надається інформація про обставини, які послужили причиною обурення угорського прем'єр-міністра та змусили його виступити на засіданні Європарламенту від 11 вересня 2011 року з емоційною промовою-звинуваченням в бік Євросоюзу.

Рефероване дослідження ставить за мету проаналізувати аргументативну стратегію, що була використана у промові угорського прем'єр-міністра Віктора Орбана "You are condemning Hungary", зокрема виявити та проаналізувати використані ним з метою переконання риторичні прийоми.

Таким чином, об'єктом статті є аргументативний дискурс, зокрема промова, яка є частиною цього дискурсу. Предметом статті, відтак, є риторичні прийоми, що використовуються автором промови.

Актуальність статті аргументується потребою розширення та поглиблення емпіричної бази дослідження у цій галузі.

Встановлено, що у своїй промові з метою впливу на аудиторію автор переважно спирається на аргументативну стратегію, яка ґрунтується на апеляції до емоцій слухачів, цінностей та історичних фактів. Виявлено, що у цьому конкретному випадку, угорський прем'єр-міністр для оформлення своєї аргументації використовує «превентивні твердження» (pre-emptive assertions), «балансуючі» конструкції (no X, but Y), фігури

образного мовлення (метафору, метонімію), що додає пафосу твердженням; навмисні помилки у логіці, прийом спільних очікувань через включеність (*clusivity*). Зазначається важлива роль «несказаного» як аргументативного прийому.

В кінці робиться висновок про визначальну роль риторичності в оформленні необхідної аргументації.

Ключові слова: аргументація, риторичний прийом, політичний дискурс, образне мовлення.

Formulation of the problem. The way in which we frame an issue largely determines how that issue will be understood and acted upon (Scott, 2013). Successful achievement of communicative goals and effective framing of an argument both require the use of a number of linguistic tools and techniques, an important place among which is occupied by rhetorical techniques, which are rightly considered among the most effective methods of framing a successful argument for the purpose of self-presentation, persuasion, request, justification, negotiation, etc.

Research analysis. Political discourse becomes the object of research for many domestic and foreign scientists. Different aspects of this type of discourse become the subject of research. Today, there are scientific studies devoted to genres and styles of political discourse (Завальська, 2017; Кондратенко, 2019; Ковальова, 2020); to the role of metaphor in Ukrainian political speeches; there have been highlighted idiostyles of some political figures (Мозер, 2020; Scott, 2009); researched methodology for studying political discourse, etc. (Запорожець, 2010; Taran, 2021). At the same time issues related to the construction of an argumentative strategy in political speeches remain relevant.

The purpose of the article involves the analysis of the argumentative strategy in the speech of Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán «You are condemning Hungary» on 11 September 2018, namely the identification and description of the rhetorical techniques used for the purpose of persuasion.

Presentation of the main material. The speech that is under analysis is the passionate reaction of the Hungarian Prime Minister Victor Orbán to the “Sargentini report” submitted to the European Parliament in October 2018. According to this report, the ruling government of Hungary was accused of serious undermining of values of the European Union, and of “posing a “systemic threat” to the EU’s fundamental principles” (Emma Beswick & Rita Palfi, 2018). Dutch Green MEP Judith Sargentini, who produced the draft report, submitted the allegations of abuse to migrants, restrictions on freedom of the press, corruption and conflicts of interest, inadequate privacy and data protection, ‘stereotypical attitudes’ towards women; and finally expressed concerns over electoral and constitutional systems. As a result, she compelled

her contemporaries to support her recommendation to launch the little-used Article 7 against Hungary as a member of EP.

Naturally, such accusations, the task that arose before Orbán was to rehabilitate the policies of his government, as well as to restore Hungary’s reputation as a democratic state, and a full member of the European Union.

The disagreement and condemnation of the report appears in the very title of the speech that was posted on the official website of the Hungarian government. It is revealed by the modifying construction “so-called” regarding the “Sargentini report”, and literally indicates that Orbán considers the report wrong.

Despite the fact that Orbán begins his speech with a cascade of pre-emptive assertions like “*I know that you have already formed your opinions. I know that the majority of you will vote in favour of the report. I also know that my contribution now will not sway your opinions*”, in fact, his speech is an attempt to catch MEP on his side and to convince them not to vote against Hungary. On the other side, the addressee of his speech is not limited only to the present MEP. We think that it includes also Hungarian electorate, which means that Orbán faces the need to rehabilitate his political reputation mainly before the Hungarians, especially before the adherents of the European Union within Hungary, and to prevent any possible claims on their side on the account of the submitted report. Orbán strives to play on the feelings and values of the Hungarians, thus out of all the charges, he chooses to focus only on the one that the Hungarians are very vulnerable about, the one concerning the Arab refugees. The above-mentioned motives explain the choice of argumentation strategy in his speech, which mainly relies on the appeal to emotions, values and facts.

Orbán starts framing his argumentation with a counterbalanced sentence of “not X but Y structure” “...because you are not about to denounce a government, but a country and a people”. By means of such construction, Orbán substitutes the “defendant” [a government → Hungarian people] appealing to the feeling of sympathy in MEP. According to B. Scott (2013) this construction is “pre-emptive and anticipates the objections that are likely to be raised, thus showing the speaker’s awareness of opposing approaches, and then promotes the speak-

er's favoured approach as the wiser one" (Scott, 2013). At the same time, this construction shows that the speaker is both aware of alternatives and appears to be balanced in his judgments. "There is a twofold advantage to this counterbalancing dynamic. The first is that the speaker appears both well-informed and well-reasoned in so far as he presents his views not as assertions, but as the more considered choice. Secondly, a pre-emptive move is in evidence, since the argument being rejected anticipates likely responses to the one being proposed, and deals with them there and then" (Scott, 2013).

The first paragraph in V. Orban's speech is remarkable for the use of figurative language, "stories in capsules" (Scott, 2013), and aims at imaging Hungary as a state with a prominent and glorious past and history that is seen from the extracts like "you will denounce Hungary", "Hungary – a member of the family of Europe's Christian peoples", "contributed to the history with its blood", "Hungary made the highest sacrifice", "opened its borders to its East German brothers and sisters", or "Hungary that rose and took up arms against the world's largest army, the Soviets" (it is interesting that Orbán doesn't mention the rallying of Hungary with another large army in the WWII). The use of the metonymy in the extract "Hungary has fought for its freedom and democracy" and almost a poetic periphrasis "And now these people want to denounce the Hungarian freedom-fighters of the anti-communist, democratic resistance" adds to the pathos of the utterance.

Further, in the second paragraph Orbán seeks to represent contemporary Hungary as a model democratic state. To achieve this, he frames his argumentation through appeal to both facts and emotions by means of assertions like "Hungary's decisions are made by the voters in parliamentary elections" or "to Hungarians freedom, democracy, independence and Europe are matters of honour" and finishes it with the sentence that contains logical fallacy of false cause "This is why I say that the report before you is an affront to the honour of Hungary and the Hungarian people". Orbán seeks to challenge the credibility of the data in the report, therefore he shifts to face-threatening speech acts of accusation and disagreement like "this report does not show respect for the Hungarian people" or "this report applies double standards", "it is an abuse of power, it oversteps the limits on spheres of competence, and the method of its adoption is a treaty violation". In Orbán's speech there is an example of indirect negation like "You think that you know the needs of the Hungarian people better than the Hungarian people themselves", with which he actually states that Members of European Parlia-

ment don't know what is better for the Hungarian people. To intensify the impact, he uses direct speech acts "I stay here", "I defend", and "I say that" and a linguistic hedge "I must say to you that".

The central message of the third paragraph is expressed by assertions like "You are assuming a grave responsibility when – for the first time in the history of the European Union – you seek to exclude a people from decision-making in Europe" and "You would strip Hungary of its right to represent its own interests within the European family that it is a member of", which are hidden accusations. This is the main thing against which Orbán speaks out. And this is the only time when he states this literally without figurative language. This idea is framed by appeals to emotions through bare assertions like "To us in Hungary, democracy and freedom are not political questions, but moral questions", "you seek to stigmatise a country and a people", "you pass moral judgements", "We have ... disputes", "we think differently about Europe's Christian character, and the role of nations and national cultures", "we interpret the essence and mission of the family in different ways", and "we have diametrically opposed views on migration". At the end of the paragraph Orban resorts to the device of shared aspirations to a better future through "clusivity" by means of pronouns "we" and "our": "If we truly want unity in diversity, then our differences cannot be cause for the stigmatisation of any country, or for excluding it from the opportunity of engaging in joint decision-making. We would never sink so low as to silence those with whom we disagree".

The concluding paragraphs are especially high-flown and emotional. The argumentation in them is mainly based on the appeals to semantic categories like "...is unfair... is un-European"; as well as on the appeals to facts through assertions like "We are the most successful party in the European Parliament", "Our socialist and liberal opponents are understandably unhappy with our success", "This report disregards agreements that were concluded years ago" or "Every nation and Member State has the right to decide on how to organise its life in its own country". The rhetorical question "But if you are free to do this and can disregard agreements at will, then what is the point of coming to an agreement with any European institution in the first place?" will call into question the reliability of any agreement with and within the European Union institutions. Assertions like "Our union is held together by the fact that disputes are resolved within a regulated framework" are targeted at finding common ground. By means of appeals to facts like "...I have made compromises

and concluded agreements with the Commission on the Media Act, on the justice system, and even on certain passages in the Constitution” Orbán foregrounds arguments to his advantage.

At the end of the speech Orbán again uses figurative language and images “defend our borders”, “We have built a fence”, “we have defended Hungary”, “we have defended Europe” or “a community denouncing its own border guards”.

We can observe the use of the “unsaid” as a framing device between such two sentences as “Every nation and Member State has the right to decide on how to organise its life in its own country” and “We shall defend our borders, and we alone shall decide who we want to live with”. The first one is an assertion of a fact and aims at finding common ground, accenting the idea that Hungary possesses equal with other members of the EU rights. The second is about shared values, in other words the desirable for Hungary state of things in future, something we [should] strive at. The authorization for this [*defend our borders, we alone shall decide*] as if flows from the first sentence as something natural, logical and legal. The unsaid idea, which actually cannot be pronounced openly by Orbán in EP, is that in spite of the fact that Hungary is a full member of the EU and consequently is obliged to provide within the country the officially adopted policy of the EU, Hungary will make an exception and won’t stick to this policy.

The last paragraph starts with the illocutionary speech act “Let us speak plainly” that is not an invitation to be sincere, but really a prelude to the open censure and disagreement with the MEP’s decision. Further by means of the logical fallacy of false cause in the part “you want to denounce Hungary because the Hungarian people have decided that our homeland will not become an immigrant country” Orbán appeals to the sense of fairness and justice of MEP. Remarkably strong sound the performatives “I *reject the threats, the blackmail, the slander ...*” or “I *respectfully inform you that ...*”. Orbán finishes his address with strong appeal to emotions through “stories in capsules” like “people will finally have the chance *to decide the future of Europe*” and “will have the opportunity *to restore democracy to European politics*”.

Conclusions. In the result of the conducted research, it was established that aiming at influencing the audience, the speaker mainly relies on the argumentative strategy based on an appeal to listeners’ emotions, values and historical facts. It was revealed that in this specific case, the Hungarian Prime Minister used “pre-emptive assertions”, “balancing” constructions (no X, but Y), figures of speech (metaphor, metonymy) to formulate his argument, which gives pathos to the statements; intentional errors in logic, reception of common ones is expected due toclusivity. The important role of the “unspoken” is indicated as an argumentative technique.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Завальська Л.В. Комунікативна стратегія аргументації в українському політичному дискурсі. *Одеський лінгвістичний вісник*, 2017. Спецвип. С. 66–69. URL: <http://dspace.onua.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/11300/16826/0%97%0%b0%0%b2%0%b0%0%bb%0%b1%8c%0%b1%8c%0%ba%0%b0%20%0%9b.%20%0%92.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> (дата звернення 31.12.2022).
2. Запорожець О. Особливості політичного дискурсу період світової економічної кризи. *Політичний менеджмент*, № 4, 2010. С. 83–93. URL: https://ipiend.gov.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/zaporozhets_osoblyvosti.pdf (дата звернення 29.12.2022).
3. Ковальова, О. Політичний дискурс: сучасні лінгвістичні інтерпретації. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*. Вип 27, том 2, 2020. С. 101–107. URL: http://www.aphn-journal.in.ua/archive/27_2020/part_2/16.pdf (дата звернення 29.12.2022).
4. Кондратенко Н.В. Дебати як мовленнєвий жанр українського політичного дискурсу. *Актуальні проблеми філології та перекладознавства*, 2019. Вип. 16. С. 99–104. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/apftp_2019_16_22 (дата звернення 31.12.2022).
5. Мозер М.Є. Комунікативні тактики та стратегії в політичному дискурсі. *Філософія та політологія в контексті сучасної культури*, 2020, Вип. 12 (1), С. 141–146. URL: <https://fip.dp.ua/index.php/FIP/article/view/1016> (дата звернення 31.12.2022).
6. Emma Beswick & Rita Palfi (2018) Article 7 sanctions: What does the Sargentini report accuse Hungary of? Euronews, 10 September. URL: <https://www.euronews.com/2018/09/10/article-7-sanctions-what-does-the-sargentini-report-accuse-hungary-of> [accessed 31 December 2022].
7. Scott, B. (2013) Framing an argument. URL: https://www.diplomacy.edu/resource/framing-an-argument/#_ftnref2 [accessed 29 December 2022].
8. Scott, B. The Cadence of Counterbalance. 3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature. The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies. University of Kebangsaan Malaysia. Volume 15, 2009. pp. 7–22. URL: <http://ejournal.ukm.my/3l/article/view/1010> [accessed 31 December 2022].
9. Scott, B. Obama’s 2013 Inaugural: a doctor’s diagnosis. URL: <https://www.diplomacy.edu/blog/obamas-2013-inaugural-doctors-diagnosis> [accessed 29 December 2022].

10. Taran, O. S. A corpus-based approach to the Ukrainian political discourse study. Communicative-pragmatic, normative and functional parameters of the professional discourse. 2021. pp. 241–258/ URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353024623_A_corpus-based_approach_to_the_Ukrainian_political_discourse_study [accessed 13 January 2023].

REFERENCES

1. Zavalska L.V. Komunikatyvna stratehiia arhumentatsii v ukrainskomu politychnomu dyskursi. [Communicative strategy of argumentation in Ukrainian political discourse]. Odesa Linguistic Bulletin. 2017. pp. 66–69. [in Ukrainian].
2. Zaporozhets O. Osoblyvosti politychnoho dyskursu period svitovoi ekonomichnoi kryzy. [Peculiarities of political discourse during the period of the global economic crisis]. Political management. 2010. pp. 83–93. [in Ukrainian].
3. Kovalova, O. Politychnyi dyskurs: suchasni linhvistychni interpretatsii. [Political discourse: modern linguistic interpretations]. Current issues of humanitarian sciences. 2020. Issue 27. Vol. 2. pp. 101–107. [in Ukrainian].
4. Kondratenko N.V. Debaty yak movlennievyi zhanr ukrainskoho politychnoho dyskursu. [Debate as a speech genre of Ukrainian political discourse]. Actual problems of philology and translation studies. 2019. pp. 99–104. [in Ukrainian].
5. Mozer M.Ye. Komunikatyvni taktyky ta stratehii v politychnomu dyskursi. [Communicative tactics and strategies in political discourse]. Philosophy and political science in the context of modern culture. 2020. Issue 12 (1). pp. 141–146. [in Ukrainian].
6. Emma Beswick & Rita Palfi. Article 7 sanctions: What does the Sargentini report accuse Hungary of? Euronews. 2018.
7. Scott, B. Framing an argument. 2013.
8. Scott, B. The Cadence of Counterbalance. 3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies. Malaysia. 2009. pp. 7–22.
9. Scott, B. Obama's 2013 Inaugural: a doctor's diagnosis. 2013.
10. Taran, O. S. A corpus-based approach to the Ukrainian political discourse study. Communicative-pragmatic, normative and functional parameters of the professional discourse. 2021. pp. 241–258.