

## **The Use of Language in Political Rhetoric: Linguistic Manipulation**

**Gunta ROZINA\***  
**Indra KARAPETJANA\*\***

### **ABSTRACT**

The paper is devoted to exploring allusion, metonymy, and metaphor- the linguistic devices used in political rhetoric. The analysis is envisaged from the perspective of linguistic manipulation. The theoretical framework has been designed considering the theoretical implications derived from the research of the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries on political discourse conducted by e.g. Atkinson, M., Chilton, P.A., Fairclough, N., Naciscione, A. The methodology of this inquiry has applied general principles of qualitative research, and it has been based on the discourse analysis of the authentic source materials published in *The Baltic Times* (2006) and *The Times* (2006). In this respect, the authors of the paper have been guided by selected principles of text linguistics and text pragmatics. One of the conclusions that the authors have arrived at is that the linguistic manipulation can be considered as an influential instrument of political rhetoric.

**Keywords:** *Ideology, Manipulation, Influential Power, Instrumental Power.*

### **ÖZET**

Bu makale, siyasi retorikte kullanılan kinaye, mürsel mecaz, ve metafor gibi dilbilimsel araçların kullanımını ele almaktadır. Analizler dilbilimsel bakış açısına göre ele alınmıştır. Teoretik çatı, 20. yüzyılın sonlarında ve 21. yüzyılın başlarında Atkinson, M. Chilton, P.A Fairclough, ve Naciscione A. 'nın ortaya koymuş oldukları siyasi söylemin teoretik etkileri ile ilgili yapmış oldukları araştırmalar üzerine inşa edilmiştir. Araştırmanın metodolojisi '*The Baltic Times* (2006)' ve '*The Times* (2006)' gazetelerinde yayınlanan özgün makaleler ve kaynaklara dayandırılmıştır. Bu bağlamda, çalışmanın yazarları metin dilbilim ve metin edimbilim prensiplerine bağlı kalmışlardır. Çalışmanın ortaya koymuş olduğu sonuçlardan biride dilbilim manipülasyonun siyasi söylemde etkili bir araç olarak kullanılabileceğidir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *İdeoloji, Manipülasyon, Etkili Güç, Araçsal Güç*

### **Theoretical background**

The present inquiry intends to focus on the language of political rhetoric applying the notion *politics* in its classical meaning, i.e., politics is "the art of governance and power"<sup>1</sup>. In this respect, the inquiry deals with viewing such areas as ideology in

---

\* Assoc.Prof.Dr. University of Latvia, Faculty of Modern Languages [Rosina.gunta@inbox.lv](mailto:Rosina.gunta@inbox.lv)

\*\*Assoc.Prof.Dr., University of Latvia, Faculty of Modern Languages [indra.karapetjana@lu.lv](mailto:indra.karapetjana@lu.lv)

<sup>1</sup> *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2001). London: Longman

linguistic theory, language and politics, language and power. As a result, it links the theoretical analysis of the above-mentioned areas with the characteristics and description of selected rhetorical devices applied by the language for politics.

### **Ideology in linguistic theory**

According to Luke<sup>2</sup>, the notion *ideology* refers to the systems of ideas, beliefs and practices, and representations, which operate in the interests of an identifiable social class or cultural group.

Ideology in linguistic theories has been viewed from the perspectives of descriptive linguistics, sociolinguistics, systemic linguistics and the ethnography of communication. On a theoretical level, descriptive linguistics approaches the investigation of language for politics as a ‘synchronic object of study’, e.g. Mey<sup>3</sup>. It does not see ideology as a possession of people’s minds or as a corpus of abstract ideas residing in their consciousness. It views ideology as an object that has a material social existence in language, text and discourse. Selected theories of sociolinguistics refer to language for politics as the source of speech, discourse and text. Being influenced by social context, an utterance and/or a text is an exposure of individual goals, which tend to reflect accepted social rules, norms and procedures. In most models, sociolinguistics examines ‘the ideological role of discourse in the formation of the speaking subject’<sup>4</sup>. Systemic linguistics<sup>5</sup> views language as a social semiotic system and stresses the relationship existing between social structure and language, on the one hand, and the relationship between language development and its use, on the other hand. The linguist claims that ‘it is not only the text but also the semantic system [...] that characterize the social system and the social structure’<sup>6</sup>. Pecheux in his work *Language, Semantics and Ideology*<sup>7</sup> offers the analysis of the direct relationship existing among the ideology, discourse and language. Kress<sup>8</sup> and Fairclough<sup>9</sup> support the idea that political discourse is ‘mediated by institutions which, in turn, position readers and writers, speakers and listeners in different positions of power and knowledge’<sup>10</sup>. Moreover, Fairclough asserts that ideology is represented through discourse and that ‘discourse is dialogical, produced by and producing the social relations of addressors and addressees’ (ibid.)

Thus, it could be asserted that politicians are and have to be concerned about using the language in order to communicate with the prospect audience: they make speeches, address the electorate in the newspapers. In other words, regimes being either democratic or totalitarian have to communicate in order to inform, persuade, advertise, issue their rules and regulations, legislate and alike.

---

<sup>2</sup> Luke, Allan. *Ideology*. In *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*, 366-369. London: Elsevier, 1998, p. 366

<sup>3</sup> Mey, Jacob. *Whose Language?* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1986

<sup>4</sup> Therborn, Goran. *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1980

<sup>5</sup> Halliday, Michael. *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold, 1978

<sup>6</sup> Halliday, Michael. *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold, 1978, p. 114

<sup>7</sup> Pecheux, Michel. *Language. Semantics and Ideology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982

<sup>8</sup> Kress, Gunther. *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989

<sup>9</sup> Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. London: Longman, 1989

<sup>10</sup> Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. London: Longman, 1989, p. 36

In view of the above stated, the subsequent discussion centres on some of the principles referring to the relationship between language and politics and to the relationship established between language and power on the other hand.

### Language and politics

In the context of making certain terminological distinctions between the notions *language* and *politics*, this inquiry views them considering the definitions offered by Chilton<sup>11</sup>. Thus, the scholar states that *language* is ‘the universal capacity of humans in all societies to communicate, while by *politics* he means ‘the art of governance’<sup>12</sup>. Thus, this inquiry views the language as an instrument to interact or transact in various situations and/or in different organizations being conventionally recognized as political environment.

It is generally accepted that the strategy that one group of people takes to make the other group of people do what it intends to be done is known as a linguistic strategy. It involves manipulative application of the language. Therefore, ‘*linguistic manipulation* is the conscious use of language in a devious way to control the others’<sup>13</sup>. Pragmatically speaking, linguistic manipulation is based on the use of indirect speech acts, which are focused on prelocutionary effects of what is said. There are a number of institutional domains and social situations in which linguistic manipulation can be systematically observed, e.g. in cross-examination of witnesses in a court of law.

Linguistic manipulation can be considered also as an influential instrument of political rhetoric because political discourse is primarily focused on persuading people to take specified political actions or to make crucial political decisions. To convince the potential electorate in present time societies, politics basically dominates in the mass media, which leads to creating new forms of linguistic manipulation, e. g. modified forms of press conferences and press statements, updated texts in slogans, application of catch phrases, phrasal allusions, the connotative meanings of words, a combination of language and visual imagery. To put it differently, language plays a significant ideological role because it is an instrument by means of which the manipulative intents of politicians become apparent.

### Language and power: influential and instrumental power of language

One obvious feature of how language operates in social interaction is its *influential* and *instrumental* relationship with power.

It is generally accepted that *influential power* inclines people either to behave in certain ways or makes people adopt opinions/attitudes without exerting obvious force on them. It operates in such social spheres as advertising, culture, media and politics. In other words, if we resist the influential power, we are not usually the subjects to some penalty or trouble. We usually do not suffer any penalty for a kind of a “sales resistance” to buy high-end or top-end goods (e.g. the highest-priced model cars, skis, furniture, etc), or for the resistance to be one political party loyal.

<sup>11</sup> Chilton, Paul Anthony. *Politics and Language*. In *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*, 688-694. London: Elsevier, 1998

<sup>12</sup> Chilton, Paul Anthony. *Politics and Language*. In *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*, 688-694. London: Elsevier, 1998, p. 688

<sup>13</sup> Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. London: Longman, 1989, p. 6

In contrast, *instrumental power* is explicit power, which is imposed by the state, by the laws and conventions of this state and by the institutions and organizations we work for. Instrumental power operates in such social spheres as business, education, and in various types of management. Thus, it can be asserted that in many, but not in all cases, if we resist instrumental power, we might be subjects to some kind of penalty.

However, it has to be admitted that in some spheres of social activity, such as politics or law, both kinds of power may be present at the same time. For example, we are subjects to current laws, which often enforce penalties for wrongdoing, but some legal processes, such as trial by jury, rely on the attempts to persuade those who are involved in them.

All in all, politicians impose laws, taxes and bureaucratic systems, i.e. they use instrumental power. However, they seek to influence us to endorse their policies, or they call for the eventual voters' political loyalty, thus imposing their influential power. They may wish to influence us to use our collective power to return them to governmental institutions, where they will use their executive power to direct or influence some important aspects of our lives. In other words, politicians aim at having the power to tell people what to do and how to live.

Seemingly, the features of political discourse vary, as do its purposes. Providing politicians interact with society in general, their purposes may be:

- to persuade voters to be a party loyal and to turn up to vote,
- to move a floating voters' party loyalty,
- to make people adopt general political or social attitudes in order to attract support for a present policy.

Similarly, politicians may also use particular language forms when answering journalists' questions. Where politicians engage in language interactions with other politicians, their discourse differs to a great extent.

Thus, it is axiomatic that language plays an essential part in politics because its main function in different political situations is to enable politicians to form structurally stable social relationships.

As it has been stated above, an essential area of political discourse is linguistic manipulation<sup>14</sup>. Therefore, discourse analysis, though primarily being a field of inquiry in linguistics, has become multidisciplinary in nature. As a result, one of the main focuses in language for politics is on the linguistic text with varying degrees of *socio-cultural* context taken into consideration.

It is clear that discourse involves both text and context. When analysing the political discourse, applied linguists are primarily interested in the transactional or interactional nature of the discourse since one of the basic functions of language is to transmit information, be it factual or propositional. In this respect, the present inquiry sees the issue of linguistic manipulation as the source for this investigation.

---

<sup>14</sup> Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. London: Longman, 1989  
Chilton, Paul Anthony. *Politics and Language*. In *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*, 688-694. London: Elsevier, 1998

According to Atkinson<sup>15</sup>, linguistic manipulation is a distinctive feature of political rhetoric, and it is based on the idea of persuading people, i.e. it persuades people to take political actions or persuades them to support a party or an individual. In modern societies, politics is mostly conducted through the mass media; therefore, it leads to new forms of linguistic manipulation.

Thus, the language applied in political discourse uses a broad range of rhetorical devices at the phonological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, pragmatic and textual levels. This is aimed at producing the type of the language that can be easily adopted by the mass media and memorized by the target audience.

### Materials and method

Modern applied linguistics uses a variety of approaches to analyse both interaction and transaction of politicians. As this inquiry intends to analyse selected rhetorical devices applied in political discourse, it focuses on the discussion of the cases of the phraseological allusion, metonymy and metaphor observed in the newspapers *The Baltic Times* (2006) and *The Times* (2006). For the purposes of this inquiry, the authors of the paper have made use of selected examples provided by the students of the Faculty of Modern Languages, the University of Latvia<sup>16</sup> who conduct the investigation of political discourse under the scientific guidance of the authors of the present inquiry.

Thus, discourse analysis has been applied as the method of the present inquiry. It has been based on selected principles of text analysis of the corpus of the above-mentioned resource materials. The research data were collected and 236 lexical items viewed to characterize the selected rhetorical devices applied in political discourse.

### Inquiry results: rhetorical devices used in political discourse Allusion as a rhetorical device of political discourse

Not surprisingly, the language applied in the political domain is rich in the use of phraseological allusions. According to the Latvian linguist Naciscione<sup>17</sup>, '*phraseological allusion* is an implicit mental reference to the image of a phraseological unit which is represented in discourse by one or more explicit image-bearing components hinting at the image'.

One of the most widely used images employed in the corpus of *The Baltic Times* relate to the *Iraq war*. We can read about '*weapons of mass destruction*', '*weapons of mass affection*'.

Similarly, the name of a dramatic event in history carries a full allusive force of the event itself. For example, we can read about the series of the so-called *Colour Revolutions*: *the Orange Revolution* in the Ukraine, *the Tulip Revolution* in Kyrgyzstan, *the Rose Revolution* in Georgia, *the Velvet Revolution* in Check Republic.

---

<sup>15</sup> Atkinson, Max. *Our Master's Voices. The Language and Body Language of Politics*. London: Methuen, 1984

<sup>16</sup> Buraja, Polina. *The Linguistic Means of Political Discourse*. Unpublished master paper. Riga: University of Latvia, 2007

<sup>17</sup> Naciscione, Anita. *Phraseological Units in Discourse: Towards Applied Stylistics*. Riga: Latvian Academy of Culture, 2001, p. 100

It has to be admitted that to understand the political discourse itself, the language user has to have both the political background, which enables him/her to comprehend the situational context of utterance and a high-level command of the foreign language: the use of allusion presupposes the knowledge of the fact, or the awareness of the contextual situation. As a rule, no indication of the source is offered to the listener or to the speaker.

From the linguistic perspective, allusion exhibits certain important semantic peculiarities: the primary meaning of the word or phrase often serves as a vessel into which the new meaning is assigned to; thus, it results in a kind of interplay between two meanings. It is generally accepted that the essential function of allusion is to give indirect reference to a historical, literary, mythological etc fact or to the fact important for a certain community or for a specified segment of society.

*The Times* (2006) often uses allusions in its headlines, for example, *Pie in the sky for teachers*; or *Pie in the sky for nurses* (September 7: 2, November, 13: 12). On a practical level, most people in Britain know the refrain of the song: *You will get pie in the sky when you die*. In this case, the use of the part of the refrain likely implies that teachers and nurses had been given nothing but promises by the political parties or authorities. However, linguistically speaking, the allusion *pie in the sky* implies a new meaning, i.e. *nothing but promises*. It seems that through the frequency of repetition this allusion has entered into the word stock of the English language and functions as a figurative synonym.

For example, *The Baltic Times* (2006) states that 'three musketeers, the three Baltic Prime Ministers Ansip, Kalvitis and Brazauskas agree that nuclear power is the one answer to the region's concern (April 20-26: 2). The above-presented statement relating to *Three Musketeers* by A. Dumas creates the image that the three Prime Ministers of the Baltic States function as if being one friendly, supportive and brave team. Beyond words, visual images can cluster around particular political personalities, thus acquiring allusive resonance.

In the case of allusions, the contextual resonance matters more than an individual who has been the author of the words/phrases.

Therefore, it can be asserted that the phraseological allusion being widely used in political rhetoric serves as an implicit mental reference to the image of a phraseological unit being represented in a political discourse by one or more image-bearing components. Moreover, phraseological allusions occupy a significant role in political rhetoric because they:

- use the image to appeal to the imagination,
- create figurative language, which extends the literal language,
- contribute to presenting successful images being backed up by utterances/statements often left unspoken, but which the listener or reader can immediately process.

### Metonymy as a rhetorical device of political discourse

As it was discussed above, the phrasal allusion is 'an implicit mental reference to the image of a phraseological unit'<sup>18</sup>. *Metonymy* is considered to be a rhetorical device that is based on some kind of association connecting two concepts, which these meanings represent. It has to be admitted that metonymy being a means of building up imagery focuses on concrete objects, which are used in a generalized meaning. Naciscione states that 'the explicit image-bearing components of the phraseological units have a metonymic function in discourse' (ibid.). Thus, it can be presupposed that metonymy as a rhetorical device applied in political discourse 'secures sustained associative vision which enables the reader or listener to see beyond the words' (ibid). In other words, metonymy is the replacement of an expression by a factually related term or notion, and it can bear the semantic connection of a causal, spatial, or temporal nature. There are known several types of the replacement of an expression by a factually related notion:

- author/work substitution, e.g. *to read Halliday*,
- product/material substitution, e.g. *to wear leather*,
- place/resident, e.g. *to visit The White House*.

In view of this, the present inquiry has observed numerous instances in political discourse when the place of some institution is used not only for the institution itself or for its staff but also for referring to its policy, e.g. *The Pentagon*, *Wall Street*, *Downing Street*, *Saeima* (i.e. the Parliament of Latvia), *the Kremlin* and so forth.

All in all, metonymy is considered to be a widely used rhetorical device in political discourse, which explains its constant application in politically related texts:

*Latvia responded to the incident by expelling a Belarusian diplomat (The Baltic Times, August 31-September 6: 4);*

*Russia has signed the document in 1941 but has never ratified it (The Times, June 8-14: 6);*

*Estonia agreed to a certain set of rules when it signed the accession treaty (The Baltic Times, November, 16- 22: 2).*

Echoes from the history are made more explicit when a particular linguistic formula is followed. For example, it is generally known that no building has contributed more to the language of politics than the Watergate building in Washington: the building housing the Democratic Party was broken into by the supporters of the Republican president Nixon, which resulted in a political crisis in the USA and was followed by the resignation and disgrace of the president Richard Nixon. Since then, the suffix *-gate* has become a linguistic formula used to create the notion referring to a particular (usually political) scandal. Thus, we speak about *Watergate*, we are aware of *Camillgate* (a scandal over the Prince of Wales' relationship with Camilla Parker Bowles), *Zippergate*, *Monicagate* (a scandal referring to the alleged behaviour of Bill Clinton), *Jurmalgate* in Latvia (a scandal showing the presence of corruption in the elections of a Mayer in Latvia). It goes without saying that some of the coinages with the suffix *-gate* will be short-lived, but the existence of *-gate* as a productive linguistic element used to refer to a particular political, social situation has been established. Since 1972 when the *Watergate* scandal has come into light, the suffix

---

<sup>18</sup> Naciscione, Anita. *Phraseological Units in Discourse: Towards Applied Stylistics*. Riga: Latvian Academy of Culture, 2001, p. 108

-gate has been applied with an increasing frequency to describe all sorts of scandals not only in English speaking countries but also in non-English speaking countries (e.g. in Latvia), where the English language has started to function as the *lingua franca* to establish and/or facilitate mass communication.

In sum, metonymy as a rhetorical device used by political discourse facilitates the perception of the political images and expresses their meaning in a more concentrated manner. The underlying idea of an image is understood by readers/listeners as it is brought to their minds by the context itself.

### **Metaphor as a rhetorical device of political discourse**

According to Kittay<sup>19</sup>, '*metaphor* is a trope in which one thing is spoken of as if it were some other thing, and it is an ubiquitous feature of natural language'. Further, the scholar claims that 'ability to understand metaphors and to use them is characteristic of mature linguistic competence' (ibid).

In view of this, no understanding of political discourse is complete without an adequate account of metaphor, which explains the reasons why metaphors underlie primarily linguistic utterances, produced by speakers of the English language and processed by listeners.

Referring to the study of political discourse, it has to be noted that when dealing with metaphors as linguistic phenomena, the English language users/learners are expected to know/study:

- how metaphors are used in communication,
- what is intended to be understood is different from what is literally said.

It is generally accepted that rules governing literal language involve syntactic, semantic and pragmatic conventions. Figurative utterances, e.g. metaphor, generally obey syntactic rules, sometimes flout semantic rules and most often violate pragmatic principles; thus, metaphors are characteristically identifiable by the form of the semantic and pragmatic violation.

Many theories are known to deal with the study of metaphor as a rhetorical device:

- the Interaction Theory<sup>20</sup> proposes the conceptual role of metaphor and stresses its cognitive role to language and thought),
- Hesse's Theory supports the idea that metaphors function as 'systematic analogies with a strong affinity to scientific models'<sup>21</sup>),
- the Experientialist Theory<sup>22</sup> stress the importance of the systematic coherence of metaphor and its role 'in grounding the human conceptual system in lived experience',

---

<sup>19</sup> Kittay, Eva. *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987, p. 4

<sup>20</sup> Black, Max. *Metaphor*. In *Models and Metaphors*, edited by Max Black, 211-229. NY: Cornell University Press, 1962

<sup>21</sup> Hesse, Mary. *Models and Analogies in Science*. London: Scheed and Ward, 1966, p. 18

<sup>22</sup> Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1980, p. 6



- the Semantic Field Theory<sup>23</sup> shows how metaphor transfers the semantic structures and relations from the semantic domain of the source to that of the topic).

Taking into account the above-stated, the language users of political discourse are to be aware of both the proper way of interpreting the metaphoric utterances and of finding the distinctive meaning for the metaphor in addition to its literal meaning.

Recent work on political discourse done by Buraja<sup>24</sup> that aimed at investigating metaphors used in political discourse discovered that there are a vast number of common source domains of metaphors used in political rhetoric:

- military domain, e.g. *Lithuania's State Security Department came under attack last week after detaining a journalist for procuring and intending to publish state secrets* (*The Baltic Times*, September 14-20: 1); *Suddenly, Germans, too, are beginning to feel that they have become a target* (*The Times*, August 21-26: 4),

- theatre domain, e.g. *An astonishing performance, one that will attract much attention in both Brussels and Moscow* (*The Baltic Times*, April 13-19: 23); *There is already a fierce behind-the-scenes battle to host the EIT* (*The Times*, October 20: 4),

- sport domain, e.g. *Ives, the second finalist in the presidential race was selected by a working group of leading parliamentary parties* (*The Baltic Times*, August 3-9: 1); *Even Hillary Clinton, the likely frontrunner to be the Democrat's choice in 2008 has begun tilting towards the anti-war sentiment in the party* (*The Times*, August 5: 37),

- medicine domain, e.g. *Perhaps the Lithuanians should follow through and give the Russians a taste of their own medicine* (*The Baltic Times*, August 24-30: 15); *But the pipe line deal that Germany has struck with Russia to bring gas to Germany around Poland, is an open sore* (*The Times*, October 12:35),

- human body domain, e.g. *Such moves fly in the face of the EU efforts to get Latvia to "step up"* (*The Baltic Times*, December 21-January 10: 3); *President Kaczynski wears history heavily on his shoulders, answering many questions with reference to Poland's particularly tortured past* (*The Times*, October 12: 35),

- animal domain, e. g. *Although the party has adopted a more moderate attitude in recent months, it has dogged by less than favourable reputation under Einars Repše* (*The Baltic Times*, October 12-18: 3); *But this week Mr Davis, having spent full ten days staring into the gift horse's mouth, began running the TV advert* (*The Times*, October 12:45),

- building and construction domain, e.g. *Only by adhering to pro-growth policies will the Baltic states break out of the basement and climb up the ladder to achieve average European living standards* (*The Baltic Times*, June 29-July 5: 17); *Archbishop builds a bridge for Muslim and Jewish leaders* (*The Times*, September 6: 2).

The discussion and analysis of metaphors employed by political discourse have indicated so far that a great deal of day-to-day language is used in metaphorical meaning. Seemingly, metaphors structure the way we think about politics, and they might affect our perception of the world. Often, as we can judge from the examples offered, metaphorical language thinly masks a particular political situation, ideology or

<sup>23</sup> Kittay, Eva. *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987

<sup>24</sup> Buraja, Polina. *The Linguistic Means of Political Discourse*. Unpublished master paper. Riga: University of Latvia, 2007

mindset. Thus, for example, in case the country is worried about *the flood of immigrants*, it is reasonable to presume that the situation with immigrants is disastrous, in fact.

All things considered, metaphors in political discourse create linguistic images that are based on a relationship of similarity between two objects or concepts. In other words, metaphors referring to a great deal of source domains characterising the political discourse are based on the same or similar semantic features where denotational transfer occurs.

### **Conclusions**

The paper has made an attempt to show that political regimes whether totalitarian or democratic communicate in order to inform, influence, issue commands, legislate, persuade, and so forth.

The research outcomes of the present inquiry show that the area of investigation is very broad: from the description of the linguistic approaches used for influencing an audience's thoughts and emotions to analysing the rhetorical devices applied to create a persuasive and manipulative political discourse.

In view of the above stated, the authors of the paper have come to the following conclusions:

1. The linguistic manipulation can be considered as an influential instrument of political rhetoric because political discourse is primarily focused on persuading people to take specified political actions.

2. Language plays a significant ideological role because it is an instrument by means of which the manipulative intents of politicians become apparent.

3. Language applied in political discourse uses a broad range of rhetorical devices at the phonological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, pragmatic and textual levels.

4. In present time societies, politics basically dominates in the mass media, which leads to creating new types of linguistic manipulation, e.g.:

- modified forms of press conferences and press statements,
- updated texts in slogans,
- a wide application of catch phrases,
- common usage of both rhetorical devices: for example, phrasal allusions, metonymy and metaphor, and connotative meanings of the words,
- a powerful combination of language and visual imagery to convince the potential electorate.

**Bibliography**

- ATKINSON, Max. *Our Master's Voices. The Language and Body Language of Politics.* London: Methuen, 1984
- BLACK, Max. *Metaphor.* In *Models and Metaphors*, edited by Max Black, NY: Cornell
- BURAJA, Polina. *The Linguistic Means of Political Discourse.* Unpublished master paper. Riga: University of Latvia, 2007
- CHILTON, Paul Anthony. *Politics and Language.* In *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*, London: Elsevier, 1998
- FAIRCLOUGH, Norman. *Language and Power.* London: Longman, 1989
- HALLIDAY, Michael. *Language as Social Semiotic.* London: Edward Arnold, 1978
- HESSE, Mary. *Models and Analogies in Science.* London: Scheed and Ward, 1966.
- KITTAY, Eva. *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- KRESS, Gunther. *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practices.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- LAKOFF, George and Johnson, Mark. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2001). London: Longman
- LUKE, Allan. *Ideology.* In *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*, 366-369. London: Elsevier, 1998.
- MEY, Jacob. *Whose Language?* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1986
- NACISCIONE, Anita. *Phraseological Units in Discourse: Towards Applied Stylistics.* Riga: Latvian Academy of Culture, 2001.
- PECHEUX, Michel. *Language. Semantics and Ideology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- THERBORN, Goran. *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1980.

