

*Holovnia A. V.,  
PhD (in Philology), Associate Professor  
at the English Philology and Translation Department  
National Aviation University*

*Kovalenko S. S.,  
Student  
National Aviation University*

## LINGUOSTYLISTIC MEANS OF THE PRAGMATIC INFLUENCE ON THE AUDIENCE (BASED ON THE SPEECH BY PRESIDENT OF UKRAINE VOLODYMYR ZELENSKYI IN THE KNESSET)

**Summary.** The article has been devoted to the analysis of the speech of the President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelenskyi to the Knesset of Israel, urged by the military aggression of the Russian Federation in Ukraine, which began on February 24, 2022. From a linguistic point of view, this speech is a clear example of political discourse, as it contains a significant number of different language tools that reinforce and complement each other. The article analyzes the linguistic and stylistic means used in the speech to create a pragmatic influence in order to convey information and convince the audience of the ideas laid down by the speaker in the speech. The article identifies the main linguistic and stylistic language tools and analyzes the mechanisms by which the appropriate impact on the audience is performed. Among the main linguistic and stylistic means used in the speech, the most common are a large number of lexical units to denote actions related to military aggression, the current state of Ukrainians and the proximity of Ukrainian and Jewish peoples, as well as lexical units with opposite meanings describing the people before and after the war. In addition, the author used a number of syntactic tools that create the effect of tension and anxiety: short sentences, parcelling, aposiopesis, gradation, parallel constructions, various types of repetition, rhetorical questions and quasi-rhetorical questions. One of the most effective linguistic means is allusion, through which the speaker brings the audience back to the most painful moments of history, thus evoking emotions and memories. Unlike most well-known political speeches, metaphor and metonymy are not common in this one. Given the wide publicity and reaction of society to this speech, we believe that the author of the speech coped with the task set and, using a whole arsenal of linguistic and stylistic means, successfully performed the intended pragmatic function.

**Key words:** speech, political speech, linguostylistic means and devices, pragmatic influence.

**Target setting.** Public speeches play a crucial role in the decision of the audience in favour of a politician. The latter, realizing this, do their best to force people make a choice in their favour, i. e. use the whole arsenal of language tools to convince the audience of their rightness, to finally get their support. In this article, we set the **aim** to consider the language means of persuasion, the linguistic tools of persuasiveness, and the level of their pragmatic influence in the speech by the President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelenskyi in the Knesset 20 March 2022.

**Research analysis.** Most speeches today are prepared by specially trained people – speechwriters who analyse the audience, the activities of the target groups and take into account the wishes of the latter. In the United States, the twenty-ninth President, Warren Harding, was the first president to initiate the tradition of writing speeches by speechwriters. However, all speeches, both prepared by experts and written personally by politicians, contain the lion's share of elements of persuasion, which should be considered in more detail.

**The body.** It is established that the strategy of persuasiveness has a hierarchical structure of five levels: the strategy of persuasiveness, which is divided into two equal vectors – positive self-presentation and negative presentation of others based on four tactics – attraction and confidence creating, activation of emotions, argumentation, activation of the addressee to actions [1, p. 18]. The speeches of presidents and public speakers can be described as emotional, unifying, appealing.

Usually, the delivery of speeches should solve two tasks: to clearly state the position of the speaker and the main points of the future activities, as well as to gain the necessary support of people. In addition, speeches are not always prepared in the same extralinguistic conditions, so the goals and strategic features of speeches, and hence the language content, are different.

Speechwriters and the speakers themselves have a rich arsenal of language tools aimed at convincing the audience. The most common are stylistic figures. Since public speeches belong to the journalistic rather than the official business style, a certain amount of such means is still allowed when writing the text of speeches. The most frequent devices are metaphor, metonymy, epithet, hyperbole, opposition. As for the metaphor, its generalization and imagery make it a convenient method of communication. In addition, the British linguist Charles Black interprets metaphor as a linguistic reflection that arises as a result of a certain “shift” in the use of a word or expression, transferred from one context to another. This phenomenon has linguistic, pragmatic and cognitive characteristics [2, p. 121–145]. Also, metaphor performs informational and pragmatic functions, influencing the attitude of the audience to the issue under discussion, causing appropriate psychological and behavioural reactions on the part of the target audience. Modern linguistics notes the special role of metaphor in political discourse, because in the political sphere metaphor is

often used to form a worldview, which is why it is one of the means of attracting the attention of listeners and a tool of emotional influence on them. In political communication, metaphor contributes to the impact on the conscious and subconscious components of the psyche of the citizen [3, p. 145].

In the view of Russian aggression towards Ukraine that started 24 February 2022 the President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelenskyy had to address his speeches to the key governmental bodies of different countries around the world in search of support and aid from them to protect his country from Russian military invasion. The speech delivered to the Knesset was passionately accepted while being slightly criticized for its touching some sensitive aspects of the country history.

One of the key pragmatic issues of the Presidents' speech is to find the way to the hearts of the Jewish nation, both officials and just the citizens. For this the speaker uses a great number of the vocabulary units from the same semantic field of closeness:

*The Ukrainian and Jewish communities have always been and, I am sure, will be very intertwined, very close. They will always live side by side. And they will feel both joy and pain together* [4].

In the speech there are many examples when the President appeals to the common sense and pride of the Jews stating that they – the country that really has the power to help – can make their right choice and help Ukraine fight against the enemy:

*Everyone knows you're doing great. You know how to defend your state interests, the interests of your people. And you can definitely help us protect our lives, the lives of Ukrainians, the lives of Ukrainian Jews* [4].

To make the role of the listeners even more precious, the speaker uses the repetition of the pronoun "you".

Moreover, in order to prove his being right, the President asks a number of rhetoric questions:

*What is it? Indifference? Premeditation? Or mediation without choosing a party?* [4].

*What will be left of all such places in Ukraine after this terrible war?* [4].

It is interesting to observe that in some cases the speaker uses rhetoric questions without question marks, making them questions and statements at the same time, so called quasi-questions:

*One can keep asking why we can't get weapons from you. Or why Israel has not imposed strong sanctions against Russia. Why it doesn't put pressure on Russian business* [4].

Apart from rhetoric questions the President uses ordinary questions giving the answer to them immediately leaving no room for speculation:

*But can you explain why we still turn to the whole world, to many countries for help? We ask you for help... Even for basic visas...* [4].

Aposiopesis in the sentences demonstrates the despair of the speaker seeking the protection.

Actually, the President even highlights that to give the answer to these questions is the matter of every person who has a common sense:

*I will leave you a choice of answer to this question* [4].

*But it is up to you, dear brothers and sisters, to choose the answer. And you will have to live with this answer, people of Israel* [4].

The importance and urgency of the issues is conveyed through the numerous uses of various kinds of repetition. The President repeats certain lexemes to highlight the value of them:

*Many, many Ukrainians as well* [4].

*We are in different countries and in completely different conditions* [4].

One of the most effective types of repetition is catch repetition. It helps to move on with the same thought making it more and more impactful:

*I don't need to convince you how intertwined our stories are. Stories of Ukrainians and Jews* [4].

In some cases, the second constituent of the catch repetition is strengthened with the help of the attribute:

*About the beginning of this invasion. Russia's invasion of Ukraine* [4].

The combination of a few stylistic devices within a certain lexical fragment makes the utterance extremely persuasive:

*And both times – as a tragedy. A tragedy for Ukrainians, for Jews, for Europe, for the world* [4].

In the quoted example we can observe a good combination of the catch repetition and gradation.

In general, gradation is one of the most favoured by the speaker and pragmatically powerful stylistic means:

*Everyone in Israel knows that your missile defense is the best. It is powerful. Everyone knows that your weapon is strong* [4].

Another means of showing the regular state of things and the nightmare of military aggression Ukraine suffers from is the use of contrast. In the following example the contrast used describes the desire of Ukrainian people to live:

*We intend to remain alive. Our neighbors want to see us dead* [4].

The following example illustrates in what way the life of Ukrainian people has been split:

*In the past, and now, in this terrible time* [4].

The example above demonstrates the impossibility of the compromise between the common sense and devil's wish:

*And mediation can be between states, not between good and evil* [4].

A set phrase, the origin of which dates back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, containing the lexemes of contrast meaning just emphasizes the closeness of the two peoples:

*And they will feel both joy and pain together* [4].

In the President's speech, a war portrait of a common Ukrainian is vividly depicted with the help of vocabulary units expressing the idea that Ukrainians are now the nation of homeless people, forced to be scattered all over the world in search of the place where they can be sheltered:

*The invasion, which has claimed thousands of lives, has left millions homeless. Made them exiles* [4].

*Our people are now scattered around the world* [4].

The only thing Ukrainians are seeking is peace:

*They are looking for security. They are looking for a way to stay in peace* [4].

All the time the President's speech is aimed at recalling the worst pages of Jewish history comparing it to the present situation in Ukraine, thus making the Jews sympathize with the Ukrainians:

*As you once searched* [4].

*That is why I have the right to this parallel and to this comparison* [4].

The combination of repetition and contrast even strengthen the desired effect:

*Our history and your history* [4].

The speaker provides the parallel between the events of the WW2 and current war in Ukraine putting the equal sign between the Nazi party, the Kremlin and Moscow:

*When the Nazi party raided Europe and wanted to destroy everything* [4].

*Listen to what the Kremlin says. Just listen!* [4].

*But listen to what is sounding now in Moscow* [4].

Following this logic, the President compares the tragedy of Jewish people and Ukrainian people meaning genocide of both nations – the Jews were exterminated by the Nazi and Ukrainian people by Russia:

*They called it “the final solution to the Jewish issue”* [4].

*Hear how these words are said again: “Final solution”. But already in relation, so to speak, to us, to the “Ukrainian issue”* [4].

Even the date of the 24<sup>th</sup> of February is viewed from the point of “Nazi-like aggression”. The President provides the parallel information on this date however different years:

*On February 24, 1920, the National Socialist Workers’ Party of Germany (NSDAP) was founded* [4].

*102 years later, on February 24, a criminal order was issued to launch a full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine* [4].

As it is known, the time of the military invasion is also quite symbolic as it coincides with the beginning of the WW2 as it was one of the most tragic periods in the history of the humankind which led to a great number of people’s lives losses:

*A party that took millions of lives. Destroyed entire countries. Tried to kill nations* [4].

Making the parallel between the two mentioned events, Volodymyr Zelenskyy equals the Nazi and Russian regimes.

Meaning the whole Russian federation, the President uses metonymy “Moscow” thus showing the point of view of the whole country is not taken into consideration, just the officials located in the capital of the country:

*This Russian invasion of Ukraine is not just a military operation, as Moscow claims* [4].

The sentences in the whole speech are quite short:

*It sounded openly. This is a tragedy. Once again, it was said at a meeting in Moscow. It is available on official websites* [4].

They sound very worried and deliver the speaker’s thought absolutely precisely.

The use of parcellation is extremely important as it really makes the sentences sharp and “painful”:

*A party that took millions of lives. Destroyed entire countries. Tried to kill nations* [4].

*Everything that Russian troops are now destroying. Deliberately. In front of the whole world* [4].

Such sentences are really powerful in terms of conveying the pragmatic aim and precise message. To increase the effect, the repetition of the possessive pronoun “our” is used which helps to show the Ukrainian nation does not claim the right for foreign issues, the people are protecting their own mother land:

*Destroying our children, our families. Our state. Our cities. Our communities. Our culture* [4].

Ukrainian President’s speech has got a wide acclaim because of its pragmatic power and straightforwardness. As far as some painful moments from Israel history were touched upon, there were even people who criticised it for being too hard and painful in relation to the national memory. The research is not aimed

at investigating this side of the speech but at the linguostylistic devices that caused it, with allusion being the key one.

First of all, the President quotes the words of the ex-Prime Minister of Israel, one of the key politicians in the world. Doing this, the speaker intentionally highlights her connection with Ukraine as she was born in Kyiv:

*That is why I want to remind you of the words of a great woman from Kyiv, whom you know very well. The words of Golda Meir* [4].

In the following example the place where the Jewish people living in Kyiv were shot by the Nazi; Holocaust – one of the most tragic periods in the history of the Jewish nation – was also touched upon in the speech:

*You saw Russian missiles hit Kyiv, Babyn Yar. You know what kind of land it is. More than 100,000 Holocaust victims are buried there. There are ancient Kyiv cemeteries. There is a Jewish cemetery. Russian missiles hit there* [4].

Another holy place and person that have attitude to the Jews and culture were also mentioned in the speech as in the course of Russian aggression they could also be hit as the town Uman where the mentioned above things are located was also struck by the missiles:

*On the first day of this war, Russian projectiles hit our city of Uman. A city visited by tens of thousands of Israelis every year. For a pilgrimage to the tomb of Nachman of Breslov* [4].

It is evident that touching such sensitive topics is absolutely intentional which is proved by the words of the President himself:

*I am sure that every word of my address echoes with pain in your hearts. Because you feel what I’m talking about* [4].

Speaking about the choice Jewish people have to make, the President even calls to the sense of gratitude that the Jews have to feel taking into consideration the events dated back to the time when Ukrainian saved the Jews from the Nazi while being endangered because of doing it:

*Ukrainians have made their choice. 80 years ago. They rescued Jews* [4].

Moreover, the President refers to the notion of *Righteous Among the Nations* used by Israel to describe those non-Jewish people who saved the Jews from extermination during Holocaust:

*That is why the Righteous Among the Nations are among us* [4].

The list of the evidences for Ukraine to be supported by Israel is really impressive, and here the President does not address just to the Knesset, but the people of Israel stating that now it is time to pay the debts and support Ukraine in their term:

*People of Israel, now you have such a choice* [4].

For this the imperative sentence-addressing is even used:

*People of Israel!* [4]

In general, the speech is full of the vocabulary expressing the idea of war, aggression and destruction:

*About the beginning of this invasion* [4].

*102 years later, on February 24, a criminal order was issued to launch a full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine* [4].

*But the threat is the same: for both us and you – the total destruction of the people, state, culture* [4].

*This Russian invasion of Ukraine is not just a military operation, as Moscow claims. This is a large-scale and treacherous war aimed at destroying our people. And everything that makes Ukrainians Ukrainians* [4].

Unlike a good tradition of using a considerable number of different types of metaphors in the political speeches, the one

of the President Zelensky does not really contain a lot, however it directly sends the message to the audience – those who are indifferent are the participants of a crime:

*And I will note only one thing – indifference kills* [4].

**Conclusions.** As it is widely stated by a number of political scientists and experts, the speech of Volodymyr Zelensky can definitely become a turning point in the relations between Ukraine and The State of Israel. Taking into consideration the reaction of the people in the Knesset, the pragmatic aim set by Ukrainian President was completely reached having proved that Ukraine is united in its desire to live freely, independently and for the sake of its own dreams, and not other people's sick fantasies and populist ideas. His speech was both emotive and emotional, thus the whole range of linguo-stylistic means and devices applied served this aim successfully.

#### References:

1. Голоднов А. В. Лингвопрагматические особенности персуазивной коммуникации (на примере современной немецкоязычной рекламы) : автореф. дис. на соискание степени канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 "Германские языки". СПб, 2003. 23 с.
2. Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke; New York : Palgrave Macmillan. 2004. С. 263.
3. Лосева І. В. Мовностилістичні ознаки політичних промов. *Нова філологія*. 2012. № 50. С. 64–66.
4. Speech by President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelensky in the Knesset [Електронний ресурс]. URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/promova-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelenskogo-v-kneseti-73701> (дата звернення: 27.03.2022).

**Головня А., Коваленко С. Лінгвостилістичні засоби прагматичного впливу на аудиторію (на матеріалі промови Президента України Володимира Зеленського у Кнесеті)**

**Анотація.** Статтю присвячено аналізу промови Президента України Володимира Зеленського до Кнесету

Ізраїлю, спричинену військовою агресією Російської Федерації в Україні, яка почалася 24 лютого 2022 року. З лінгвістичної точки зору ця промова є яскравим прикладом політичного дискурсу, оскільки містить значну кількість різного роду мовних засобів, які підсилюють та доповнюють один одного. У статті проводиться аналіз використаних у промові лінгвостилістичних засобів створення прагматичного впливу з метою донесення інформації та переконання слухачької аудиторії у закладених спікером у промові ідеях. У статті було встановлено основні лінгвостилістичні мовні засоби та проаналізовано механізми, за допомогою яких здійснюється відповідний вплив на аудиторію. Серед основних лінгвостилістичних засобів, використаних у промові, найбільш вживаними є значна кількість лексичних одиниць на позначення дій, пов'язаних з військовою агресією, нинішнім станом українців та близькістю українського та єврейського народів, а також лексичні одиниці з протилежним значенням, що вказують на життя українського народу до війни та після її початку. Крім того, автор промови використав цілу низку синтаксичних засобів, які створюють ефект напруги та тривоги: короткі речення, парцеляція, апосіопеза, градація, паралельні конструкції, різного роду повтори, риторичні питання та квазі-риторичні питання. Одним із найбільш дієвих лінгвістичних засобів є алюзія, за допомогою якої спікер переносить аудиторію до найбільш чітких моментів історії, тим самим викликаючи емоції та спогади. На відміну від більшості відомих політичних промов, метафора та метонімія не є частими. Враховуючи широкий розголос та реакцію суспільства на цю промову, вважаємо, що автор промови впорався з поставленим перед ним завданням та, використовуючи цілий арсенал лінгвостилістичних засобів, успішно виконав задуману прагматичну функцію.

**Ключові слова:** промова, політична промова, лінгвостилістичні засоби, прагматичний вплив.