

ABSTRACT

Subject matter: Specifics of argumentation in political discourse (based on the material of the English, Spanish and Russian languages)

Author: Galkin V. P.

Scientific supervisor: PhD in Philology, associate professor, professor Zaitseva O. L

Information about the sponsor organization: Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University; 9 Kalinin Ave., Pyatigorsk, Stavropol region, 357532.

Research relevance: discourse is a pretty new and understudied concept itself, let alone the specifics of argumentation in its separate genre. For the sake of its more thorough and complete studying a theoretical base – which the actual thesis can provide – is needed. It is necessary to carry out comparative analyses of argumentation specifics in different languages to study this theme intelligently, however there are not so many such studies.

Purpose: the analysis of the three items of political discourse in the different languages and identification of differences and similarities in argumentation in each of the three languages which enables to work out new models of studying and amplify knowledge.

Tasks: basing on the works of some distinguished linguists, to present their main ideas of the political discourse and argumentation; to choose ones we will be handling while studying this problem; to identify the methodology of debates argumentation specifics studying, basing on generally accepted approaches to argumentation and political discourse analyses; to carry out general and comparative analyses of the items of political discourse and identify differences and similarities between them in relation to argumentation specifics from syntactical and lexical points of view.

Theoretical and practical significance: the result of this study will be the analysis of argumentation specifics in political discourse, which can be further used in the course of lectures of linguistic specialization in such fields as theoretical linguistics, text and discourse theory, and the likes.

Results of the research: The study shows that a lot of both emotional and logical arguments were used in all the debates. However, the number of emotional arguments outweighed, as they are more understandable and comprehensible for the audience, and the essential objective of the politicians in the analyzed debates in the first place was to win out the audience, rather than to over-persuade their opponent. The language structure also affects the choice of lexical and syntactical means. The English language is an analytical language, so that the preference is given to different syntactical means and constructions. The Russian language is an inflectional language, so in the debates in Russian we see that lexical means prevail. The Spanish language is also an inflectional one, however the politicians' goal was to prove the incompetence of their opponent and the inefficiency of his program, rather than gain the audience's trust. Due to this reason the politicians used more logical arguments than emotional ones.

Recommendations: The analysis of argumentation could also touch the discourse structure of other languages.