

Rafayel HARUTYUNYAN
Yerevan State University

LINGUISTIC MEANS OF EXPRESSING VERBAL AGGRESSION IN POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

The present paper is an attempt to highlight some of the linguistic means of expressing verbal aggression in political communication. The object of investigation is the study of verbal aggression from pragmatic perspectives mainly focusing on the instances of verbal aggression in English-speaking politicians' speeches aimed at revealing linguistic units used to verbally attack the opponent. The main task is to find a rapport between those language means and effects they produce as well as to analyze the level of their intensity based on the contexts they are unfolding in.

Key words: *political communication, verbal aggression, level of intensity, layers of vocabulary, linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts*

In accordance with the actual facts, aggression has always been in the history of the mankind with the development of human civilization. Life is inevitably full of conflicts and these conflicts can be ranged from a simple personal choice to a global war. As far as human beings are concerned, they are the most persistent from all the creatures towards the violence as a response to a conflict and, of course this can bring to an endless conflict to the world. Because aggression is so complicated to define, on the largest scale, it is accepted to include the following categories: physical aggression, e.g. striking, quarreling, psychological aggression and intimidation, e.g. threats, blackmail, insults, sexual harassment, e.g. wolf whistles, offensive remarks, indecent assaults and verbal aggression, e.g. name-calling, shouting, baiting, etc. In psychology, the term aggression refers to define behaviours that can cause both physical and psychological harm. Psychological aggression can have different purposes, e.g. to express anger or hostility, intimidate or threaten, express possession, assert dominance and this type of behaviour mainly centers to cause someone either physical or mental harms. Psychological aggression, is increasingly being recognized as a destructive and harmful behaviour that occurs within intimate relationships /Follingstad, 2007: 439/. Physical aggression, according to Cambridge dictionary, is behaviour causing or threatening physical harm towards others. It includes hitting, kicking, biting, using weapons, and breaking toys or other possessions /Cambridge Advanced Learners' Dictionary, UK, 1995/. As is known, from the early ages people have always been facing with the physical aggression which has even more consequences than verbal aggression. When someone does an act of a physical aggression within the environment, people

can possibly suffer from injuries that make them be away from the society or even they are left with irrecoverable disabilities. As for verbal aggression, in the following article “*The dimensionality of the verbal aggressiveness scale*”, it is defined as the act of using aggressive language on a target, a person’s attitude toward using aggressive language /Levine, Beatty, Limon, 2004: 245-265/.

Verbal aggression coincides with the aggressive language and it should be added in this connection that the aggressiveness in language is a kind of communication and behaviour where one expresses his/her feelings, needs, and rights without regard or respect for the needs, rights, and feelings of others /Jones, Wortman, 1973/. Turning into a more detailed examination of the problem we can state that the aggressive language can damage the self-concept of its victims through social media, and verbal aggression can destroy civil discourse in groups and large organizations.

Aggressive language can range from polite to rude. Politeness does not always appear to be in the realm of etiquette and manners as elegant messages can also contain savage outcomes, e.g. the act of flattery typically makes use of excessive commendatory speeches for the purpose of creating a favourable attitude in that person towards the flatterer. It is worth mentioning that there are different ways to categorize aggression and violence from acts of physical aggression that do not have a damaging consequence to acts of violence that do and as an act of verbal aggression that can cause paramilitary conflicts and interpersonal abuse.

Along with the development of so many social and political problems in the world the discussions on them become more heated and intriguing therefore, the cases of verbal aggression increase and need linguistic investigation. In this paper, a special emphasis is laid on political discourse as it plays an important role in shaping people's thoughts and attitudes.

Discourses can be used for asserting power and knowledge, and for resistance and critique. The speaker expresses his/her ideological content in texts as does the linguistic form of the text. What is more, texts are selected and organized syntactic forms whose "content-structure" reflects the ideological organization of a particular area of social life. Political discourse, as a sub-category of discourse in general, can be based on two criteria: functional and thematic /Dijk, 2011/.

Political discourse is a result of politics and it is historically and culturally determined. It fulfills different functions due to different political activities. Political discourse is thematic because its topics are primarily related to politics such as political activities, political ideas and political relations. Power is a complex and an abstract idea and has a significant influence on our lives. Language has a key role in the exchange of values in social life and transforming power into right and obedience into duty. It may both create power and become an area where power can be applied.

Thus, the analysis allows to say that both verbal and physical aggressions harm society individually and collectively. And despite the fact, that there exist thousands of various ways that hold our interest and attention, political communication is still an indispensable part of media representations in terms of aggression and violence. The following analysis of the political speeches is to show how verbal aggression is expressed through the use of language and which are the contexts it is unfolding in.

The factual data of the research are political speeches taken from English speaking politicians' electoral campaigns, governmental debates, dialogic and monologic talks, interviews and etc. The choice of the examples analyzed in this paper is largely conditioned by the fact that compared to other political events taking place these are the platforms where politicians use different linguistic strategies to verbally attack and destroy the conversational asymmetry between their opponent and attain the state of the powerful and therefore, the cases of verbal aggression are more prevalent.

In order to clarify the point mentioned above let us start with the analysis of the following dialogic speech act which is taken from the conversation between CNN Reporter and Donald Trump.

Of special interest is the following example:

CNN REPORTER – Thank you Mr. President. I wanted to challenge you on one of the statements that you made in the tail end of the campaign in the midterms.

DONALD TRUMP (*interrupting*) – ***Here we go.***

CNN REPORTER – Well if you don't mind Mr. President.

DONALD TRUMP (*interrupting and twisting his finger*) – ***Let's go, common.***

CNN REPORTER (Continuing his point that Trump has interrupted) – That this caravan was an invasion.

DONALD TRUMP (*with arrogance and ignorance*) – ***I consider it to be an invasion.***

CNN REPORTER – As you know, Mr. President, the caravan was not an invasion, it's a group of migrants moving up from central America towards the borders with the US.

DONALD TRUMP (Grinning) – ***Thank you for telling me that. I really appreciate it.***

CNN REPORTER – Why did you characterize it as such? I... (*Trump interrupts*)

DONALD TRUMP – ***Because I consider it as an invasion. You and I have a difference of opinion.***

CNN REPORTER – But do you think that you demonized immigrants in this election?

DONALD TRUMP – Not at all. I want them to come in to the country but they have to come in legally. You know, they have to come in Jim, through a process. I want it to be a process and I want people to come in and we need the people.

CNN REPORTER – But your campaign.... (Trump interrupts)

DONALD TRUMP – *Wait, Wait, Wait.* You know why we need the people, don't you? Because we have hundreds of companies moving in, we need the people.

CNN REPORTER – Your campaign had an ad showing migrants climbing over walls and so on.

DONALD TRUMP – *Well that's true. They weren't actors.*

CNN REPORTER – They are not going to be doing that.

DONALD TRUMP – *They weren't actors, Well, no, it was true. Do you think they were actors? They weren't actors. They didn't come from Hollywood.*

DONALD TRUMP – *I think you should let me run the country, you run the CNN and, if you did it well, your ratings would be much better.*

CNN REPORTER – Well let me ask...If I may ask you one more question?

DONALD TRUMP – *That's enough (furiously).*

CNN REPORTER – Mr. President, if I may ask you one more question? Are you worried...?

DONALD TRUMP – *That's enough.*

DONALD TRUMP – *That's enough.*

DONALD TRUMP – *That's enough.*

CNN REPORTER – The other folks have had... Pardon me Ma'am, I'm, Excuse me.

DONALD TRUMP – *That's enough.*

CNN REPORTER – Mr. President, I had one other question, if I may ask.

DONALD TRUMP – Peter let's go.

CNN REPORTER – On the Russia investigation are you concerned that you may have indictments?

DONALD TRUMP – *I'm not concerned about anything with the Russian investigation, because it's a hoax.*

DONALD TRUMP – *That's enough, put down the mic!*

CNN REPORTER – Mr. President, are you worried about indictments coming down in this investigation.

DONALD TRUMP – *I tell you what CNN should be ashamed of itself having you working for them. You are a rude, terrible person. You shouldn't be working for CNN. Go ahead!* /<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v3abZ4aAGUU/>.

The analysis of aggression as a complex social phenomenon and thus its verbal manifestation, which is the primary focus of our research should by all means begin with the analysis of the context it is unfolding in. If we view politics as a big context where “so many incredible things can take place” in order to attain the state of the powerful, and if we view the events taking place in it like the pre-electoral campaign of the US elections as a smaller context, we cannot exclude the presence of aggression (both verbal and non-verbal) in the speeches and moreover in the debates between the two candidates. So, this is one of the primary findings of our research that the words that can express verbal aggression are not violent and aggressive or offensive as such but the context they appear in makes them aggressive or offensive. The first point to be made here is that in the adduced example there are the following linguistic means which make the verbal aggression possible in the context: firstly, we come across instances of **irony** expressed with gap-filling words that are normally used in daily conversations like:

e.g. Here we go, Let's go, common, thank you for telling me that, I really appreciate it, they weren't actors, they didn't come from Hollywood,

Irony is also expressed by means of a conditional sentence:

e.g. I think you should let me run the country, you run the CNN and, if you did it well, your ratings would be much better.

It does not require a close examination to see in this example that not one word or word combination but the whole range of sentences make the speech ironic i.e. the means that are used to express verbal aggression are common words but the micro-context – the interruptions they were followed by make them sound aggressive. The conditional sentence illustrated above comes to show that conditionality can be part of the expression of verbal aggression. This means that conditional sentences themselves are not aggressive acts, but in this particular example the statement that preceded it made it sound aggressive.

In the same dialogue we come across examples of repetition as well:

e.g. Wait, Wait, Wait, That's enough.

In this context the extra-linguistic factors: the furious manner it was expressed with and the interruptions they were preceded by make repetition an aggressive act detaching repetition from its common use (in poetry to make the poetic sounding of the speech more impressive and attractive). Imperative sentences and **denials** expressed with **negative** sentences may cause verbal aggression:

e.g. That's enough, put down the mic! Wait, Wait, Wait! I'm not concerned about anything with the Russian investigation, because it's a hoax.

Adjectives expressing rudeness and negativity also express verbal aggression:

e.g. I tell you what CNN should be ashamed of itself having you working for them. – You are a rude, terrible person. – You shouldn't be working for CNN.

We have to add here that these examples are taken from a dialogue hence the probability that different linguistic units (imperative or negative sentences, adjectives) may appear to be aggressive is higher as compared to monologic speech like this one: President Donald Trump: Iran's Aggression Increased After Nuclear Deal | NBC News /<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hU9DLdpmEtI/>

e.g. The US would withdraw from the Iran nuclear deal. ***This horrible one-sided deal allowed Iran to continue its path towards a bomb and the regime cash lifeline when they needed it the most. They were in big, big trouble, they needed cash, we gave it to him. In the years since the deal was signed Iran's aggression only increased. The regime used new funds from the deal to support terrorism, build nuclear capable missiles and foment chaos. Following America's withdrawal, the US began reimposing a nuclear-related sanction on Iran.*** All US nuclear-related sanctions will be in full force by early November. After that the US will pursue additional sanctions tougher than ever before to counter before the entire range of Iran's malign conduct. ***Any individual or entity who fails to comply with these sanctions will face severe consequence.***

There is every reason to believe that verbal aggression is achieved here with the help of adjectives having negative connotations (***horrible, one-sided***), by means of repetition of one and the same adjective that intensifies the description (in a big, big trouble). More importantly in the last sentence of the passage we come across conditionality expressed not directly by means of an “if” clause, but by means of a secondary clause which hides but implies condition. If we compare this sentence with the one expressed by Trump in the interview with CNN reporter (see above) we see that there is a difference in the manifestation of verbal aggression by means of conditional sentences. In one case it can directly be expressed with an “if” clause in another case it can be a disguised condition depending on the choice of the author.

Coming back to the dialogic speech another example should be taken into consideration. The example is from the conversations between Donald Trump and Media reporters with the following reference /<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jt15XK7QP38/>:

Reporter 1 – There had been a report out that 48 bomb threats have been made against Jewish centers all across the country in the last couple of weeks. There are people who are committing anti-Semitic acts or threatening to ... (Trump interrupts)

Donald Trump – *You see, he said he was going to ask a very simple question, an easy question. And it is not. It's not. Not a simple question. Not a fair question. Okay sit down. I understand the rest of your question, so here's the story folks.* Number one, I am the least anti-Semitic person that you have ever seen in your entire life. Number two, racism. The least racist person, in fact we did very

well relative to other people running as a republican. *Quiet, Quiet, Quiet. See he lied about. He was going to get up and ask a very straight, simple question. So, welcome to the world of the media.*

It is not difficult to surmise that here as in the previous examples the speech containing verbal aggression is preceded by interruption. The linguistic items creating verbal aggression are as follows: firstly, the speaker begins his speech with the expression “*you see*” – a gap-filling word which is used both in formal and informal contexts and draws the attention of the listener to the topic of discussion.

Secondly, the speaker gives one and the same description to the question the reporter was about to ask with two different adjectives (*simple, easy*) underlining the primitivity of the question. Moving on, the speaker showing his attitude towards the question describes it as “*not a simple question, not a fair question*”. The speaker intentionally repeats the word “*question*” with different attributes next to it which makes the speech more aggressive. This same regularity is observed at the end of the speech as well when the speaker repeats the word “*quiet*” for several times.

Repeating the same word for the purpose of drawing attention to the speaker and his viewpoint is observed in the following example as well <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AuXXlgJdSXo/>:

Donald Trump – *Look Biden and his son are stone cold crooked and you know it. His son walks out with millions of dollars. The kid knows nothing. You know it and so do we. Go ahead and ask a question.*

Reporter 2 – The question sir was what did you want from Zalinski to do what about Vice president Biden and his son Hunter?

Donald Trump – *Are you talking to me? You haven't finished with me yet?*

Reporter 2 – Yeah, I was just to follow up of what I just asked you.

Donald Trump – *Listen, Listen, Listen, You ready? We have the president of Finland. Ask him a question.*

Reporter 2 – I have one for him. I just wanted to follow up on the one that I asked you.

Donald Trump – *Did you hear me? Ask him a question, please. I have given you a long answer, ask this gentleman a question, don't be rude.*

Reporter 2 – No sir, I don't want to be rude. I just wanted to have you to have a chance to answer the question I asked.

Donald Trump – *I've answered everything. It is whole hoax and you know who is playing into the hoax? People like you and the fake media that we have in this country and I say in many cases the corrupt media because you're corrupt.*

In general, we see here that the speaker (Donald Trump) repeats the word “*listen*” for three times in order to draw the reporter's attention to his statement and accompanies it with a question “*You ready?*” in order to intensify the utterance.

Irrespective of the speaker's motivation, this combination makes the speech more aggressive. In the same example we see that in two different cases interrogative sentences made the speech more aggressive (*Are you talking to me? Did you hear me?*) though their meaning as such is not aggressive at all. Verbal aggression in this dialogue is also realized via words bearing negative connotations (**hoax, the fake media, the corrupt media etc.**).

Moving on with our analysis of the linguistic manifestation of verbal aggression in political communication we would like to adduce some more examples where repeating the same word for several times can be considered to be verbal aggression:

e.g. Reporter 3 – Are you going to include the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus...

Donald Trump – *Do you want to set up the meeting? Do you want to set up the meeting?*

Reporter 3 – No, no, no,

Donald Trump – *Are they friends of yours? Set up the meeting, Let's go, set up the meeting. I would love to meet to Black Caucus. I think it's great. The Congressional Black Caucus, it's great.*

Obviously, the topic of the discussion (setting up the meeting) is being repeated by the same speaker three different times in the dialogue. This means that the anger and fury the speaker feels makes him repeat the same sentence for several times which results in verbal aggression and affects the audience and the person it is targeted to.

As we already mentioned both linguistic and extralinguistic factors may influence the overall sounding of the speech, in this particular research we are considering the aggressive sounding. However, the aggressiveness may be achieved not only with the help of macro and micro contexts of the utterance but also by means of pure linguistic units. Now let us consider the following example:

Reporter 4 – You said that the leaks are real, but the news is fake. I guess I don't understand, it seems that there's a disconnect there. If the information coming for those leaks is real then how can the stories be fake?

Donald Trump – The reporting is fake. Look, look, Jim, you know what it is. Here is the thing. The public isn't, you know, they read newspapers, they see television, they watch... they don't know if it's true or false.

Reporter 4 – Why not just say "it's just story I don't like"? When you call it fake news, you're undermining confidence in our news media, isn't that important?

Donald Trump – I understand *what you are*. You are right about that, expect this. See I know I should get good and I should get bad. *And sometimes, I'll say "wow" that's going to be a great story" and I'll get killed. I know what's good and what's bad. I'd be a pretty good reporter. Not as good as you.*

Here, it is worth mentioning that aggressiveness can be noticed in the way Donald Trump refers to the reporter (what you are) – by using an interrogative word that is normally used to refer to objects not people. At the end of his speech the speaker expresses irony comparing him with the reporter (not as good as you) and using an adjective having positive connotation. So, it can be inferred that not only adjectives bearing negative connotations but also those with positive connotation may express verbal aggression if used in a comparison.

In political discourse so many incredibly offensive and ironic instances of verbal aggression may be encountered like in the example: Presidential debate: Hillary Clinton calls Donald Trump “a puppet” for Vladimir Putin /https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-qIN1-z_JqQ/

e.g. Donald Trump – 1800 nuclear warheads and *she is playing chicken*, look from everything I see has no respect for this person.

Hillary Clinton – *Well that’s because he would rather have a puppet as president*. Oh, pop today. It’s pretty clear you won’t admit now, you are, Russians have engaged in cyber-attacks against the United States of America that you encouraged espionage against our people that you are willing to spout the Putin line sign up for his wish list rake up NATO do whatever he wants, to do and that you continue to get help from him because he has a very clear favorite in this race, so I think this is such an unprecedented we have never had a foreign government trying to interfere in our election.

It stands to reason that the two examples in bold show that if verbal aggression is expressed through irony it may go too “far” – becoming not innocent at all and can offend people deeply. At least in this example we see that from the similar response given by Hillary Clinton.

Interrogative sentences as mentioned earlier may also be indicators of verbal aggression, moreover, our research shows that they can be means to verbally abuse and mentally suppress the listener:

Speaking at the CNN GOP debate, candidates Donald Trump and Jeb Bush spar over what it takes to keep America safe /<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HKQgrOV27X0/>,

e.g. Donald Trump – Look the problem is we need toughness. Honestly, I think Jeb is a very nice person. He is a very nice person but we need tough people and we need toughness and we need intelligence and we need tough. Jeb said when they come across the southern border they come as an act of love.

Jeb Bush – You said on September 30th that ISIS was not a factor.

Donald Trump – *Am I talking or are you talking Jeb?*

Jeb Bush – I am talking right now, I am talking.

Donald Trump – *You can go back, you are not talking, you interrupted me, are you going to apologize? Am I allowed to finish?*

This example shows that interrogative sentences if used immediately after one another can convey a higher level of verbal aggression that cannot only influence the listener badly or offend him but also as we have already mentioned can cause verbal abuse, mental suppression to the listener. It is also worth mentioning that the questions mostly used for verbal abuse are general questions that contain more rhetoric and influential elements.

Besides the above-mentioned cases, verbal aggression is also expressed by means of free sentences where any linguistic unit can be used if the context and the content of the dispute make these sentences sound aggressive. Here is an example: US election 2020: highlights from the third Democratic presidential debate /https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F_TYe2wdaGg/,

Sen. Amy Clobuchar – Houston, we have a problem. This, *we have a guy there that is literally running our country like a game show, he would rather die than we'd.*

Sen. Kamala Harris – *President Trump, you spent the last two-and-the half years full time trying saw hate and devising among us and that is why we've got nothing done. You have used hate, intimidation, fear, and over 12000 lies as a way to destruct from your failed policies and your broken policies. The only reason you have not been indicted is because there was a memo at the Department of Justice that says sitting president cannot be charged with a crime.*

In the highlighted sentence we have a simile where two components (*running a country and running a game show*) are being compared, besides the colloquial word “*guy*” is used to refer to a president which shows both sarcasm and disrespect towards the latter.

The analysis undertaken within the scope of the current research comes to confirm the idea that political communication is one of the interesting aspects of linguistic investigation. Mainly concentrating on the language use in American politicians' speeches we have attempted to study the verbally aggressive and violent language with all its intensity trying to highlight which linguistic means are used to verbally attack the opponent and cause verbal abuse and mental suppression as well as to study verbal aggression via which politicians win political communication. The study of American politicians' speeches has brought us to the conclusion that words that can express verbal aggression are not violent and aggressive or offensive as such but the context they appear in makes them aggressive or offensive. Irony expressed with gap-filling words that are normally used in our daily conversation as well as irony expressed by conditional sentences, repetition and adjectives expressing rudeness and negativity can convey a higher level of verbal aggression. Repeating the same words, e.g. gap fillers which are used in both formal and informal contexts, has the purpose of drawing attention to the speaker and his viewpoint creating conversational dominance in terms of

asymmetry, i.e. unequal distribution of entitlements and rights. Verbal aggression can be expressed by linguistic and extra-linguistic factors that may influence on the overall sounding of the speech. When interrogative sentences are used immediately after one another, they can express verbal aggression that can not only influence the listener badly but also offend and cause verbal abuse and mental suppression. Verbal aggression is also expressed by means of “free sentences” where any linguistic sentences can be used if the context and content of the dispute make these sentences sound aggressive.

REFERENCE

1. Follingstad D. Rethinking Current Approaches to Psychological Abuse: Conceptual and Methodological Issues // *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, v.12. Kentucky University, 2007.
2. Galperin I.R. Stylistics. M.: Higher School, 1977.
3. Infante D. A., Wigley Ch. III Verbal Aggressiveness: an Interpersonal Model and Measure. Kent: The Kent State University Press, 2009.
4. Johnson P. A., Widnall Sh. E., Benya F. F. Sexual Harassment of Women. Washington, D.C.: The National Academic Press, 2018.
5. Jones E. E., Wortman C. Ingratiation: An Attributional Approach. Morristown: General Learning Press, 1973.
6. Levine T. R., Beatty M. J., Limon S. The Dimensionality of the Verbal Aggressiveness Scale // *Communications Monograph*, v. 71, 2004.
7. van Dijk T. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. SAGE Publications Ltd, 2011.
8. Wodak R. The Discourse of Politics in Action. Lancaster University, 2009.

SOURCES OF DATA

1. CALD – Cambridge Advanced Learners’ Dictionary, UK, 1995.
2. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v3abZ4aAGUU>
(last access:10.03.2020)
3. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hU9DLdpmEtI>
(last access: 05.02.2020)
4. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jtl5XK7QP38>
(last access:06.03.2020)
5. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AuXXlgJdSXo>
(last access:06.03.2020)
6. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-qIN1-z_JqQ
(last access:10.03.2020)

7. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HKQgrOV27X0>
(last access: 05.02.2020)
8. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F_TYe2wdaGg
(last access: 10.03.2020)

Ռ. ՀԱՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՅԱՆ – Խոսքային ագրեսիայի դրսևորման լեզվական միջոցները քաղաքական հաղորդակցության մեջ. – Սույն հոդվածն ուսումնասիրում է քաղաքական հաղորդակցության մեջ խոսքային ագրեսիայի դրսևորման լեզվական որոշ միջոցներ: Հոդվածի խնդրո առարկան խոսքային ագրեսիայի ուսումնասիրությունն է՝ գործաբանության տեսանկյունից, անգլալեզու քաղաքական գործիչների ելույթների նյութի հիման վրա: Քննության նպատակն է վեր հանել լեզվական այն միջոցները, որոնք կիրառվում են խոսքով գրուցակցի վրա ճնշում գործադրելու ընթացքում: Փորձ է կատարվում օրինաչափություններ գտնել լեզվական այդ միջոցների կիրառման ու նրանց ունեցած ազդեցության միջև, ինչպես նաև վերլուծել դրանց ուժգնության մակարդակը՝ ըստ գործածության համատեքստի:

Բանալի բառեր. քաղաքական հաղորդակցություն, խոսքային ագրեսիա, ուժգնության մակարդակ, բառապաշարի շերտեր, լեզվական և արտալեզվական համատեքստեր

Ր. АРУТЮНЯН – Лингвистические средства выражения вербальной агрессии в политическом общении. – Настоящая статья представляет собой попытку выделить некоторые языковые средства выражения вербальной агрессии в политической коммуникации. Объектом исследования является изучение вербальной агрессии с прагматической точки зрения, в частности, в её проявлении в выступлениях англоязычных политиков. Основной задачей исследования является выявление связи между языковыми средствами вербальной атаки на противника и теми эффектами, которые они производят, а также анализ уровня их интенсивности на основе контекстов, в которых они проявляются.

Ключевые слова: политическое общение, вербальная агрессия, уровень интенсивности, слои лексики, лингвистические и экстралингвистические контексты

Ներկայացվել է՝ 15.04.2020
Երաշխավորվել է ԵՊՀ Անգլիական բանասիրության ամբիոնի կողմից
Ընդունվել է տպագրության՝ 19.06.2020