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The topicality of the research is stipulated by the general tendency of modern studies to the analysis of cognitive pragmatic aspect of the utterance, implicit world of foreign language culture, intertextual relations of literary text and its stylistically relevant parameters. Various problems arise; they are related to the recognition of allusions in the literary texts by the listener, the desire to use them without losing their artistic shade of meaning and transferring functions they perform in the original of work of art, as well as to the identification of the best ways to reconstruct them.

Subject of the research are the allusions, found in the English texts of political pre-election debates speeches of the US president candidates in 2016, D. Trump and H. Clinton. Means of allusions representation, verbalized units, found in the English texts of speeches of D. Trump and H. Clinton in the number 121 units constitute the object of the research. The materials of the three TV debates, totally 68 pages of the text, 43134 characters have been analyzed for the given research. The theoretical basis of the article is the works of A. Kirilina1, M. Tomskaya, O. L. Bessonova2 and O.I. Goroshko3. Gender relations are fixed in the language in the form of culturally determined stereotypes, imprinted on the person's speech behavior and on the processes of its linguistic socialization.

The study aims at identifying cognitive-pragmatic potential of allusions in the English political discourse and determining different ways of allusions embodiment by means of stylistic devices of the English language. It presupposes a solution of such objectives: specify the content of term notion “gender in political aspect” in modern linguistics;
- determine the types and mechanisms of allusions in political discourse;
- identify main characteristic features and functional traits of political discourse;
- describe the possibility of verbalization of allusions in the pre-election speeches of D. Trump and H. Clinton;
- explore pragmatic potential of lexical means of allusion representation in political speeches.

Main part. Gender differentiation of political discourse has become possible after the women became active participants of the political process. Despite the fact that the speech of the weaker sex is characterized by expressiveness and inconsistency, their political discourse tends to “masculinity” which is a distinctive feature of the political process expressed by the use of metonymy, metaphor and allusion. Verbal aggression, intolerant interruption of the interlocutors by each other, negativeness of verbal attack is equally reflected in the speeches of politicians of both sexes4.

4Butova I. “Henderna skladova u politichnomu dyskursi SShA ta Ukrainy” [Gender component in political discourse of the USA and Ukraine], Movoznавство, Науковий відкрив, 2012, N 1, P. 60–62.
Aggression and uncompromising stand of political polemics of the XXI century reduces the chances for singling out some peculiarities of typical female utterance which was previously characterized by a “bit softer” vocabulary. According to O. Bessonova there doesn’t exist any fundamental differences in the linguistic behavior of men and women, but some distinctions do occur at all levels of the language. As the scientist mentions, gender differentiation is mostly represented on phonological and discursive levels and less – on the lexical and syntactical ones.

Women and men use language differently in certain microgroups. Men tend to participate in hierarchical groups where they strive for achieving the leading positions. This means they use language units in such a way that they are able to achieve the desired goal. Opposition, confrontation or the fight is a ritual for them, that is why they are successful in the debate. Ethics of communication of women and men also differs. The things women find dominant are quite natural for men. Men like language duels, and women try to avoid verbal attacks.

The study of linguistic behavior of men and women shows that women’s speeches are often too expressive, emotional, not always consistent.

The text is not necessarily “female”, if it was written by a woman, and vice versa. Men need to demonstrate their masculinity brightly. Of course, it is difficult to analyze political writing on the subject of gender markerdom, as there are official requirements to both carrying the polemics and business writing. However, a specific kind of written communication is characteristic for some representatives of a political life on the pages of their own live journal, a progressive interactive form of informal dialogue.

For example, H. Clinton often uses constructions If I can, I’m humbled in her speeches: “We have a full agenda, so let me, if I can, just emphasize just a few points”. “I am honored and humbled to call President Mandela my friend”.

Gender peculiarities of political speech are well traced on the material of allusions, since hints, references to common facts characterize the speaker from the position of gender to the best advantage. It should be noted, that allusions serve to enrich the speech, enhance its expressiveness. In American political public speeches allusions serve as a means of creating intertext, which represents compressed information, received from the source text. Allusive unit adds a new meaning and establishes parallels. Allusions contribute to the obtaining of new, additional information from the already known image – precedent-related name, situation or text.

Thus, in the basis of this stage of investigation lies the study of the language means which reflect psycho-emotional condition of the US presidential candidates in 2016, D. Trump and H. Clinton, and fully reveal the peculiarities of functioning of allusions in their political pre-election debates.

Most researchers believe that the language of woman-politician is more expressive than that of a man, women take up a defensive position more often, while men start with a certain pressure, interrupt, speak aggressively and assertively.

We cannot say that H. Clinton’s speeches are too emotional, but she tries to speak consistently, to answer questions, building a consistent report, and D. Trump denies, protests, gives cross-talks, interrupting her. In the following example repeating allusion “President Obama” D. Trump eliminates the previous message, mentioned by H. Clinton:

**TRUMP:** So is it President Obama’s fault?
**CLINTON:** before you even announced.
**TRUMP:** Is it President Obama’s fault?
**CLINTON:** Look, there are differences...
**TRUMP:** Secretary, is it President Obama’s fault?

Furthermore, in our opinion, H. Clinton’s remarks are often groundless and sound like empty promises, because they are not certified by specific explanations of how to achieve those goals she speaks about: **CLINTON:** Well, at least I have a plan to fight ISIS.

Well, I hope the fact-checkers are turning up the volume and really working hard. Donald supported the invasion of Iraq.

Trying to influence the feelings of the audience in the first debate the Secretary starts her speech mentioning her granddaughter: The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be and what kind of future we'll build together. Today is my granddaughter's second birthday, so I think about this a lot.

D. Trump’s political language is characterized by emotionality, sharp tone, attracting much attention, causing noise. His displeasure and negative attitude to Barack Obama administration he expresses skillfully using the means of comparing the economy with the historical period of the Great Depression:

**TRUMP:** Now, look, we have the worst revival of an economy since the Great Depression. And believe me: We're in a bubble right now. And the only thing that looks good is the stock market, but if you raise interest rates even a little bit, that's going to come crashing down.

We are in a big, fat, ugly bubble. And we better be awfully careful.

Our airports are like from a third world country.

Political statements of H. Clinton are less categorical, although she tries with all her inherent correctness to be polite in the debate, referring to Trump allegedly unpaid taxes:

**CLINTON:** So if he's paid zero, that means zero for troops, zero for vets, zero for schools or health. And I have no reason to believe that he's ever going to release his tax returns, because there's something he's hiding.

However, when D. Trump’s aggression becomes too obvious and passes to the offences:

She doesn’t have the look. She doesn't have the stam-

---


9 Ibid.
ina. I said she doesn't have the stamina. And I don’t believe she does have the stamina. To be president of this country, you need tremendous stamina. She's got experience, but it's bad experience. And this country can’t afford to have another four years of that kind of experience; H. Clinton also allows herself to use disrespectful language, units with negative connotation, citing her opponent, in this case it seems that she has prepared these “quotes” in advance, but till the last moment she was trying to hold back, not to repeat them, but the situation called for immediate action:

CLINTON: You know, he tried to switch from looks to stamina. But this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs and dogs, and someone who has said pregnancy is an inconvenience to employers, who has said... ... women don’t deserve equal pay unless they do as good a job as men. And one of the worst things he said was about a woman in a beauty contest. He loves beauty contests, supporting them and hanging around them. And he called this woman “Miss Piggy”. Then he called her “Miss Housekeeping”, because she was Latina. Donald, she has a name. Her name is Alicia Machado.

Taking into consideration the above mentioned, we can say that is really difficult to determine purely “male” or “female” text, because political discourse dictates its own rules, and the opponents are required to keep the format of the program, requirements of presentation of their reports, while disputing. Candidates’ pre-election speeches are about equally emotive, at the same time D. Trump sounds more aggressive and H. Clinton’s expressions are not always convincing, are not supported by objective data.

Political discourse in the English language nowadays operates and logically allots to men linguistic characteristics of dominance, leadership, activities, publicity, rationality and willpower, and to women – the image of indecision, hesitation, passivity, dependence, lack of logical thinking and desire for achievement. In such way certain oppositions are lined up and are easily observed in the linguistic behavior of men and women. Gender markers of masculinity in political discourse are as follows: terminology, striving for maximum precise nomination, use of assessing adjectives, as well as abstract nouns, it makes possible to define the masculine language behavior of a politician as “instrumental”. At the lexical level semantics of instinctive sphere is clearly seen in relief and in syntax short imperative “instrumental”. When analyzing specific events, creating new occurrences of certain units use.

There are the units used by both politicians and those used by each of them separately for different purposes. In their pre-election discourse many figures of paraphrasing can be traced – they are used to mitigate the unpleasant messages or, on the contrary, to strengthen the influence on the audience, e.g. in response to D. Trump’s attack on Hillary’s husband, former President Bill Clinton: “If you look at Bill Clinton, far worse. Bill Clinton was abusive to women”, H. Clinton attacks mentioning D. Trump’s racist remarks about decent people of America: “He never apologized to Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the Gold Star family whose son, Captain Khan, died in the line of duty in Iraq. And Donald insulted and attacked them for weeks over their religion”. The reaction to allusion-antonym is the same type of stylistic transfer. Similar phenomenon is observed among the place names. Direct opposition of countries to which each of them feels their own drawn or antipathy:

TRUMP: Because they’re using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China, and many other countries are doing the same thing. // Our jobs are fleeing the country. They’re going to Mexico.

CLINTON: There’s no doubt now that Russia has used cyber attacks against all kinds of organizations in our country... // I’ve been to countries where governments either forced women to have abortions, like they used to do in...
China, or forced women to bear children, like the used to do in Romania.

By means of quantitative method we managed to show statistics of allusions use by D. Trump and H. Clinton. Thus, we verified 121 allusive phrases in D. Trump’s and H. Clinton’s speeches. They are distributed as follows (see Table 1). Quantitative indices show that in the researched speeches D. Trump appeals to socially important historical events, everyday facts, references to famous persons, hints on world events of various kinds, place names, documents, international treaties, organizations, media, etc. 19% more often than his opponent H. Clinton. That is, his speech is more expressive, imaginative, represents an attractive material for analysis from the point of view of linguistics.

Table 1

Quantitative indices of allusions use in the pre-election speeches of D. Trump and H. Clinton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allusions</th>
<th>D. Trump</th>
<th>H. Clinton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthroponyms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statesmen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Militaries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalists</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorists</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportmen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film directors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War heroes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International treaties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, ethnicity, religion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Epoch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions. Allusion in political speeches in pragmatic terms fulfills the function of convincing voters, helps to change the perception of the facts and events that may cause antipathy by the audience. It focuses on both the major and minor details, sometimes replacing important to the background. Most frequently allusion in political discourse can be seen in such aspects as work and private lives of politicians and their environment, economic and political activities of the authorities and political parties, elections, military campaigns, means of attack and defense, terrorist or anti-terrorist campaign, negotiations, summits in the media, espionage etc. It is a kind of semantic manipulation tool, the task of which is to develop the recipients’ world-view, influence on their mind and control over their behavior. From the lips of politicians these concepts sound differently. In some they are positive, in others – negative, because each politician fills these terms with one’s own content. The method of creating ambiguity of the key political concepts is used for manipulation of the listener’s consciousness and submission of their views the system of views of the speaker.
English language

prognoses to do achieve. Gender differences in language representation are mainly on the phonological and discourse level, and only in a lesser extent on the lexical and syntactic levels.

Gender differences in political language are well illustrated by allusions, as implicit references to well-known facts best characterize the speaker's stance. Allusions serve to enrich discourse, increase its expressiveness. In American political public speeches, allusions serve as a means of creating intertextuality, which is important for the audience. Allusions add new meaning, renew parallels. Thanks to allusions, new, additional information emerges from the known image – precedent name, situation, and the like, in the text. Gender, “masculine” or “feminine”, as political discourse dictates its rules, and opponents are obliged to comply with the form of transmission, requirements of building speeches, conducting debates.

Pre-election speeches of candidates are emotionally colored in almost the same way, while D. Trump's speech is more aggressive, and H. Clinton's speech is not always convincing, not supported by objective data.

Allusion in political discourse serves the function of convincing the electorate, helping to change the audience's perception of facts and events that may evoke antipathy. It focuses attention on important and secondary details, sometimes pushing the main point into the background. Allusion in political discourse is most often hidden in such aspects as the activity and private life of politicians and their parties, economic and political activity of public and political structures, parties, elections, regional campaigns, surprise attacks, terrorism, and counter-terrorism campaigns, negotiations, talks at ZMI, espionage. This is the way to make sense of the inherited meaning, making it possible to influence the audience's opinion, moving on to its solidity and setting the agenda.

Phrases: allusion, political discourse, stylistic means, gender differentiation, pre-election political speech, pragmatics of text.

Oksana Makovska – lecturer of the Department of Foreign Languages of Bukovinian State Medical University, executive in charge of the scientific research work of the department, author of over 60 scientific and methodological articles. Research interests: cognitive linguistics, verbalization of lexical units in branch terminological systems in Ukrainian and English.

Mykhailo Vakhotskyi – senior lecturer of the Department of Foreign Languages of Bukovinian State Medical University, co-author of the scientific research work of the department, author of over 40 scientific and methodological articles. Research interests: functioning of medical terms with the onymic component.

Received: 09.05.2017
Advance Access Published: June, 2017

© O.Makovska, M. Vakhotskyi, 2017