

THE ISSUE OF AN ADDRESSEE IN A POLITICAL DISCOURSE

A great number of studies on the political discourse have been published in recent decades, which testifies to a considerable research interest towards this sphere of discourse studies. In some works on the issue this interest is explained by the following: 1) inner requirements of the linguistic theory; 2) political aspects of political thinking and its connections with political behaviour; 3) social needs and strivings to free political communication from manipulations with public thinking [1, p. 245]. The study of political discourse was greatly contributed by numerous Ukrainian and foreign researchers, and namely P. Bailey, A. Blackledge, F. Batsevych, P. Cap, K. Cart, P. Chilton, O. Chudinova, V. Demiankov, N. Fairclough, T. Haig, Ch. Hart, A. Musolff, N. Fairclough, U. Okulska, N. Reva, I. Shevchenko, L. Slavova, G. Street, T. van Dijk, R. Wodak and very many others. To that end, it is necessary to note that there exists an area of political discourse research which remains hardly investigated and, hence, presents a topical subject of studies. This is the nature and characteristic features of the political discourse addressee. The main aim of this paper is highlighting the most important aspects of political discourse addressee, as one of the main components of political discourse that needs thorough research.

In foreign linguistics the study of political research was and is largely exercised within the direction of critical discourse analysis (hereafter – CDA). This history of this direction started about three decades ago, and during this time the given direction spread to many countries of the world, having given start to a number of research journals and bulletins; some of them have acquired the status of periodicals. The acknowledged founder of CDA is T. van Dijk, who was quickly followed by his supporters N. Fairclough, R. Wodak and T. van Leeuwen; these scholars inspired quite a number of younger researchers. With the reference to other authors [6; 8; 9], T. van Dijk defined the main tasks of CDA in the following way:

- the subject of CDA is social problems;
- relations concerning power and power institutions are of a discursive nature;
- discourse possesses historical characteristics;
- discourse performs an ideological function;
- discourse is a component of culture and society;
- discourse analysis tasks are interpretive and explanatory;
- discourse is a form of social activity [16].

In the process of performing these tasks the brightest features of CDA as a linguistic doctrine are the interest to various forms of social inequality, to domineering and subordination which are continuously formed and copied through language and discourse. CDA representatives consider the language as a border notion which combines linguistic and social features, as an ideological and social construct which is originated by political, nationalistic, colonial or segregation activity in their various manifestations [13]. As to the issue of theoretical and methodological differences in the views of CDA representatives, T. van Dijk emphasized the absence of unique

approach to the methodology of this discourse direction; remarking that any method can be used for achieving the aim of the researcher [17]. T. van Leeuwen remarked that CDA representatives deal not only with the issues of discourse analysis proper, but with the criticism of social theories; and within the recent period social theories can dominate over the discourse analysis [18, p. 234]. With the research approach described, it seems logical that CDA studies are focused on the personalities of politicians and public figures (for who in their works there exist a number of special terminological expressions: political players/subjects [12; 15], public actors [16], actors [10], collective and individual agents [14], political representatives [7]). At the same time, however, such an object as an addressee, to whom the message is really intended, is left as if unnoticed and remains outside the focus of the researchers' attention. In the papers on political discourse one can come across only some fragmentary notes on a recipient of this discourse kind or short non-analytical observations [11; 20] when the context of the paper requires such notions. It should be emphasized that papers devoted to the study of political discourse addressee are really few in number. For instance, in A. Blackledge's book (Chapter 6) the political discourse addressee is noted as 'common people' in connection with re-contextualization techniques in the interpretation of political events. The author states that a politician can refer to the opinion of the part of political audience which meets his own interests, leaving all other opinions aside; and thus the real point of view of the political discourse addressee is distorted [5]. However, this scholar doesn't suggest any analysis of the category of the political discourse addressee either, considering it just as a collective recipient. A. Wiczorek claims in the introduction to her research that it refers primarily to the relationship between a speaker (a political figure) and his addressee. But her paper deals practically with the role of a speaker, because it is he who determines the degree of closeness between the discourse participants and in such a way creates their activity in the discourse reality [19, xii].

Of greater interest, in our opinion is the research made by T. Kaminskaya, the object of which is the addressee image in mass media texts [3]; the latter are understood as the texts of political plot. Hence, the addressee is considered as: a) a real individual; b) as a category participating in a communicative act; c) as a sociological category with its certain characteristics which are obtained by means of sociological research; d) as a text category.

The author focuses mostly on the study of social and economic issues while developing the classification of addressees of mass media texts and suggests her own view of the notion of the 'target audience' [3, pp. 174-183, 239]. In her classification of addressees of mass media texts the researcher uses notions suggested in those texts (so, they are mostly descriptive and non-analytical), and this makes the given classification uncertain and vague. The author comes to the conclusion that the system of addressees is moveable and determined by the social situation which is moveable in its turn [3, p. 238].

In Ukrainian linguistics the category of the political discourse addressee has not gained the research attention it deserves. In general terms, all important issues of an addressee category were highlighted in the book written by O. Vorobyova on the material of a short-short story. The scholar introduced the terms of 'a split addressee' on the basis of the following factors: the distribution of real, depicted and reflected communication; the definition of the reader's image as a modus of addressiveness

realization; the heterogeneous character of the image of a reader which is seen as a reflection of a dialogical interaction; the interrelation between an addressant and an addressee in a discourse. Consequently, the scholar suggests the typology of an addressee category, differentiating between three addressee types: a) a fictional addressee (i. e., an image of a belles-lettres piece); b) a hypothetical addressee (i.e., an addressee image as seen in an addressant's imagination that the text message is directed to and which acts as a mediator between the discourse author and the addressee); c) real addressee which is a recipient of a certain definite discourse [2, p. 138, 139].

As a particular type of an addressee of the political discourse, the further step of its study was exercised by Ukrainian linguists A. Prokopenko and N. Reva; they chose a political interview as the material of their research and they consider it to be a kind of media-political discourse [4]. The authors single out the following features of a media-political discourse addressee: social position, age, gender, psychological state, cognitive abilities, values, peculiarities of speech anticipation. On the basis of these characteristics they introduce certain typologies which are grounded on one or several of the given characteristics.

This study is the only known attempt of characterization of the political discourse addressee, and it certainly possesses certain research importance. However, the authors do not analyse the signified addressee types deeply, being focused rather on structural and linguistic specifics of the discourse genre which was the material of their research. And their typology was worked out on the basis of only one genre of the political discourse. We believe that their results should be applied to a broader discourse material, which evidently will lead to the further development of their classifications.

As the result of the exercised review it is possible to state that the greatest problem in the research level of the political discourse addressee is that this category is practically left outside the area of investigation, and particularly, outside the area of linguistic research. Such situation makes the given category a topical subject of study. It seems prospective to treat the issue of the political discourse addressee from the angle of cognitive linguistics as the constituent of a multimodal paradigm suggested as the methodology of such a study.

REFERENCES

1. Баранов А. Введение в прикладную лингвистику. М. : Ленанд. 2017. 368 с.
2. Воробьева О. П. Текстовые категории и фактор адресата : Монография. К. : Вища школа. 1993. 200 с.
3. Каминская Т. Л. Образ адресата в текстах массовой коммуникации: семантико-прагматическое исследование : дис. ... докт. филол. наук : 10.01.10. Санкт-Петербург. 2009. 284 с.
4. Прокопенко А. В., Рева Н. С. Актуалізація адресатності у тексті політінтерв'ю. *Сучасні дослідження з іноземної філології. Збірник наукових праць*. Випуск 13. 2015. С. 159-169.
5. Blackledge, A. *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World (Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2005. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.15>

6. Caldas-Coulthard, C.R. & Coulthard, M. (Eds.) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1996. URL: <https://www.felsemiotica.com/descargas/Caldas-Coulthard-Carmen-Rosa-and-Coulthard-Malcolm-Eds.-Texts-and-Practices.-Readings-in-Critical-Discourse-Analysis.pdf>

7. Carta, C. & Wodak, R. Discourse analysis, policy analysis, and the borders of EU identity. 2015 Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/13015952/Discourse_analysis_policy_analysis_and_the_borders_of_EU_identity?email_work_card=view-paper

8. Fairclough, N. Political discourse in the media: An analytical framework. In: A. Bell & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse*. London : Blackwell, 1998. pp. 142-162.

9. Fairclough, N.L. and Wodak, R. Critical discourse analysis. In: T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Vol. 2. Discourse as Social Interaction. London: Sage, 1997. p.p. 258-284. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281506450_Critical_Discourse_Analysis

10. Glynos, J., Howarth, D., Norval, A., Speed, E. Discourse Analysis: Varieties and Methods. ESRC National Centre for Research Methods. 2009. Review paper. URL: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279668539>

11. Haig, E. Media Representations of Political discourse: A critical discourse study of four reports of Prime Minister's Questions. 2009. URL: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37510329>

12. Kranert, M. Political myth as a legitimation strategy. The case of the golden age myth in the discourses of the Third Way. *Journal of Language and Politics*. 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000087>

13. Pennycook, A. *Language r a local ractise*. London: Routledge. 2010. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203846223>

14. Schroder, K. & Phillips, L. *Mediatized Politics: Political Discourses and the Media Contemporary Danish Democracy*. 2012. URL: https://www.nordicom.gu.se/sites/default/files/kapitel-pdf/12_059_070.pdf

15. Stopfner, M. Just thank God for Donald Trump in Dialogue practices of populists and their supporters before and after taking office. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 186, 2021. P. 308-320. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.10.002>

16. van Dijk, T. A. Critical Discourse Analysis. Introduction: What Is Critical Discourse Analysis? 2004. URL: https://www.academia.edu/4716299/8_Critical_Discourse_Analysis_0_Introduction_What_Is_Critical_Discourse_Analysis?email_work_card=title

17. van Dijk, T. A. *News as Discourse*. London: Routledge. 2013. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199585977.013.007.

18. van Leeuwen, T. Towards a semiotics of typography. *Information Design Journal*. 2006. 14 (2). p.p. 231–255. DOI: 10.1075/idj.14.2.06lee

19. Wieczorek, A. E. Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociatio in Political Discourse. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280727060_Clusivity_A_New_Approach_to_Association_and_Dissociation_in_Political_Discourse/link/55c3243408aeb975673e5601/download

20. Wodak, R. "We have the character of an island nation". A discourse-historical analysis of David Cameron's "Bloomberg Speech" on the European Union. EUI Working Paper. 2016. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305709545>We_have_the_character_of_an_island_nation_A_discoursehistorical_analysis_of_David_Cameron's_Bloomberg_Speech_on_the_European_Union