

Отримано: 14 квітня 2019 року

Прорецензовано: 7 травня 2019 року

Прийнято до друку: 23 травня 2019 року

e-mail: valerymykhaylenko@i.ua

DOI: 10.25264/2519-2558-2019-6(74)-82-85

Valery Mykhaylenko. Delta of personal pronouns in political discourse. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»: серія «Філологія»*. Острог: Вид-во НаУОА, 2019. Вип. 6(74), червень. С. 82–85.

УДК811.811

Valery Mykhaylenko,
*Doctor of Philology, Professor, King Danylo University, Ivano-Frankivsk***DELTA OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

The intention behind language used by candidates during an election campaign is to persuade voters to vote for a particular political party. The aim of this article is to explore the use of personal pronoun delta: "I/WE a → YOU → THEY" in the speech by Jeremy Corbyn, English Labour Leader (2017) from the critical discourse analysis approach, focusing on their political speech functions. The pronouns 'I', 'we', 'you' and 'they' were chosen for the present research due to their presenting three major foci of the speech: the Speaker + Addressee + Opponent (negatively marked), or other than the first two (positively marked) in political speeches. The third person singular pronouns 'he' and 'she' were not examined because of their referential function. This paper will investigate the pragmatics of pronominal choice and the way in which politicians construct and convey their own identities and those of their parties and opponents within political speeches. The personal pronouns chosen can be used by speakers to refer to themselves and to others, and to evoke multiple identities of themselves and others, presented from a range of perspectives. The pronominal choices politicians make serve persuasive and strategic political functions. In this paper it has been argued that personal pronouns in political discourse reflect a variety of aspects of the speaker – ethics, education, communicative skills, determination and truth value, and the political culture of the party and the country, the relationship between the party and electors, etc. Some of these features are encoded in the personal pronoun used in the politician's mode.

Key words: personal pronoun, political discourse, function, semantics, pragmatics.

Михайленко Валерій Васильвич,
*доктор філологічних наук, професор, Університет Короля Данила, м. Івано-Франківськ***ТРИКУТНИК ОСОБОВИХ ЗАЙМЕННИКІВ У ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ**

Мета даної статті – визначення функціональної семантики особистих займенників у триаді: "I/WE → YOU → THEY" у промові Джеремі Корбіна, лідера англійської Лейбористської партії (2017). Займенники 'I', 'we', 'you' та 'they' були вибрані для даного дослідження завдяки їхньому представленню трьох основних складових промови: мовець + адресат (обидва позитивно марковані) + опонент/інші (негативно марковані).

Ключові слова: особовий займенник, політичний дискурс, функція, семантика, прагматика.

PRELIMINARIES. Jukka Tyrkkö says that "from Aristotle and Cicero to St. Thomas Aquinas to Dryden, the formal study of rhetoric has been a key topic of study in the humanities" and an intrinsic link between language and politics. Explorations of functions and pragmatics of personal pronouns use in political speeches have a wave character. The peaks of publications reveal an intrinsic link between language and politics [see 11], and reassert the relationship of language and politics -- they are interlinked with elections of either presidential elections, or midterm elections to the Congress in the US, or parliamentary elections the UK. The mass media, the fourth power in a democratic country, scrutinizes contemporary politics – the citizens or electorate want to hear the speech verbal content, to interpret its non-verbal constituent, to decode the speaker's intentional meaning, and relate the speaker's words to their deeds [4; 12]. The aim of this article is to explore the use of personal pronoun [22] delta: "I/WE → YOU → THEY" in the speech by Jeremy Corbyn, English Labour Leader (2017) from the critical discourse analysis approach, focusing on their political speech functions. The pronouns 'I', 'we', 'you' and 'they' were chosen for the present research due to their presenting three major foci of the speech: the Speaker + Addressee + Opponent (negatively marked) [14, p.251; 16, p.59] or other than the first two (positively marked) in political speeches. The third person singular pronouns 'he' and 'she' were not examined because of their referential function [see 9, p.45; 17, p.59; 19, p.215; 18, p.529].

DISCUSSION. The use of personal pronouns has been shown in numerous previous studies of political language. Given that nearly all political speeches are ultimately intended to exploit in-group and out-group dynamics to the advantage of the speaker and the detriment of their political opponents, the considered use of personal pronouns is a highly salient characteristic of political speaking.

According to Fairclough [7, p.17-18], discourse is a way of representing aspects of world, processes, relations, and structures of material world, mental world of thoughts, feelings, beliefs, and social world, cf. language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning [8, p.49; 15, p.60]. The concepts of identity and identification are central to accomplishing the persuasive aspect of political discourse during an election campaign. Candidates present themselves as being able to identify with the needs, wants and interests of the electorate and try to convince voters it is in their interest to identify with particular candidates. The personal pronouns chosen can be used by speakers to refer to themselves and to others, and to evoke multiple identities of themselves and others, presented from a range of perspectives. The pronominal choices politicians make serve persuasive and strategic political functions [20, p.447]. The traditional polarization in politics is that of us vs. them (we/they). Political speeches usually include classical rhetorical devices such as figures of speech: simile, metaphor, the three-part statement and contrastive pairs (or antithesis). Politicians often refer to things in groups of three: veni, vedi, vici, ("I came, I saw, I conquered" – Julius Caesar [1, p.1-3]).

CORPUS ANALYSIS. The deliberate and considered use of personal pronouns is one of the primary linguistic features used by political speakers to manage their audiences' perceptions of in-groups and out-groups. The deliberate and considered use of personal pronouns is one of the primary linguistic features used by political speakers to manage their audiences' perceptions of in-groups and

out-groups [see 6, p.64]. Interpersonal function of the personal pronouns and the functional approach to language has been influential in a diversity of analytic approaches to discourse modality and its units [8, p. 49].

First person singular *I*. In 12c., a shortening occurred in of Old English *ic*, the first person singular nominative pronoun, from Proto-Germanic **ek* (source also of Old Frisian *ik*, Old Norse *ek*, Norwegian *eg*, Danish *jeg*, Old High German *ih*, German *ich*, Gothic *ik*), from PIE **eg-* «I,» nominative form of the first person singular pronoun (source also of Sanskrit *aham*, Hittite *uk*, Latin *ego* (source of French *Je*), Greek *ego*, Russian *ja*, Lithuanian *aš*). Reduced to *i* by mid-12c. in northern England, later everywhere; the form *ich* or *ik*, especially before vowels, lingered in northern England until c. 1400 and survived in southern dialects until 18c. It began to be capitalized mid-13c. to mark it as a distinct word and avoid misreading in handwritten manuscripts (Dictionary of Etymology).

The least frequent pronoun amongst three is *I* in the British English political discourse, wherein the speaker does not separate himself/herself from the community, and in case of the Leader s/he speaks on behalf of the party or the nation “we”

- (1) When the personal pronoun *I* is used, it refers not just to the speaker of the utterance,
- (2) But also can refer to any of the speaker’s interactional and social identities
- (3) To describe the specific deeds [18, p.539].
- (4) In political speeches, *I* can be used by the speaker to convey his opinion, it makes the speech more subjective.
- (5) It shows the authority of the speaker and it can be a way to show compassion with the audience [3, p.27]. But the issue of subjectivity is what might make some politicians avoid using *I*.
- (6) The first person singular pronoun of *I* in political speeches gives a sense of *here and now*, suggesting that *I* captures the moment.

(7) *I* can also be used to create a ‘relationship’ with the audience, because using *I* makes the speech seem as if it is on a more personal level.

(8) *I* might also be used to show commitment to the audience and personal involvement in issues; *I* gives the speaker a personal voice that distances him from others. This means that it cannot always be expected that the other members of his party agree with the speaker’s opinions when the pronoun *I* is used [see 10, 397].

The advantage of using *I* is that it shows personal involvement, which is especially useful when positive news is delivered. N.R. Bramley points out that ‘*I think*’ is also used in these interviews as a way of making a claim for which they do not want to be held accountable. The meaning of ‘*I think*’ in the speech also allows politicians to make a strong claim within a proposition that s/he may not otherwise be able to make [cf. 3, p.27; 65]:

1. *And I mean richer in every sense.* (on behalf of the party)
2. *So today, I say to tax cheats, the rip off bosses, the greedy bankers;*
3. *It makes me angry. And I know it makes the people of Britain angry too.*

The Modern English *we*, first person plural pronoun, «*I* and another or others,» developed from Proto-Germanic **wejes* (source also of Old Saxon *wi*, Old Norse *ver*, Danish *vi*, Old Frisian *wi*, Dutch *wij*, Old High German and German *wir*, Gothic *weis* «we»), from PIE **we-* (source also of Sanskrit *vayam*, Old Persian *vayam*, Hittite *wesh* «we,» Old Church Slavonic *ve* «we two,» Lithuanian *vedu* «we two»). The «royal we» (use of plural pronoun to denote oneself) is at least as old as «Beowulf» (c.725); use by writers to establish an impersonal style is also from Old English; it was especially common 19c. in unsigned editorials, to suggest staff consensus, and was lampooned as such at least since 1853 (Dictionary of Etymology).

The use of *we* to express ambiguity of reference and group membership. The denotational or basic meaning of *we* is collective identity or group membership; ‘*you* and *I*, ‘*I* and (an)other’ [see 23]:

- (1) implicit in the use of *we* is the authority to speak on behalf of *others*. Politicians use *we* for a number of different purposes:
- (2) to talk on behalf of their party; to deflect individual responsibility; to include or exclude hearers from group membership;
- (3) to invoke a general collective response or attitude to a matter.
- (4) by saying our administration, instead of my administration.

The Nominative *we* usually combines with modal verbs: will, can, convince and correlates with the Accusative *us* and Possessive *our*. And three of them are positively charged by the speaker. *We* points to institutional identity; *us* and *them* stand for dichotomy of just me/not just someone else; *we* co-implicate the people: *we* presupposes collective response [3, p.73f.]:

1. *We can transform Britain into a country that – instead of being run for the rich – is a one where everyone can lead richer lives.*
2. *Richer because all of us have potential to fulfil, family to support, interests to pursue, richer when that potential is not held back.*
3. *We caught a glimpse of that wealth only two days ago when Rupert Murdoch’s Sunday Times published its Rich List. (I as one of you)*
4. *That’s what we mean when we say the system is rigged for the rich. (our party)*
5. *We have to convince the sceptical and undecided.* (our party and supporters) [They are not sure which way to turn.]
6. *Labour is under attack because we are standing up to the elites who are determined to hijack Brexit to pay even less tax and take even more of the wealth we all create. (we: not them)*
7. *We’re drawing a line.* (this is the last straw)
8. *In the coming days, we will be setting out our plan to transform Britain {promise; swear.*
9. *The question now is what sort of Brexit do we want – and what sort of country do we want Britain to be after Brexit? (the common people).*
10. *We won’t be paying lip-service to working people.* (the party will keep on supporting you).
11. *When we win, the British people win. The nurse, the teacher, the small trader, the carer, the builder, the office worker win.*

The Modern English *you* developed from the Old English *eow*, dative and accusative plural of *þu* [see thou: 17, p.59], objective case of *ge*, «ye» (see *ye*), from Proto-Germanic **juz-*, **iwwiz* (source also of Old Norse *yor*, Old Saxon *iu*, Old Frisian *iuwe*, Middle Dutch, Dutch *u*, Old High German *iu*, *iuwih*, German *euch*), from PIE **yu*, second person (plural) pronoun. Pronunciation of *you* and the nominative form *ye* gradually merged from 14c.; the distinction between them passed out of general

usage by 1600. Widespread use of French in England after 12c. gave English *you* the same association as French *vous*, and it began to drive out singular nominative *thou*, originally as a sign of respect (similar to the «royal we») when addressing superiors, then equals and strangers, and ultimately becoming the general form of address. Through 13c. English also retained a dual pronoun *ink* «you two; your two selves; each other (Dictionary of Etymology). Depending on the political arena, the addressee (YOU) may be portrayed not merely as the Other but as a Threat or an Enemy [see 21; 11, cf. 15, p.60].

The use of Nominative *you* and Possessive *your* reflects one community

The pronoun *you* usually refers to the person(s) the speaker is talking to. Although, *you* has multiple functions:

(1) to serve as an indefinite (generic) pronoun;

(2) the indefinite *you* can be a replacement for I and refer to the speaker, and also be used by the speaker to include himself as a member of a category;

(3) indefinite *you* is not used to discuss actual experience; instead it is used to discuss ‘conventional wisdom’. In this sense, *you* is used to convey common sense or generally admitted truth, with the hope of receiving the agreement of the audience [1, p.13fl.]. When using the indefinite version of the pronoun *you*, it can be unclear whom the speaker is referring to. It can be used to refer to anyone and/or everyone.

1. *If you're a young couple, or anyone trying to get a home and can't make a home because rent and house prices are too high.*

2. *Then you're being held back.*

3. *And if you've worked hard all your life, but can't pursue your dreams in retirement because you're supporting your family well into adulthood. Then you too are being held back.*

The pronouns of address in Early Modern English are suggested that *you* and *thou* might have functioned as markers of in-group or out-group relations in the negotiation of social identities, and as discourse markers signalling a change of conversational topic and the presence of a boundary in the structure of the dialogue [5, p. 9].

The use of personal pronouns in political discourse illustrate that *I* can be used for distancing the speaker from the addressee (*you*), to underline that the speaker and addressee are equal (*we*) the thing or the person (*they*) spoken of [see 24]. It can also be used to lessen the speaker's responsibility for actions or events. It can be used to show ideological differences, as discussed earlier in the use of *us* and *them*.

The pronoun *they* goes back to c. 1200, from a Scandinavian source (Old Norse *þeir*, Old Danish, Old Swedish *þer*, *þair*), originally masculine plural demonstrative pronoun, from Proto-Germanic **thai*, nominative plural pronoun, from PIE **to-*, demonstrative pronoun (see that). Gradually replaced Old English *hi*, *hie*, plurals of *he*, *heo* “she,” *hit* “it” by c. 1400. Colloquial use for “anonymous people in authority” is attested from 1886. *They say* for “it is said” is in Milton.

The most important loan of this kind [from Scandinavian to English] was that of the pronominal forms *they*, *them* and *their*, which entered readily into the system of English pronouns beginning with the same sound (*the*, *that*, *this*) and were felt to be more distinct than the old native forms which they supplanted (Dictionary of Etymology).

The Nominative *they*, Accusative *them* and Possessive (or Genitive) *their* are used as the result of pronominalization where the referent can be either a suppoter or the means of alienizing antagonists.

The Modern English political discourse the pronoun *they* is used in the following functions:

(1) to separate themselves or their ‘group’ from others, i.e. *they* excludes *I*. *They* points to those who are not *we*;

(2) It is used to form an oppositional relationship between *him* or *her* and *others*, often with negativity towards the others;

(3) *they* is, just like *we*, used to create an *us* and *them* separation;

(4) it can be used to make the speaker seem less responsible for his or her actions and show ideological difference among people and positive presentation of self of the speaker [see 3];

(5) *they* can be used to distance self from *other* both consciously and subconsciously;

(6) by separating *us* from *them*, the speaker sometimes creates an image of *them* being inferior to *us* [13, p.36];

(7) *they* can also be used in a neutral context, where the speaker does not speak of the *others* in a negative or positive way, even if *they* are still not part of the same group as him or her;

(8) *they* is used in an oppositional context; *they* is registered in an affiliative context; *they* is regularly used in a neutral context; the Generic *they* is used to refer to *they* (unspecified categorical *they* [3, p. 184fl.]:

1. *Resign themselves to things the way they are – underestimating just how many more burdens the Tories could impose if their mission to rig the system for the rich isn't halted.* (not our party)

2. [*We have to convince the sceptical and undecided.*] *They are not sure which way to turn.* (*those*, who are still not supporters of the Labour Party)

3. *In case their talk of fairness doesn't wash, they have another card to play.* (Tories)

FINDINGS & PERSPECTIVES. In this paper we have been arguing that personal pronouns in political discourse reflect a variety of aspects of the speaker – ethics, education, communicative skills, determination and truth value, and the political culture of the party and the country, the relationship between the party and electors, etc. Some of these features are encoded in the personal pronoun use in the politician's mode.

Politicians use pronouns to refer to categories and group memberships in which they can choose to place themselves or not. The choice is always based on presenting themselves in a positive light. The hearers can choose to be a part of these categories, or not (Saj, 2012).

Since there are quite a lot of publications on pronominal choices in politics of politicians working in the UK, the USA or elsewhere, it might be interesting to compare and analyze pronouns in politics used by politicians from Ukraine in future studies, to see their common and distinctive features.

References:

1. Allen W. Australian political discourse: pronominal choice in campaign speeches / Ed. Mary Laughren & Ilana Mushin. Selected Papers from the 2006. Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society. 2007. P. 1–13.

2. Bello Umar. If I could make it, you too can make it! Personal pronouns in political discourse: A CDA of president Jonathan's presidential declaration speech. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. 2013. Vol.3 (6). P. 84–96. 3. Bramley N.R. Pronouns of politics: the use of pronouns in the construction of 'self' and 'other' in political interviews. Doctor of Philosophy Thesis. Australian National University, 2001. 364 p.
4. Bull Peter. *The Microanalysis of political communication: Claptrap and ambiguity*. London. New York: Routledge, 2003. 240 p.
5. Calvo Clara. Pronouns of Address and Social Negotiation in as You Like it. *Language and Literature*. 1992. Vol 1. Issue 1, 2. P. 5–27.
6. Delisle Helga H. Intimacy, solidarity and distance: The Pronouns of address in German. *Die Unterrichtspraxis / Teaching German*. 1986. Vol. 19. No.1. P. 4–15.
7. Fairclough N. Political correctness: The politics of culture and language. *Discourse and Society*. 2003. Vol. 14. No.1. P. 17–28.
8. Halliday M. A. K. Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning. London: Edward Arnold, 1978. 258 p.
9. Ilie C. Insulting as (un)parliamentary practice in the British and Swedish parliaments: A Rhetorical approach", *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse / Ed. P.Bayley*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2004. P. 45–86.
10. Johansson M. Presentation of the political self: commitment in electoral media dialogue. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. 2008. Vol. 27, 397–408.
11. Joseph John Earl. *Language and Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 2009. 170 p.
12. Jucker J. News interviews: A Pragmalinguistic analysis. Amsterdam: Gieben. 1986. 195 p.
13. Karapetjana I. *Pronominal Choice in Political Interviews*. *Baltic Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture*. Vol. 1. Riga: University of Latvia, 2011. P. 36–45.
14. Kienpointer M. Varieties of rudeness: Types and functions of impolite utterances. *Functions of language*. 1997. Vol.4. P. 251–287.
15. Mykhaylenko Valery. Discourse aspect of the you-pronoun. *Англїстика та американїстика*. Випуск 9. 2012. P. 60–64.
16. Mykhaylenko Valery. Negation operators in creating the opponent's image. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету*. Серія: Філологія. 17 (12). 2015. P. 59–61.
17. Mykhaylenko Valery. Functional overview of second person singular pronoun in "BEOWULF." *Studia Philologica*. 2017. Vol.7. P. 36–43.
18. Saj Hala El. Discourse Analysis: Personal pronouns in Oprah Winfrey hosting Queen Rania of Jordan. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*. 2012. Vol. 2. No. 6. P. 529–532.
19. Schegloff E.A. From interview to confrontation: observations on the Bush/Rather encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*. 1989. Vol. 22. P. 215–240.
20. Stewart M. C., Clarke H. D. The (un)importance of party leaders: leader images and party choice in the 1987 British election. *Journal of Politics*. 1992. Vol.54. P. 447–470.
21. Tyrkkö Jukka. Looking for rhetorical thresholds: Pronoun frequencies in political speeches. *Studies in variation, contacts and change in English. The Pragmatics and Stylistics of Identity Construction and Characterisation / Ed. Nevala Minna, Ursula Lutzky, Gabrielle Mazzon, Carla Suhr*, Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2016. <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/17/tyrkkö/>. Date of access: April 10, 2019.
22. van Dijk Teun A. What is political discourse analysis?. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. 1997. Vol.11. P. 11–52.
23. Wales Katie. *Personal pronouns in present-day English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 234 p.
24. Wilson John. *Politically speaking: The Pragmatic analysis of political language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2003. xvii, 256 p.