

The Discourse Personality of Politician Sergey Mikheyev with Regards to his Speech Behaviour

Дискурсивная личность политика Сергея Михеева в отношении его речевого поведения

Recibido: 4 de octubre del 2019

Aceptado: 13 de noviembre del 2019

Written by:

Tatyana A. Sidorova⁹⁵

https://elibrary.ru/author_profile.asp?id=642319

Elvira N. Akimova⁹⁶

https://elibrary.ru/author_profile.asp?id=509172

Nataliya E. Petrova⁹⁷

https://elibrary.ru/author_profile.asp?id=407526

Elena N. Shirokova⁹⁸

https://elibrary.ru/author_profile.asp?id=241836

Natalia S. Bolgova⁹⁹

https://elibrary.ru/author_profile.asp?authorid=1033556

Abstract

This paper presents the results of research into the linguistic personality of politician Sergey Mikheyev when viewed as a discourse personality. Special consideration has been given to the speech behaviour characteristic of a discourse personality. The paper presents the results of the cognitive-discursive and linguo-rhetorical description of a discourse personality. The relevance of this research is based on the growing interest for linguistic personality typology with regards to discourse (K. F. Sedov, V. I. Karasik, N. D. Golev, A. V. Bolotnov, *et al.*). A mixed type of political discourse that actualises both the personal and status factors of its formation was chosen as the object of analysis. The research focuses on semantic dominants and semantic constructs of the discourse behaviour of the Russian politician Sergey Mikheyev, as well as on the cognitive and linguo-rhetorical mechanisms of the interpretation of speech acts when viewed as elements of individual discourse

Аннотация

В работе представлены результаты исследования языковой личности политика Сергея Михеева как дискурсивной личности. Особое внимание уделяется речеповеденческому аспекту дискурсивной личности. Представлены результаты когнитивно-дискурсивного и лингвориторического описания дискурсивной личности. Актуальность исследования обусловлена возрастающим интересом к разработке проблемы типологии языковых личностей в дискурсивном аспекте (Седов К. Ф., Карасик В.И., Голев Н.Д., Болотнов А.В. и др.). Объектом анализа стал смешанный тип политического дискурса, актуализирующий личностный и статусный факторы его формирования. Предметом исследования являются содержательные доминанты и смысловые конструкты дискурсивного поведения российского политика Сергея Михеева, когнитивные и

⁹⁵ Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor of Russian Language and Speech Culture Department, Honorary Worker of Higher Professional Education of the Russian Federation, professor Northern (Arctic) Federal University named after M.V. Lomonosov, Arkhangelsk, Russia

⁹⁶ Doctor of Philology, Professor, Department of Russian Philology and Cross Cultural Communication, Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Moscow, Russia

⁹⁷ Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor Head of the Department of Russian Language and Speech Culture, Minin Nizhny Novgorod State Pedagogical University (Minin University), Department of Russian Language and Culture of Speech, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia

⁹⁸ Doctor of philology; associate professor, professor of Russian Language and Culture of Speech Chair, Minin Nizhny Novgorod State Pedagogical University (Minin University), Nizhny Novgorod, Russia

⁹⁹ Postgraduate Student, Department of Russian Language and Speech Culture, High School of Social Sciences and Humanities and International Communication Northern (Arctic) Federal University named after M.V. Lomonosov Arkhangelsk, Russia

behaviour. We define the linguo-rhetorical competence of the politician's personality. The study is novel in that it identifies semantic dominants and semantic constructs found in Mikheyev's discourse and uses an integrative approach to analysis (cognitive-discursive and linguo-rhetorical). It is proven that semantic dominants, constructs, and presuppositions manifest inventive mechanisms of individual discourse activity. We suggest defining the status of Mikheyev's discourse personality as a mixed type of elitist linguistic personality that is pragmatically oriented. We prove that the discourse personality of Sergey Mikheyev is a prototype of a future successful politician's linguistic personality. The paper presents the author's original communicative competence system of S. Mikheyev's discourse personality.

Keywords: Discourse personality, discourse behaviour, semantic dominant, semantic construct, linguo-rhetorical mechanisms of discourse activity.

Introduction

The relevance of this research is determined by the insufficient research coverage of the linguistic personality's role in discourse generally and in political discourse specifically. Political discourse studies based on the pragmatic-communicative and the cognitive-discursive approach, combined with the linguo-rhetorical approach, are on the rise today. We take the fundamental view, expressed by L. P. Yakubinskiy, that it is essential to approach the language "in connection with communication conditions" (Yakubinskiy, 1986: 18). Therefore, it is relevant to develop a typology of linguistic personalities in various types of discourse. The main research objective is to define the status of the politician Sergey Mikheyev's discourse personality by identifying its characteristics. Discourse personality is understood in the context of speech behaviour. The paper considers communicative situations where a discourse personality manifests itself. Semantic dominants, presuppositions, and semantic constructs were defined, which allowed us to identify the

лингвориторические механизмы интерпретации речевых действий как компонентов дискурсивного поведения личности. Определяется лингвориторическая компетентность личности политика. Новизна исследования видится в выделении содержательных доминант и смысловых конструкторов дискурса С. Михеева, а также в интегративном подходе к анализу (когнитивно-дискурсивному и лингвориторическому). Доказано, что смысловые доминанты, конструкторы и пресуппозиции манифестируют инвентивные механизмы дискурсивной деятельности личности. Предлагается определение статуса дискурсивной личности С. Михеева как смешанного типа элитарной языковой личности, прагматически ориентированной. Доказано, что дискурсивная личность Сергея Михеева является прототипом языковой личности успешного политика будущего времени. Представлена авторская система коммуникативных компетенций дискурсивной личности политика С. Михеева.

Ключевые слова: дискурсивная личность, дискурсивное поведение, смысловая доминанта, смысловой конструктор, лингвориторические механизмы дискурсивной деятельности.

personal preferences of the discourse personality and the nature of its linguistic consciousness.

This way the paper presents an observation of the discourse behaviour of a specific politician's personality (Vorozhbitova et al., 2019). Since we study oral discourse, the reflective activity of a discourse personality that is determined by cognitive and discursive means of self-presentation becomes an important characteristic. As a result of such observation, we can define semantic dominants of the discourse personality's behaviour: relation to itself, the addressee, ethnocultural values, etc. In the face of changing linguistic mentality, observations of individual discourse behaviour in various genres of political discourse are becoming relevant not only for discourse studies, but also for axiological linguistics.

Review of Literature

The relationship between language and thought has a long history in modern linguistics. We think the study of linguistic personality is taking place as part of this relationship, especially considering the cognitive-discursive linguistic paradigm. There are, for instance, studies of the media environment as an influencing factor on discourse personality (L. R. Duskayeva, M. Y. Kazak, V. E. Chernyavskaya, N. I. Klushina, *et al.*), typologies of linguistic personalities (N. D. Golev, E. V. Ivantsova, V. I. Karasik, V. V. Krasnykh, S. N. Plotnikova, K. F. Sedov, *et al.*), descriptions of individual and cognitive styles of a discourse personality (A. V. Bolotnov, A. V. Kulminskaya, T. L. Kaminskaya, E. V. Lukashevich, *et al.*), etc. We believe that cognitive style is an element of the discourse personality's individual style. S. Browse (Browse, 2016: 18-37) also points out the complexity of the individual style. When defining the status of Mikheyev's discourse personality, we consider the nature of the politician's cognitive style.

Especially relevant today are the studies that focus on the influence that various aspects of discourse have on personality. N. N. Boldyrev, for instance, notes the importance of the context of knowledge: "Contexts of knowledge are behind every word spoken by any given community in any given linguistic culture. These contexts are largely marked by sociocultural and ethnic uniqueness, including at the level of basic lexicon" (Boldyrev and Dubrovskaya, 2016: 173-182). In addition to the conceptual-cognitive context, the Hungarian researcher Z. Kövecses identifies the situational, discourse, and bodily context (Kövecses, 2019: 126-130), D. Geraerts (Geraerts, 2018: 41-45) and M. Hilpert (Hilpert, 2014) talk about the role of various contexts.

Since we are researching the discourse personality in the aspect of speech behaviour, the studies of linguistic consciousness should also be mentioned. Several studies point out the dominant principle of linguistic consciousness organisation. This principle is reflected in Mikheyev's speech behaviour when he constantly refers to historical facts of the past. Such cognitive representations are based on the nature of linguistic consciousness and are understood by researchers as forms of experience interpretation (McCune, 2016: 127-143). A discourse personality uses the concepts that reflect its world view. They constitute the Speaker's individual sphere of concepts. I. I. Sulima is one of the researchers who investigates

such concepts (Sulima, 2017: 30-33). Mikheyev typically uses the cognitive mechanism of transformation when going from the conceptual sphere of living to the conceptual sphere of being. S. Andreev and other researchers view this as a connection between microcosm and macrocosm (Andreev, Mistecky, Altmann, 2018).

Notably, there are studies that analyse the special competencies of a communicative personality and a discourse personality. For example, I. Sikora identifies the ability to express and perceive specialist knowledge with the help of terminology (Sikora, 2014: 500-508). G. Lakoff, who analyses Donald Trump's discourse activity, points out Trump's ability to create a feeling of spontaneous speech and sincere emotions which helps to create a friendly atmosphere. Therefore, President Trump uses parcelled and elliptical syntactic structures and often creates pauses (Lakoff, 2016).

The studies of the individual linguistic and cognitive characteristics of a discourse personality have recently become relevant. D. Salazar, for instance, points out cases where the speaker is dependent on the same phrases (Salazar, 2014: 114-115). Researchers are also interested in the conversational processes the speakers go through and the way information is presented (Bogdanova-Beglarian, Sherstinova *et al.*, 2017: 503-511).

Another interesting area of research is the study of discourse personality as a persuasive personality. M. Hilbert studies several sensory and cognitive systems that activate when perceiving information (Hilbert, 2017: 82). This is especially important for the discourse personality of Sergey Mikheyev, who uses different channels to affect the addressee: intellectual, emotional, and sensory (gestures, facial expressions, intonation, tone of voice). Political discourse is a multi-code system (Barabash *et al.*, 2019). According to B. Oben and G. Brône, different sign systems can be used by the speakers to refer to the same object in order to increase the persuasive effect (Oben, Brône, 2016: 32-51). Modern research is generally focused around finding new ways of implementing discourse activity. At the same time, there is insufficient research coverage of the types of individual self-presentation, particularly self-presentation of a political personality.

Materials and Methods

Theoretical framework of our research is comprised of the studies by both Russian and foreign linguists focusing on discourse analysis in various aspects: the pragmatic aspect (T. G. Vinokur, T. A. Van Dijk, J. Lakoff, R. Leneker, E. Sheigal, *et al.*), the cognitive aspect (N. N. Boldyrev, V. I. Karasik, E. S. Kubryakova, C. Fillmore, W. Chafe, *et al.*), the communicative aspect (T. A. Van Dijk, M. Y. Oleskhov, V. I. Karasik, I. A. Sternin, *et al.*), and the linguo-rhetorical aspect (N. A. Bezmenova, A. A. Vorozhbitova, J. Du Bois, A. K. Mikhalskaya, G. G. Khazagerov, *et al.*) This study employs the cognitive-discursive approach that is based on the linguo-rhetorical approach. Anthropocentric principle is central to this research as it allows us to analyse linguistic and discursive phenomena in close connection with communicative/discourse personality (N. D. Arutyunova, N. F. Alefirenko, V. V. Barabash, T. G. Vinokur, M. L. Makarov *et al.*). The linguo-rhetorical approach correlates with the cognitive-discursive approach at the level of anthropocentrism, which is why we consider both to be the most appropriate approach for identifying specific features of a discourse personality. From the discourse perspective, a personality is both the creator and the consumer of discourse. The cognitive-discursive approach provides a deeper understanding of the Speaker (the addresser, the producer) and the way the knowledge, which is objectified in political discourse, is conceptualised. The political reality created by the discourse personality reflects a unique categorical mindset which is based on visual and sensory experience and the assessment of political events. Since the discourse personality also bears a certain ideology, in our research we rely on the ideological dominants of its speech behaviour: Ethos, Pathos, Logos, and Sofia.

It is important to stress that this paper uses the instrumental approach to analysing the discourse of Sergey Mikheyev. According to V. I. Karasik, “the central point in describing discourse from this perspective is the tone of communication; that is, its emotional and stylistic mode, which is determined culturally as well as by the communicators’ attitudes, which are attributable to a particular situation” (Karasik, 2019: 261). This approach is based on the understanding of the language as an instrument of discourse activity. We think that the linguistic, discursive, and cognitive means undergo instrumentalization in the process of discourse activity, i.e. they become a tool for expressing discursive meanings. Since we are interested in the speech behaviour aspect of the discourse personality, we also rely on the classification of the social actions of communicants developed by J.

Habermas, who contrasted the four main actions – teleological, normative, dramaturgical, and communicative (Habermas, 1984: 85–86). The communicative actions of a discourse personality are obviously subject to different interpretations. We think that social actions in Mikheyev’s discourse are combined rather than opposed. As an example, in the process of a communicative action that is aimed at expressing a certain attitude or presupposition, as well as interpreting and evaluating a specific political reality, the politician simultaneously changes the addressee’s attitude (teleological action), confirms his own belonging to a particular community and a particular ideology (normative action), and performs self-presentation (dramaturgical action).

Sergey Mikheyev’s speeches on the topic of Russia and Ukraine in the TV show “The Evening with Vladimir Soloviev” were chosen as the study material (Channel One, TV show “The Evening With Vladimir Soloviev” 08.10.2018; 07.03.2018; 16.03.2018).

Analysis and Results

To analyse the discourse personality of a particular politician we need to take into account not only the discourse genre, but also the type of communication and communication channel. The genre we focus on is *political speech*. The communication type is subject marked, and the communication channel is direct oral communication. The participants in the communicative situation are expert politicians, guests of the TV show, the show host, and the general public (viewers, journalists, government officials). The purpose of the discourse in general is to discuss current political events in Ukraine and Russia. The purpose of Mikheyev’s individually-oriented discourse is to interpret and evaluate a political event, change the addressee’s point of view relating to the political event, and make a self-presentation. It should be noted that in his speeches, Mikheyev constantly switches between the status mode and the personally-oriented mode of communication.

As Mikheyev’s discourse personality interacts with the addressee, it constantly provokes reflections, particularly sociocultural and historical ones. In his interpretation of the Trade Unions House fire in Odessa, for instance, the politician harshly criticises justifications of violence for the greater good. The semantic dominant of his statement is the following moral idea: *Killing people, even for the greater good, is immoral*. The regulatory Ethos category is used in the analysis: *She said: “In the end, it’s actually good that they were burnt...”* The politician obviously appeals to sociocultural moral values. At

the same time, he refers to his own emotional space: *I do not want millions of people in Ukraine to die, even if they are my enemies.* The politician uses a discourse orientation sign (*friends – enemies*) (Sheigal, 2000) to intensify his negative emotional expression, which objectifies the Pathos category. In his discourse, Mikheyev often appeals to Logos by means of sententia: *The problem of many Ukrainian experts is that they lie to themselves.* The speaker focuses on the addressee and effectively uses the dispositional mechanism, developing his discourse in accordance with the laws of logic. After criticising his communication partner's behaviour, he moralises: *It could have been said that as a result of the tragic events in Ukraine, a great deal of heartache, casualties, and lawlessness occurred... That's it! There you go.* The author builds a cause-and-effect relation (appeals to Ethos) and immediately explains the image used for equating the situations (the Sofia category).

Based on presuppositions, the following semantic dominants are represented in Mikheyev's discourse by means of the cognitive inference mechanism: *The Ukrainian elite is corrupt and incompetent; Ukraine sees Russia as an enemy; The Ukrainian regime is criminal; Ukraine depends on the West; Ukraine and the West are guided by double standards; Any revolution generates myths and is therefore destructive to the state; Russia pursues a friendly policy towards Ukraine; The West is imposing its ideology on Ukraine, etc.* Key ideas based on the discursive personality's values, semantic dominants, and presuppositions were attributed to semantic constructs: *pro-Western development of Ukraine will lead to failure; the current Ukrainian regime and authorities are corrupt; relations between Russia and Ukraine can be mutually beneficial.* Here is a statement that objectifies the semantic dominant ***Ukraine sees Russia as an enemy:***

“The country that accuses Russia of aggression, that has been saying for many years that it wants to tear itself away from the terrible embrace of the totalitarian regime, that its only dream has been to break free of Russia completely, is still in the CIS.”

Semantic presupposition – *Ukraine accuses Russia of aggression; Ukraine considers Russia to be a totalitarian country and wants independence from Russia.* Pragmatic presupposition – *If Ukraine pursues an anti-Russian policy, it should not be in alliance with Russia.* Aesthetic presupposition – the use of the metaphor *“terrible embrace of the totalitarian regime”* (the marker of otherness).

The statement that objectifies the semantic dominant ***Revolution is destructive to the state:***

Any revolution generates a huge number of myths. It needs it to be this way. The revolution needs, so to speak, to get people to follow it today, at this very moment, at any cost. Otherwise, it will all go back to violence again. Because otherwise any revolution will start devouring its own children.

Logical presupposition 1 – *the true motives and objectives of the revolution can push people away, which is why there is a need for myths.* Logical presupposition 2 – *in the end, the revolutionary rage turns against those who carry it out.* Aesthetic presupposition – *the use of the precedent statement “The revolution, like Saturn, devours its own children”.* The statement becomes a marker of otherness. Semantic and pragmatic presuppositions correlate with the Logos category, sociocultural presuppositions with the Ethos category, and aesthetic presuppositions with the Pathos and Sofia categories.

It should be noted that ethnocultural presuppositions often arise in discourse on the basis of associations (e.g. *what goes around comes around*). Our analysis showed that the basis of semantic constructs in Mikheyev's discourse is formed by moral attitudes of the people: *A bad peace is better than a good war, The lies will eat away at you, etc.* Sometimes the politician only hints at the sociocultural meaning: *We are having this discussion, but the ě's were dotted a long time ago* (ibid). This expression is a humorous version of a famous fixed expression “to dot the i's”, which means “to clarify all the details”. It should be pointed out that the Russian letter “ě” has become a symbol of a negative assessment, and in this context, it might be a marker of condemning the way Yeltsin seized power. Therefore, the politician calls this seizure “an illegal armed usurpation.” Our research has demonstrated the prevalence of sociocultural and value components in Mikheyev's individual cognitive sphere.

Based on the analysis and our insights into the development of political trends in Russia, we believe that the discursive personality of Sergey Mikheyev is a linguistic personality prototype of a successful future politician (according to the concept developed by V. I. Karasik). The qualities Mikheyev combines as a politician are ideologically close to the majority of the Russian population, and his discursive behaviour model allows him to perform communicative tasks in

politics very effectively, which helps to accomplish the goals he sets for himself. This is why his discourse personality can be considered as a prototype.

As a discourse personality, Sergey Mikheyev has the linguo-rhetorical competence that is important for a politician and a public speaker. The following are his specific competencies:

- the ability to choose the appropriate language tools depending on the communication conditions and social roles of the participants in communication, and the ability to create his own discourse;
- the ability to come into contact with the participants in discourse activity, maintain the contact, reflect in accordance with the purpose of the discourse activity, provide feedback, and navigate within communication;
- the ability to understand various types of utterances, to logically build the sequence of utterances, to choose the means of language and discourse depending on the goal;
- the ability to manage his own communicative behaviour, particularly in cases of communication failure;
- the use of plasticity of communicative actions, cooperation strategies, politeness tactics, respectfulness, attentiveness, and sincerity;
- the ability to take into account the interests of opponents in communication and adjust their viewpoints by means of communicative impact;
- leadership qualities such as the ability to rationalise, to persuade the opponent without suppressing his/her initiative, to be passionate and enthusiastic;
- creative thinking: putting forward his own initiatives, proposals, and hypotheses;
- the ability to analyse, interpret, evaluate, predict, and propose a model of behaviour;
- the use of rhetorical topoi, for example, saying that the Ukrainians are also Slavs and appealing to a shared past;
- the ability to objectify the categories of Logos, Pathos, Ethos, and Sofia in the discourse. The Ethos category is objectified in the politician's discourse in the form of sociocultural and moral presuppositions and semantic

dominants. The Pathos category is objectified with the use of linguistic and discursive means of emotional expressiveness: evaluative lexical items, collocations, interjections, colloquial syntactic structures, discursive words, modal particles, etc. The Logos category is marked by the ability to rationalise and prove a point, and by appealing to verbal, behavioural, and figurative stereotypes based on the use of dispositional mechanisms. The Sofia category is objectified by figurative language, reflexive speech acts, rhetorical figures, tropes, and various semiotic signs. The category of communicative initiative, which is closely related to the category of Sofia, forms a certain social psychological tone of discourse. The discourse personality we analyse in this study is characterised by the tone of self-assurance and sincerity. This is why he can be considered as a personality with a high communicative activity level.

Markers of Sergey Mikheyev's discursive behaviour as a discourse personality:

- inherently linguistic: prevalence of indirect communication, mixing of different styles, simplified syntax, the use of tropes, figures of speech, emergent meanings, connotations, discursive words and collocations, etc. The predominant mechanisms for implementation of linguo-rhetorical competence are the following: inventive (topics "cause-effect", "circumstances", "comparison", "example"), dispositional, elocutionary (irony, metaphor, metonymy, address, exclamation, period, etc.), actional (the use of intonation, gestures, facial expressions, rising or falling tone, etc.);
- semantic: presuppositions, semantic dominants, semantic constructs, and sententiae implement the following communicative meanings: *to clarify, to adjust the assessment of a political event and a politician's behavior, to give individual assessment of a political fact, to convince an opponent, to change the viewpoint of the addressee, to form a new viewpoint, etc.*;
- sociocultural: the use of precedent phenomena and signs of the current political situation, interpretation of political events based on ethnocultural

consciousness in addition to individual linguistic consciousness, prevalence of moral principles; creating a social psychological tone of persuasiveness and assurance;

- pragmatic: the use of strategies and tactics of cooperation and indirect motivation; aiming for a constructive dialogue in general; prevalence of folk axiology; combining linguistic and extralinguistic (gestures, facial expressions, intonation) tools; combining targeted and controlled speech acts with unconscious and involuntary actions, including emotional reaction. The aim of Mikheyev's discourse is to stimulate the addressee's linguistic consciousness to initiate a change in attitude to political facts and to rethink those political facts.

Characteristics of Sergey Mikheyev's discourse personality:

- The need for self-realisation. This explains the frequent use of discursive words that express the Speaker's attitude to political events, politicians, and their rhetoric (*Personally, I...; so to speak; simply*, etc.), informing others about personal experience (*I've never heard of... I don't read newspapers... etc.*), explication of motivation (propaganda of ethnocultural values, exposing the true goals of opponents, stimulating and influencing public opinion). The discourse reflects such psychological personality characteristics as duplication of meaning by the use of different language tools, prevalence of the rational and reflexive types of political reality perception, sense of humour, freedom in communication (hence the mixing of styles and dialogization of monologues). Mikheyev is capable of creating discourse-reactions to events, asking provocative questions, and reducing situations to absurdity (for example, by saying that his opponents are willing to completely justify Hitler for the war against the USSR).
- Distinctive thesaurus. Mikheyev's discourse personality is characterised by the extensive knowledge of history, politics, and social sphere, and by possessing a shared cross-national and ethnocultural cognitive base. The politician's reflexive activity appeals to

cultural traditions and ethnocultural values. The prevalent functional type of speech is reasoning. Typical associations are related to history and daily life. The key concepts are CONSCIENCE, SPIRITUALITY, MOTHERLAND, GOOD / EVIL, etc. The conceptualisation type is moral and ethical.

- Specific discourse categories: **expressiveness** (*It was gradually going away, step by step, bit by bit, and I think some parts of it are still there*); **intertextuality** (*any revolution will start devouring its own children*); **social judgement**, including **ideological judgement** (*They played Yanukovich as if they played piano*); **black-and-white mentality** (dogmatic statements, labelling, dispositional mechanism with the use of "That's it" or "As simple as that" at the end); **intensity** (amplification, exaggeration, hyperbole, repeating meanings, words, and phrases: *...this relativistic morality, this relativity of everything around us, it will inevitably lead to disaster and come back to you anyway*); **situationality** (understatement, free word order, informal communication style based on the use of vernacular language, discursive words, elliptical syntactic structures, etc.). Situationality is also determined by such speech processes as reduplication (*tuda-syuda* [Eng. "back and forth"]) and interjective pragmatemes (*shchas!* [Eng. "As if!"]).

The category of **interaction with the addressee** plays a special part in Mikheyev's discourse: referring to the addressee by surname or first name, using the pronouns "you" and "they", and integration signs.

- Intellectual characteristics. Aligning with the opinion of the majority of people and with the historical record. Judgement, irony, and expressiveness are prevalent in the politician's discourse, although he is also inclined to rationalise and generalise. The discourse personality of the politician is characterised by critical thinking, professional competence, and high intelligence level as evidenced by the use of scholarly vocabulary, intertextuality of discourse, indirect communication techniques, sententiae,

aphorisms, periphrases, and expressives.

Thus, the study proved that the conceptualisation of political reality in Mikheyev's discourse is morally and ethically oriented. We have defined the key concepts of Mikheyev's discourse. The analysis of semantic dominants, constructs, and presuppositions demonstrated specific characteristics of the semiotic sphere of discourse. We have identified characteristics of Mikheyev's discourse personality and his specific discourse categories. Inherently linguistic, semantic, sociocultural, and pragmatic markers of Sergey Mikheyev's discursive behaviour have been defined. The paper presents the author's original linguo-rhetorical competence system of Mikheyev's discourse personality. The linguo-rhetorical approach used in this study demonstrated that the value of the politician's influence on public opinion is measured not only by the metaconcepts VALUE, EVALUATION, STEREOTYPE, NORM, but also the regulatory categories Ethos, Logos, Pathos, and Sofia.

Discussion

While generally agreeing with the statement by V. V. Krasnykh that the Speaker in the process of communication acts in all their capacities (Krasnykh, 2001: 151 – 152), we still think it is possible to distinguish a personality with regards to discourse and view it as a discourse personality. Discourse personality is focused on the very process of interaction, which is reflected in individual discourse behaviour that is analysed in this study. The status of the term "individual discourse behaviour" has not yet been settled. For K. F. Sedov, for instance, "discourse activity" is part of the concept of "discourse behaviour" (Sedov, 2004: 9). T. G. Vinokur considers it to be derived from the concept of "speech activity" (Vinokur, 1993). I. N. Borisova (Borisova, 2005) shares this view and considers speech behaviour, including discourse behaviour, to be a form of the manifestation of speech activity. We share I. N. Borisova's opinion about the special role of sociocultural context in the analysis of speech / discourse behaviour. Like the elements of a linguistic personality (speech personality, communicative personality, discourse personality, or text personality), several types of speech behaviour can be distinguished. We share the view

of both T. G. Vinokur and I. N. Borisova and believe that it is the discourse activity of the communication subject that creates the specific nature of discursive behaviour. For instance, S. Mikheyev's statement that "These new *Chubaisyata*¹⁰⁰ are completely detached from reality" contains a word derived from the proper noun Chubais. The modality of the nomination is objectified by a suffix that becomes a marker of irony and contempt: conceptualisation changes its orientation towards the moral and ethical sphere. Chubaisyata are not "*the children of Chubais*"—they are people who are completely detached from reality, who fail to do anything useful but are part of the inner circle of the government. This is the contextual meaning of the nomination. These people are characterised by the quality of slacktivism and/or clicktivism (Penney, 2017: 131-133). The Speaker's creativity is typical for his discourse activity, and the neologism, which marks the discourse behaviour, becomes the result of this activity.

There are still various grounds for the typology of a linguistic personality in academic literature. From the standpoint of psycholinguistics, for instance, Mikheyev's discourse personality can be attributed to the rational-heuristic type of linguistic personality since the politician tends to express his negative emotions indirectly, by means of figurative language and irony. He carefully selects the right linguistic and discursive devices depending on the purpose of discourse and with the pragmatic aspect in mind. His discourse is appropriate and comprehensible because he uses colloquial syntactic and lexical devices and figurative language.

According to the typology developed by V. I. Karasik (Karasik, 2004), Sergey Mikheyev is an egocentric linguistic personality. This is evidenced by the use of expressions that are not standard for the institutional discourse preceded by the indicator "so to speak": *Even when they say we are your friends..., and we do everything it takes to take your interests into account, so to speak... This is offensive for the Ukrainians, so to speak... It's as if there is something we don't understand, yes, so to speak...* In addition, the politician's discourse is full of vivid judgement-based images: *fun and frolic; a mishmash, a lame duck; to squeeze the sorest corns; to glue the nation together; to cut all the hoses and all the oxygen; vatniks*¹⁰¹; *a reverse backflip; a*

¹⁰⁰ Translator's note: *Chubaisyata* contains a suffix that is used for naming young animals in Russian and literally means *Chubais' younglings*.

¹⁰¹ Translator's note: *vatnik* is a term for a traditional Russian cotton-padded jacket. Used figuratively, *the vatnik* means a representative of a certain archetypical Russian who slavishly supports the regime out of fear and/or hatred.

somersault; a clown, etc.). The fact that Sergey Mikheyev very rarely cites any authorities or results of any studies supports the idea of the egocentric linguistic personality.

From the sociolinguistic perspective, we do not think Sergey Mikheyev can be considered as a typical representative of any particular social group. Mikheyev often addresses his opponents in a way that goes beyond what is appropriate within the communicative code, so he cannot be attributed to the “intellectual” social type. He has too much of a black-and-white mentality and his statements are not flexible enough to be characterised as the “television presenter” type. Since the list of social types is open, we can assume that this is a mixed type of a pragmatically oriented elitist linguistic personality. This type is characterised by several models of speech behaviour which have been shown as part of the analysis. Figurative and evaluative language mark the process of the politician’s reflexive activity, which is aimed at the interaction with the addressee and at immediate reaction. Integration signs (forms of indirect imperative: *can’t, need to, should, must, etc.*, and the pronoun “we”), orientation signs (*political elite, Ukrainian experts, Ukrainian authorities, etc.*), and agonial signs (*I’m sick and tired of you, shut up, bugger me, etc.*). The choice of a sign objectifies the category of Sofia and is based on the elocutionary mechanism.

Since situationally is an essential characteristic of discourse behaviour along with intentionality, interactivity, and discontinuity, it is worth noting that Mikheyev’s discourse behaviour depends on communication factors. Interactivity is manifested in the fact that his speech is always addressed to either opponents or like-minded people. Intentionality is associated with the mechanisms of the verbal implementation of ideas, which was shown as part of our analysis. Thus, Sergey Mikheyev is a prototype of an elitist discourse personality of a mixed type with a high level of communicative activity. He positions himself as a rational but ironic personality.

Directions for future research

In this paper, we attempted to describe a politician’s discourse personality from the standpoints of the cognitive-discursive, linguo-rhetorical, and instrumental approaches. Similar future research can obviously be done based on other approaches and their combinations. As demonstrated in this study, the self-presentation characteristics of a discourse personality depend on communicative

situations. Therefore, such characteristics can eventually be considered in other communicative situations and in other discourse genres of a political personality. The self-presentation types of a discourse personality are insufficiently covered in academic literature. Discourse personality analysis can be useful for studying personal self-identification in various manifestations of personality, modelling communicative behaviour of a discourse personality in various types of discourse, and for identifying both typical and individual linguistic, sociocultural, linguo-cognitive, and linguo-rhetorical characteristics of discourse activity.

This paper can be used to study the cognitive style of a discourse personality generally and a political personality specifically. The research can be a starting point for studying a discourse personality in both personally- and status-oriented types of discourse.

References

- Andreev, S., Mistecky, M., & Altmann, G. (2018). *Sonnets: Quantitative Inquiries*. RAM-Verlag.
- Barabash, V.V., Kotelenets, Elena A., Karabulatova, Irina S., Lavrentyeva, Maria Y., Mitina, Yulia S. (2019). The confrontation between the Eastern and Western worldviews in the conceptual space of the information war against Russia: the genesis and evolution of the terminological apparatus. *Amazonia investiga*, Vol. 8 Núm. 19: 246 - 254 / Marzo - abril 2019, p.246 – 254.
- Bogdanova-Beglarian, N., Sherstinova, T., Blinova, O., & Martynenko, G. (2017). Linguistic Features and Sociolinguistic Variability in Everyday Spoken Russian. *SPECOM, 2017. Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence, LNAI, 10458*, 503–511.
- Boldyrev, N. N., & Dubrovskaya, O. G. (2016). Sociocultural Commitment of Cognitive Linguistics via Dimensions of Context. *ILHA DO DESTERRO: A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies*, 69(1), 173–182.
- Borisova, I. N. (2005). *Russkiy razgovornyy dialog: struktura i dinamika [Russian spoken dialogue: structure and dynamics]*. Moscow: KomKniga. (In Russian).
- Browse, S. (2016). Revisiting Text World Theory and Extended Metaphor: Embedding and Foregrounding Extended Metaphors in the Text Worlds of the 2008 Financial Crash. *Language and Literature*, 25(1), 18–37.

- Geraerts, D. (2018). Paradigm Shifts in Linguistics. *Kognitivnyye issledovaniya yazyka [Cognitive studies on language]*, 34, 41–45.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. 1. Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. L.: Heinemann.
- Hilpert, M. (2014). *Construction Grammar and its Application to English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hilbert, M. (2017). The More You Know, the More You Can Grow: An Information Theoretic Approach to Growth in the Information Age. *Entropy*, 19(2), 82.
- Karasik, V. I. (2004). *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs [Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse]*. Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury. (In Russian).
- Karasik, V. I. (2019). *Yazykovaya spiral: tsennosti, znaki, motivy [Language spiral: values, signs, motives]*. Moscow: Gnosis. (In Russian).
- Kövecses, Z. (2019). Metaphor, Mind and Context. *Kognitivnyye issledovaniya yazyka [Cognitive studies on language]*, 37, 126–130.
- Krasnykh, V. V. (2001). *Osnovy psikholingvistiki i teorii kommunikatsii [Bases of psycholinguistics and theory of communication]*. Moscow: ITDGG Gnosis. (In Russian).
- Lakoff, G. (2016). Understanding Trump [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://georgelakoff.com/2016/67/23/understanding-trump-2/>
- McCune, L. (2016). *Meaning, Mind and Communication. Explorations in Cognitive Semiotics*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 127–143.
- Oben, B., & Brône, G. (2016). Explaining interactive alignment: A multimodal and multifactorial account. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 104, 32–51.
- Penney, J. (2017). *The Citizen Marketer. Promoting Political Opinion in the Social Media Age*. Oxford University Press.
- Salazar, D. (2014). *Lexical Bundles in Native and Non-Native Scientific Writing*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamin's. 114–115.
- Sedov, K. F. (2004). *Diskurs i lichnost: evolyutsiya kommunikativnoy kompetentsii [Discourse and personality: evolution of communicative competence]*. Moscow: Labirint. (In Russian).
- Sheigal, E. I. (2000). *Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa: dis. doktora filol. nauk: 10.02.01 [Semiotics of political discourse: thesis for doctoral degree in philology: 10.02.01]*. Volgograd. (In Russian).
- Sikora, I. (2014). Contemporary Approach to Terminological Competence, Management and Terminology Teaching on the Basis of Courses for Translators Offered by Polish Higher Education Institutions. In *Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World*. Vienna: University of Vienna. 500–508.
- Sulima, I. I. (2017). Social Philosophy of Science in Search of Tools. *Epistemology & Philosophy of Science*, 54(4), 30–33.
- Vinokur, T. G. (1993). *Govoryashchiy i Slushayushchiy. Varianty rechevogo povedeniya [The Speaker and the Listener. Options of Speech Behaviour]*. Moscow: Nauka. (In Russian).
- Vorozhbitova, A., Karabulatova, I., Bzegezheva, Z., Druzhinina, V., & Pyankova, T. (2019). A glossy magazine discourse of the early twenty-first century as a tool of globalization: Sochi school of linguistics and rhetoric. *Amazonia Investiga*, 8(24), 170–180.
- Yakubinskiy, L. P. (1986). *Izbrannyye raboty. Yazyk i yego funktsionirovaniye [Selected works. Language and its functioning]*. Moscow: Nauka. 17–58. (In Russian).