

сучасному етапі розвитку мовознавчої науки накопичено суттєвий досвід деталізованого аналізу лінгвістичних аспектів *брехні*, що стало можливим завдяки актуалізації інструментів комунікативної, когнітивної, політичної, юридичної, соціо- і гендерної лінгвістики, лінгвoseміотики, лінгвофілософії та інших актуальних мовознавчих галузей. Тому саме акумуляція та консолідація такого поліаспектного досвіду й дасть змогу розробити нові концепції інтерпретації феномена *неправди* в різних ракурсах, аспектах, параметрах: наприклад, крізь призму лінгвістики гумору, лінгвістики пропаганди, лінгвістики реклами та ін. з урахуванням гендерних, вікових, професійних і національно-маркованих параметрів вивчення мовної особистості, агента мовленнєвої дії, який ретранслює неправду.

Література

1. Вайнрих Х. Лингвистика лжи. Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия : сборник статей / под общ. редакцией В. В. Петрова. М.: Прогресс, 1987. С. 44–87.
2. Ленец А. В. Перспективы научного направления «Лингвистика лжи» в России и Германии. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/perspektivy-nauchnogo-napravleniya-lingvistika-lzhi-v-rossii-i-germanii-1>
3. Ленец А. В. Коммуникативный феномен лжи: лингвистический и семиотический аспекты: на материале немецкого языка. Автореф. дис. ... докт. филол. наук. Иркутский государственный лингвистический университет. Ростов–на–Дону, 2010. 39 с.
4. Ленец А. В. Отечественные и зарубежные теории лжи и обмана. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/otechestvennye-i-zarubezhnye-teorii-lzhi-i-rechevogo-obmana>
5. Морозова О. І. Лінгвальні аспекти неправди як когнітивно-комунікативного утворення (на матеріалі сучасної англійської мови) : Автореф. дис... д-ра наук: 10.02.04. К.: Київський національний лінгвістичний університет, 2008. 35 с.
6. Почепцов Г. Г. Виртуальные войны. Фейки: [монография]. Х.: Фолио, 2019. 392 с.
7. Сваричевська Л. Лінгвoseміотика брехні: пошук істини. *Вісник Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія філологічна*. Випуск 52 (2011). URL: <http://publications.lnu.edu.ua/bulletins/index.php/philology/article/view/3052>
8. Шестак Л. А. Политическая лингвистика: фрейм-события и фейк-нюс. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/politicheskaya-lingvistika-freym-sobytiya-i-feyk-nyus>
9. Collins Language Lovers Blog. URL: <https://blog.collinsdictionary.com/language-lovers/fake-news-unicorn-lucy-mangans-take-on-collinswoty-2017/>
10. Collins English Dictionary. Thesaurus and reference materials URL: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/fake-news>

УДК 808.51-057.177.11(439)(043.2)»2018»

RHETORIC DEVICES IN VIKTOR ORBAN'S SPEECH "YOU ARE CONDEMNING HUNGARY" OF 11 SEPTEMBER 2018

M. M. Yurkovska

The speech that is under analysis is the passionate reaction of the Hungarian Prime Minister Victor Orbán to the “Sargentini report” submitted to the European Parliament. According to this report, the ruling government of Hungary was accused of serious undermining of values of the European Union, and of “posing a “systemic threat” to the EU's fundamental principles” (Emma Beswick & Rita Palfi, 2018). Dutch Green MEP Judith Sargentini, who produced the draft report, submitted the allegations of abuse to migrants, restrictions on freedom of the press, corruption and conflicts of interest, inadequate privacy and data protection, 'stereotypical attitudes' towards women; and finally expressed concerns over electoral and constitutional systems. As a result, she compelled her contemporaries to support her recommendation to launch the little-used Article 7 against Hungary as a member of EP.

Naturally, such accusations, the task that arose before Orbán was to rehabilitate the policies of his government, as well as to restore Hungary's reputation as a democratic state, and a full member of the European Union.

The disagreement and condemnation of the report appears in the very title of the speech that was posted on the official website of the Hungarian government. It is revealed by the modifying construction "so-called" regarding the "Sargentini report", and literally indicates that Orbán considers the report wrong.

Despite the fact that Orbán begins his speech with a cascade of pre-emptive assertions like "*I know that you have already formed your opinions. I know that the majority of you will vote in favour of the report. I also know that my contribution now will not sway your opinions*", in fact, his speech is an attempt to catch MEP on his side and to convince them not to vote against Hungary. On the other side, the addressee of his speech is not limited only to the present MEP. We think that it includes also Hungarian electorate, which means that Orbán faces the need to rehabilitate his political reputation mainly before the Hungarians, especially before the adherents of the European Union within Hungary, and to prevent any possible claims on their side on the account of the submitted report. Orbán strives to play on the feelings and values of the Hungarians, thus out of all the charges, he chooses to focus only on the one that the Hungarians are very vulnerable about, the one concerning the Arab refugees. The above-mentioned motives explain the choice of argumentation strategy in his speech, which mainly relies on the appeal to emotions, values and facts.

Orbán starts framing his argumentation with a counterbalanced sentence of not X but Y structure "*...because you are not about to denounce a government, but a country and a people*". By means of such construction, Orbán substitutes the "defendant" [a government → Hungarian people] appealing to the feeling of sympathy in MEP.

The first paragraph is remarkable for the use of figurative language, "stories in capsules", and aims at imaging Hungary as a state with a prominent and glorious past and history that is seen from the extracts like "*you will denounce Hungary*", "*Hungary – a member of the family of Europe's Christian peoples*", "*contributed to the history with its blood*", "*Hungary made the highest sacrifice*", "*opened its borders to its East German brothers and sisters*", or "*Hungary that rose and took up arms against the world's largest army, the Soviets*" (it is interesting that Orbán doesn't mention the rallying of Hungary with another large army in the WWII). The use of the metonymy in the extract "*Hungary has fought for its freedom and democracy*" and almost a poetic periphrasis "*And now these people want to denounce the Hungarian freedom-fighters of the anti-communist, democratic resistance*" adds to the pathos of the utterance.

Further, in the second paragraph Orbán seeks to represent contemporary Hungary as a model democratic state. To achieve this he frames his argumentation through appeal to both facts and emotions by means of assertions like "*Hungary's decisions are made by the voters in parliamentary elections*" or "*to Hungarians freedom, democracy, independence and Europe are matters of honour*" and finishes it with the sentence that contains logical fallacy of false cause "*This is why I say that the report before you is an affront to the honour of Hungary and the Hungarian people*". Orbán seeks to challenge the credibility of the data in the report, therefore he shifts to face-threatening speech acts of accusation and disagreement like "*this report does not show respect for the Hungarian people*" or "*this report applies double standards*", "*it is an abuse of power, it oversteps the limits on spheres of competence, and the method of its adoption is a treaty violation*". In Orbán's speech there is an example of indirect negation like "*You think that you know the needs of the Hungarian people better than the Hungarian people themselves*", with which he actually states that Members of European Parliament don't know what is better for the Hungarian people. To intensify the impact he uses direct speech acts "*I stay here*", "*I defend*", and "*I say that*" and a linguistic hedge "*I must say to you that*".

The central message of the third paragraph is expressed by assertions like "*You are assuming a grave responsibility when – for the first time in the history of the European Union – you seek to exclude a people from decision-making in Europe*" and "*You would strip Hungary of its right to*

represent its own interests within the European family that it is a member of”, which are hidden accusations. This is the main thing against which Orbán speaks out. And this is the only time when he states this literally without figurative language. This idea is framed by appeals to emotions through bare assertions like *“To us in Hungary, democracy and freedom are not political questions, but moral questions”*, *“you seek to stigmatise a country and a people”*, *“you pass moral judgements”*, *“We have ... disputes”*, *“we think differently about Europe’s Christian character, and the role of nations and national cultures”*, *“we interpret the essence and mission of the family in different ways”*, and *“we have diametrically opposed views on migration”*. At the end of the paragraph Orbán resorts to the device of shared aspirations to the better future through “clusivity” by means of pronouns “we” and “our”: *“If we truly want unity in diversity, then our differences cannot be cause for the stigmatisation of any country, or for excluding it from the opportunity of engaging in joint decision-making. We would never sink so low as to silence those with whom we disagree”*.

The concluding paragraphs are especially high-flown and emotional. The argumentation in them is mainly based on the appeals to semantic categories like *“...is unfair... is un-European”*; as well as on the appeals to facts through assertions like *“We are the most successful party in the European Parliament”*, *“Our socialist and liberal opponents are understandably unhappy with our success”*, *“This report disregards agreements that were concluded years ago”* or *“Every nation and Member State has the right to decide on how to organise its life in its own country”*. The rhetorical question *“But if you are free to do this and can disregard agreements at will, then what is the point of coming to an agreement with any European institution in the first place?”* will call into question the reliability of any agreement with and within the European Union institutions. Assertions like *“Our union is held together by the fact that disputes are resolved within a regulated framework”* are targeted at finding common ground. By means of appeals to facts like *“...I have made compromises and concluded agreements with the Commission on the Media Act, on the justice system, and even on certain passages in the Constitution”* Orbán foregrounds arguments to his advantage.

At the end of the speech Orbán again uses figurative language and images *“defend our borders”*, *“We have built a fence”*, *“we have defended Hungary”*, *“we have defended Europe”* or *“a community denouncing its own border guards”*.

We can observe the use of the “unsaid” as a framing device between such two sentences as *“Every nation and Member State has the right to decide on how to organise its life in its own country”* and *“We shall defend our borders, and we alone shall decide who we want to live with”*. The first one is an assertion of a fact and aims at finding common ground, accenting the idea that Hungary possesses equal with other members of the EU rights. The second is about shared values, in other words the desirable for Hungary state of things in future, something we [should] strive at. The authorization for this [*defend our borders, we alone shall decide*] as if flows from the first sentence as something natural, logical and legal. The unsaid idea, which actually cannot be pronounced openly by Orbán in EP, is that in spite of the fact that Hungary is a full member of the EU and consequently is obliged to provide within the country the officially adopted policy of the EU, Hungary will make an exception and won’t stick to this policy.

The last paragraph starts with the illocutionary speech act *“Let us speak plainly”* that is not an invitation to be sincere, but really a prelude to the open censure and disagreement with the MEP’s decision. Further by means of the logical fallacy of false cause in the part *“you want to denounce Hungary because the Hungarian people have decided that our homeland will not become an immigrant country”* Orbán appeals to the sense of fairness and justice of MEP. Remarkably strong sound the performatives *“I reject the threats, the blackmail, the slander ...”* or *“I respectfully inform you that ...”*. Orbán finishes his address with strong appeal to emotions through “stories in capsules” like *“people will finally have the chance to decide the future of Europe”* and *“will have the opportunity to restore democracy to European politics”*.

Reference

1. Emma Beswick & Rita Palfi (2018) Article 7 Sanctions: What does the Sargentini Report Accuse Hungary of? *Breaking News*, 10 September. URL: https://www.euronews.com/2018/09/10/article-7-sanctions-what-does-the-sargentini-report-accuse-hungary-of_ [accessed 1 May 2021].