

Elya Davtyan

Lecturer and Ph.D. student of Foreign Language

Department at Eurasia International University

Email: davtyanelya@gmail.com

DOI: 10.53614/18294952-2021.1-100

POLITICAL LEADERS’ SPEECH EXPRESSING TOLERANCE/ INTOLERANCE IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE CONDITIONED BY GENDER (WITH THE COMBINATION OF ENGLISH, FRENCH, AND ARMENIAN)

The concept of “gender” is one of the most discussed, criticized and speculated concepts in recent years, which is of interest from different perspectives – cultural, sociological, political, linguistic, psychological, etc. Gender obtains a unique manifestation in the political discourse. The analysis of speech of female and male politicians enables to identify the peculiarities of gender approaches in the political communication. There are obvious differences in the speech of men and women. They are conditioned by social and biological roles as well as stereotypes. In our work, we have analyzed the debates and speech of some key figures in American, French, and Armenian politics based on gender features. The contextual analysis used throughout the studies determines whether the speech has gender-specific peculiarities and what linguistic devices in the speech make it possible to speak, for example, whether the speech is mild or coarse, tolerant or intolerant.

Key words: political discourse, tolerance, intolerance, stylistic devices, speech behavior, speech difference.

Introduction

The political discourse has become a significant and inseparable part of our

daily life, and we can't behave indifferently towards the changes that are taking place around us all over the world. The struggle for power is the main theme and moving force in this sphere of communication. Since this struggle is realized through the language, the existence of linguistic investigation within political science becomes inevitable. Besides, the gender of a politician makes a great effect on the construction of the political addressee and the choice of language units. Individual qualities are manifested not only in behavior, lifestyle but also in speech of people. Actually, language is a significant tool of persuasion. Therefore, to gain a favorable public opinion, politicians employ appropriate linguistic resources in their political speech.

The choice of stylistic devices also depends on the strategy followed by the politician. For example, if he implements a strategy of integration, explanation or resistance, then different stylistic devices are used. In the article different communication strategies and performances used by both men and women are being discussed.

Stylistic devices help to embellish the speech and to attain success both in public debates and in the political discussions. Political leaders apply stylistic devices to their remarks in order to strengthen their thoughts and arguments on an issue or to create an impression of an authoritative leader. So, language is a powerful instrument in gaining public support in elections or to increase the political interests.

The peculiarities of the speech style of men and women are manifested at two levels: speech behavior and speech. For example, men interrupt more often, are more categorical, seek to control the topic of the dialogue. Male sentences are usually shorter than female sentences. Men in general are much more likely to use abstract nouns, while women use concrete ones (including proper nouns). Men use adjectives more often, while women use more verbs.

Women's speech includes a large concentration of emotionally evaluative vocabulary, while masculine evaluative vocabulary is more often stylistically neutral. Often, women tend to intensify primarily a positive assessment. Men use negative assessment more pronouncedly, including stylistically reduced vocabulary, they are much more likely to use slang words and expressions, as well as non-literary and profanity.

The problem of linguistic personality and his/her speech behavior are among the central issues of modern linguistic studies. Of a particular interest is the study of the discourse of public linguistic personality, in particular, the discourse of political leaders. Understanding the contemporary political discourse would not be complete without linguistic analysis, which includes the field of research attention of speech tools that form the portrait of a modern politician. The analysis of individual speech characteristics of political leaders is an actively developing area of linguistics. This is quite natural: among all the variety of problems of modern society, many people are worrying about the speech of representatives of the political elite. The success or failure of the election and, consequently, the

fate of the country which largely depend on the speech behavior of political leaders. That is why in all countries, starting from school and ending with the work of image-maker specialists, great attention is paid to the speech and, more specifically, to the speech behavior of a person claiming power. In our paper we tried to find out individual speech characteristics of some political leaders based on gender features.

Political discourse

The political discourse is the formal exchange of reasoned views on which of several alternative courses of action should be taken to solve a societal problem. It is intended to involve all citizens in decision-making, persuade others (through valid information and logic), and clarify what course of action would be the most effective in solving the societal problem. The political discourse is often described as a communication where the main motive and purpose are the struggle for power and underlying the ideas of competition and action. (Sheigal, 2000). Logical reasoning and emotional influence is an inseparable part of the political discourse. These two essential functions are often interrelated in the context of actual political activity, serving the fundamental purpose of political discourse to create an image of a certain reality for the political addressee. Modern research in political discourse is carried out from a variety of perspectives: in particular functional style, cognitive linguistics, pragmatics and speech analysis, logic in particular argument theory, sociolinguistics, public psychology, communication theory, critical speech analysis, and so on.

In recent years, the concepts of political linguistics and political speech analysis have also been circulated, which shows that in the modern world, the language of politics plays an important role and that role is fully realized (Khmeltsov, 2004).

As an important manifestation the political speech has a particularly significant role in the development of democratic societies. The political leader, speaking directly to his people, can be more influential. This phenomenon was formed in the ancient world when speeches were made at public meetings and, thus, the decisions were made. Political speech is a classic example of rhetorical art and is also studied within it. The political talk genre is a unique interactive form of communication with groups of people and masses. A political speech is not a monologue, it is a necessary dialogue, on the basis of which the speaker has the desired or expected answer for the orator.

Persuasion is especially important in political discourse as it the basis of political rhetoric; and all political discourse is built around it (Dijk, 2006). Persuasion is the influence of a politician or orator delivering a verbal or written message to an audience whose purpose is to persuade and influence the audience. To get the result of the persuasion it is necessary to get the audience reaction, thus, it is necessary to ensure audience involvement in the persuasion communication process. The persuasive communication is a highly conscious, focused verbal activity that requires great intellectual effort and awareness. (Baghdasaryan, 2011)

D.Trump's and H.Clinton's speech differences

Analyzing and comparing both the speeches and the debate between the US President Donald Trump and US Senator Hillary Clinton, we concluded that Donald Trump's speech strategy is extreme and intolerant. He is a politician who is not interested in communicating with the audience. However, his comments indicate that his speech is light and not deep, as if it were part of a performance. Unlike Trump's speeches, Clinton's speeches are characterized by a logical structure and sequence, with a more balanced and at the same time contemptuous character of the speech of the opponent. Their communication strategies are so different from one another that eventually they begin to complement one another. During the 2016 campaign, Trump said of his opponent, Hillary Clinton:

«She doesn't have look, she doesn't have the stamina, I said she doesn't have stamina and I don't believe she does have the stamina to be president of the country you need, tremendous stamina». (Trump, Presidential debate)

«Hillary has the experience, but it's bad, bad experience..... so she got the experience that I agree, but a bad bad experience». (Trump to Clinton: 'You Do Have Experience, 2016) *In response to this type of qualification, Clinton responds:*

«He tried to switch from looks to stamina, but this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs, and dogs». (At Debate, Clinton Calls Out Trump For Calling Women "Pigs, Slobs, And Dogs", 2016)

By repeating simple sentences and words, Trump wants to convince the audience that she is unable to run the country because she has a bad experience and lacks stability. Often his speeches may contain offensive sentences:

«You are a rude, terrible person... you are a very rude person. The way you treat Sarah Huckabee is horrible and the way you treat other people is horrible. When you report fake news, when you report fake news, which CNN does a lot, you are the enemy of the people». (Trump calls CNN reporter a 'rude, terrible person' during explosive press conference, 2018)

Through the gradation, repetition of words, he expresses his indignation at the CNN reporter, calling him rude and terrible, as well as an enemy of the people. This kind of irrepressible Trump behavior speaks to his unprofessional and intolerable image. His rhetorical style amazes at its simplicity, with the same limited vocabulary and adjectives, with a non-standard and intolerant ideology. Unlike Hillary Clinton, he stands out for his extreme stance on immigration.

«We will build a great wall on our southern border. We need 1000 miles and we have all of the materials. We can do that so beautifully. And this is going to be a serious wall. This is going to be a high wall». (Trump, youtube, 2016)

«If a company wants to fire their workers and go to Mexico or another country and then they think they're going to ship their products back into the United States, we will charge them a tax of 35 percent» (Trump, youtube, 2016) With such examples, we are convinced that D. Trump is armed with an intolerant policy, and we can even say that he has a zero tolerance in his speeches. On the contrary

in Clinton's speeches, we note a tolerant attitude toward immigrants. In his speeches, she highlights their role as well as their need to be in the United States.

«Whether you're Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Latin American, whether your family just arrived or has been here since before the United States even existed [cheers], you're not strangers. You're not intruders. You're our neighbors, our colleagues, our friends, our families. You make our nation stronger, smarter, more creative. And I want you to know that I see you and I am with you, and time and again time and again we have seen that when we invest in the community when we make it possible for Latinos to get the health care you need, get the education you desire, compete for jobs, start new businesses, pursue your dreams, all of America benefits». (Clinton H. R., 2016)

Using gradation, parallel structures, and the frequent use of the pronoun “you”, Clinton values the role of immigrants in American life. Emphasizing their role both in business and in the education system, she considers immigrants to be a partner, friend, and ultimately family, and emphasizes that the country only benefits from their presence. Trump often uses the pronoun “we” in his speech:

«We have to stop our companies from leaving the United States». (Trump, you tube, 2016)

Using the pronoun “we”, Trump reminds his people that he is one of them. “We” is one of the speech strategies to which Trump convinces his audience and supports his political views and actions. Trump uses various types of repetition in his message to support and strengthen his political ideologies. Speaking in Iowa he addresses the crowd:

“People don't know how great you are. People don't know how smart you are. These are the smart people. There are the smart people. There are the really smart people. And they never like to say it. But I say it. And I'm a smart person. These are the smart. We have the smartest people. We have the smartest people. And they know it. And some say it. But they hate to say it. But we have the smartest people”. (Trump, Donald Trump's Bizarre Speech: 'You Are The Smartest People', 2016)

Repetition as a flexible tool, generating greater excitement and pleasure, can be used to increase audience perception. That is, he emphasizes some key points of speech in order to integrate them into the brain of the audience. But analyzing Trump's speech, we notice that the overuse of repetition renders the speech meaningless and groundless. Moreover, out of the eighty words uttered in the last sentence, only fourteen words are two syllables, the remaining words one syllable. He repeats the word – “people” eight times, the “smartest” word three times, and the “person” he utters once, all the other words are single words. Unlike Donald Trump's speeches in Clinton's speeches, we find widespread use of the “I” pronoun, that is typical of female politicians as they have to constantly struggle to establish their status, their right to participate in the country's political life. As a woman politician, she rarely expresses her feelings, but there are times when H. Clinton hints at her family, her role in her life. In such cases– she not only expresses her emotions but also wants to show the direct connection between himself and the audience:

“Today is my granddaughter’s second birthday, so I think about this a lot”. (Clinton H. , ‘Today is My Granddaughter’s Second Birthday’: Why I Think Hillary Clinton ‘Trumps’ Donald at Public Speaking, 2016)

Another speech was made by Clinton during the attack on the US Consulate in Bengal. Unlike male politicians, his speech had an emotional tone typical of female politicians.

“I stood next to president Obama as the Mrines carried those flag-draped caskets off the plane at Andrews, I put my arms around the mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, sons and daughters” (Clinton H. , Hillary Clinton Nearly Tears Up At Benghazi Hearing, 2013)

As a woman politician, she does not hide her feelings, does not restrain her tears, and shares the grief of those families that she considers a tragedy for the whole nation. Acting as the mother of the whole nation she says:

«As I have said many times since September 11, I take responsibility» (Clinton H. , Hillary Clinton Biography, 2018)

Given the linguistic features of the speech of H. Clinton, it should be noted that her goal is to maintain the position of an influential woman. She skillfully combines the peculiarities of the language of men and women. Moreover, she is trying her best to control herself in order to remain in her political character. The euphemism is widely used in her speeches. Robin Lakoff claims that the use of lexico-grammatical euphemism makes the word indecisive, indefinite and characteristic only for women. For example:

«You know, I’m here tonight as a proud mother, as a proud Democrat» (Clinton H. , Hillary Rodham Clinton’s Democratic Convention Speech, 2008)

However, in opposition to R. Lacoff’s assertion, we can say that such euphemisms is found in the speeches of male politicians. For example, Trump uses vocabulary-grammatical euphemisms in his evasive response:

«Well, nobody was pressing it, nobody was caring much about it. I figured you’d ask the question tonight, of course. But nobody was caring much about it. But I was the one that got him to produce the birth certificate. And I think I did a good job». (Trump D. , 2017)

According to D. Borisov during the conversation, men interrupt women more often than men do. (Borisoff, 1988) Social scientists Zimmerman and K. West from the University of Santa Barbara agree with him. (Zimmerman, 1975) A striking proof of their study is the 2016 election campaign in the United States D. Tramp and H. Clinton’s debate, where D. Tramp interrupts H. Clinton 70 times, and H. Clinton just 17 times. (Frostenson, 2016). However, by analyzing a number of political debates, we will try to counter their assertions and say that female politicians, in turn, do not lack the ability to interrupt and, using the other’s tolerant image, try to advance their assertions and views. A vivid evidence of this is the debate between Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton, where B. Obama patiently listens to H. Clinton’s accusations and insults and never interrupt her: ...it is sometimes difficult to understand what Senator Obama has said, because as soon

as he is confronted on it, he says that's not what he meant. The facts are that he has said in the last week, that he really lied. (Chozick, 2008) In this case, Clinton behaves inappropriately towards the opponent, accusing him of lying. While B. Obama's similar behavior indicates that he is a restrained and tolerant politician. To succeed in politics, women politicians must go against stereotypes. To make women more effective, they need to get out of the house, become more ruthless, cold and dominant. However, in parallel with this assertion, if a woman uses more powerful and ambitious forms of language, or "attempts to be like a man," she may be viewed negatively (Irving, 2019) At the same time, speaking to the public requires courage; the speaker must be able to somehow manifest himself, show his real face, his real beliefs, on the basis of which the audience will be able to make his most important conclusions about politics. (Kara-Ghazaryan, n.d.).

So, analyzing the speeches and debates of Trump and Hillary Clinton, we have come to the conclusion that the views of Trump testify to his intolerance. His hatred of immigrants, his aggressive attitude towards the opponent, his negative attitude towards globalization allows him to think that politics is not constructive at all. Having a rather poor vocabulary consisting of the one-syllable word and often repetitive words, uttering deceptive and groundless sentences, nevertheless, in its simplicity and immediacy, he captured the hearts of Americans who elected him the next President of the United States. On the contrary, being a more tolerant and constructive politician, Hillary Clinton was defeated by Donald Trump. Her biggest problem, as many have acknowledged, has always been his identity. She is called very cold, extremely rude, extremely professional. She is not a very good orator, she has no persuasion, she has no original ideas, and today rhetoric is the main weapon of a politician (Kara-Ghazaryan, n.d.).

Emmanuel Macron's and Marine Le Pen's speech difference

A politician's speech behavior seems to be a flexible mechanism for unconsciously influencing an individual's psychology. Mastery of rhetorical, non-standard thinking, high level of intelligence are the components of the formation of political power. Such verbal behavior is typical of the current French President Emmanuel Macron. Unlike US President Donald Trump's speeches, the sentences in Emanuel Macron's speeches are much more complex in structure, full of metaphors. In his sentences, he outlines a philosophical legacy that is especially decorative in making beautiful turns. What about Marine Le Pen, she is above all a "Le Pen" and that her name has become a sort of political label thanks to his predecessor-father of Jean-Marine Le Pen. Currently, M. Le Pen, who ran for head of state, is the most popular female politician in France, taking an active part in the life of her country. Firmly defending its position, possessing its own ideology, she continues to wage an active political struggle. Her scandalous image is widely represented in the French press. Repeatedly, the authors of the publications resorted to a precedent anthroponym, likening the French politician to the US President Donald Trump: "En français," Trump "se dit" Le Pen. / "In French,

Trump is considered to be Le Pen.”

Both candidates represent new political divisions. For E. Macron, it is progressive against conservatives, for Marine Le Pen, it's patriots against globalists. The reference to the anthroponym “Trump”, based on the analogy in the views of two politicians (negative attitude to immigrants, nationalism, populism) and the contradictory attitude of the public towards them, allows us to give an estimated implicit characterization of the image. The unexpected election of President D. Trump led to consider the potential victory in the presidential election, M. Le Pen. Thus, in the French press, her possible victory was represented by the following metaphors: “catastrophe” (catastrophe), “danger” (danger), “péril” (danger), “peur” (fear): “Le Pen présidente serait une « catastrophe totale »”. (Le Pen présidente serait une « catastrophe totale», 2017) “Le Pen president would be a ‘total disaster’”. (“Le Pen president would be a ‘total disaster’”, 2017) The metaphors listed are negative and indicate a very negative attitude in society towards the conflicting personality of a woman politician. Marin Le Pen herself, positively assessing her candidacy, metaphorically calls herself the “pole of stability”, which runs counter to public opinion:

“Je suis le seul pôle de stabilité dans le chaos dans lequel se débattent la droite comme la gauche”, – décrypte Marine Le Pen ” (Grigoryevich, 2018) (*“I am the only pole of stability in the chaos in which the right and the left are struggling”*).

The press often emphasizes the determination of M. Le Pen – a feature inherent in any promising politician. So, in the political newspaper “Marianne” this quality is expressed by a hyperbole: “Marine Le Pen va tout faire pour accréditer l'idée”. (Marine Le Pen will do everything to accredit the idea, 2017) (“Marine Le Pen will do everything to accredit the idea”). Whereas, Macron's opinion is quite different. He hints at the inactive nature of M. Le Pen's policy and her lack of a clear coherent political course:

“Continuez votre antienne Madame Le Pen, vous n'avez que cela à la bouche. Vous n'avez pas de projet pour le pays”. («Perlimpinpin», 2017) (*«Continue your antiphon Madame Le Pen, you have only that in your mouth. You have no plans for the country”*).

The lexeme “antienne”, literally meaning the repetition of a line in a psalm, is figuratively used in French in the meaning of “annoying repetition of something”.

“Depuis 40 ans, des Le Pen sont candidats à la présidentielle. Mais tout cela ne m'intéresse pas. Vous allez continuer votre logorrhée, comme vous le faites à longueur d'interventions”. (Galimatias, 2017) (*“For 40 years, Le Pen has been a presidential candidate. But all of that doesn't interest me. You will continue your “logorrhea”, as you do throughout interventions ”*).

“Logorrhea” is a literary term for a flood of useless words. Bilateral accusations and criticism are a commonplace in political discourse.

«Monsieur Macron, c'est le candidat de la continuité, d'une continuité morbide,

dont le chemin est parsemé des cadavres des emplois délocalisés, des ruines des entreprises en faillite» (“Mr. Macron is the candidate of continuity, of morbid continuity, whose path is strewn with the corpses of relocated jobs, the ruins of bankrupt companies).

Metaphorical words make Marine Le Pen’s speech more compelling and impressive. Journalists emphasize that the latter does not have typical feminine (female) qualities, such as sensitivity and modesty. Regarding a woman politician in the French press the phrase “insensible aux affaires” – “insensitive to affairs.” The slightest manifestations of modesty are perceived by the press with irony:

“*Alors pourquoi cette timidité inhabituelle chez Marine Le Pen?*” (“So why this unusual shyness in Marine Le Pen?”) (Grigoryevich, 2018)

Marine Le Pen’s sentences are less sparse, consisting of a subject, predicate, and complement. They embody two opposing worldviews, have different audiences, two different approaches – direct and high-flown. Macron’s current task is to break out of this stereotypical framework (artistic, philosophical) and join a people anchored in a more pragmatic reality. Macron’s linguistic approaches contribute to the lack of specific communication between him and the audience. The speech of both of them revolves around the same value. In their speeches we often find the same abstract nouns: “liberté”, “identity”, (identité), “people”, or “nation”, but with different approaches. Marine Le Pen reflects on the past, history, civilization, while Emmanuel Macron looks to the future, to changes. Marie Le Pen’s political ideas are extreme, intolerant, she strongly criticizes the European Union, and her only wish is for France to leave the European Union.

«*L’Union Européenne tue le service public par ultra-libéralisme, mais aussi parce qu’elle est loin, qu’elle méconnaît totalement la réalité des gens*». (“The European Union is killing public service by ultra-liberalism, but also because it is far away, because it totally ignores the reality of people”). (Grigoryevich, 2018)

Her criticisms of the European Union are almost at the epicenter of his speeches.

«*L’Union européenne, comme l’Union soviétique, n’est pas soumise à réparation. Je veux revenir à l’alliance des États souverains d’Europe*». (“The European Union, like the Soviet Union, is not subject to reparation. I want to return to the alliance of European sovereign states”), – has declared Le Pen in the Brussels journal “EU-observer”. (Grigoryevich, 2018)

According to the extremist leader of France, “after the European Union,” prosperity is expected in Europe (Panarmenia Net 17 հոկտեմբերի 2013 թ). Unlike Marie Le Pen, Macron’s behavior is more tolerant of the European Union.

«*L’Europe que nous connaissons est trop faible, trop lente, trop inefficace mais l’Europe seule peut nous donner une capacité d’action dans le monde face aux grands défis contemporains*» (Macron, 2017)(“The Europe we know is too weak, too slow, too ineffective, but Europe alone can give us the capacity to act in the world in the face of the great contemporary challenges”).

Macron often uses stylistic devices in his speech to make it more expressive.

In this case, by using stylistic device of the anticlimax, he considers Europe weak and ineffective, while at the same time considering it a tool against the world's challenges. (Emmanuel Macron's European ambitions by 2024, 2017)

No matter how monstrous the European Union may seem to Marine Le Pen, for her the real monster is globalization, the main cause of the destruction of nations. She qualifies globalization as a horrible thing and an impetus force for Islamic fundamentalism. Le Pen says to a roaring crowd in the southeastern city of Lyon:

«Nos dirigeants ont choisi la mondialisation, qu'ils voulaient être une chose heureuse. Cela s'est avéré être une chose horrible. Ils en ont fait une idéologie: la mondialisation économique, qui refuse toute réglementation ... Elle pose les conditions d'une autre forme de mondialisation: l'intégrisme islamiste.» (“Our leaders chose globalization, which they wanted to be a happy thing. It turned out to be a horrible thing. They made an ideology out of it: economic globalization, which refuses any regulation ... It sets the conditions for another form of globalization: Islamist fundamentalism.”). (Vinacur, 2017)

«C'est l'Union européenne qui accélère la mondialisation, [...]». (“It is the European Union that is accelerating globalization, [...]”).

In one sentence she expresses her hostility for both the European Union and globalization.

Contrary to the negative attitude of Marine Le Pen to the European Union, E. Macron has a completely different opinion about it.

“L'Europe c'est nous. C'est nous qui l'avons voulu. Et nous avons besoin de l'Europe parce que l'Europe nous rend plus grands, parce que l'Europe nous fait plus forts”. (“Europe is us. We wanted it. And we need Europe because Europe makes us bigger, because Europe makes us stronger ”).

He sees the potential of the French people in the European Union, which helps them become stronger and bigger.

Marine Le Pen has also an intolerant behavior toward the immigration which becomes her Pandora's box, from which a profusion of demons is released. She does not qualify immigration as an chance, but finds it as a tragedy for the French people

«Pour beaucoup de Français, l'immigration massive est une oppression, immigration massive n'est pas une chance pour la France, c'est un drame pour la France». (“For many French people, massive immigration is oppression, massive immigration is not an opportunity for France, it is a drama for France”). (Pen, 2017)

She offers a simple explanation for complex security issues, which is a shortcut linking immigration to insecurity and terrorism:

«Immigration massive, assimilation impossible, communautarisme, fondamentalisme islamique, insécurité. Tous ces phénomènes sont évidemment liés » (“Massive immigration, impossible assimilation, communitarianism, Islamic fundamentalism, insecurity. All these phenomena are obviously linked ”).

Whereas, the immigration for Macron is a great opportunity for economic, cultural, and social development.

“Contrairement à ce que certains disent, nous ne sommes pas confrontés à une vague d’immigration. Le sujet de l’immigration ne devrait pas inquiéter la population française. L’immigration fait partie du monde dans lequel nous vivons. De surcroît, l’immigration se révèle être une chance d’un point de vue économique, culturel, social.” (Dravigny, 2017) (*Contrary to what some say, we are not facing a wave of immigration. The subject of immigration should not worry the French population. Immigration is part of the world in which we live. In addition, immigration is an economic, cultural and social opportunity*).

Her intolerance for globalization, the European Union and immigration have revealed her extreme, even zero tolerance, which prevented Le Pen from capturing the hearts of the French people and becoming its leader.

It was not just the talent, the extraordinary will power, and the coherent strategy of a single man that led to the astonishing change that France has experienced in a short time. He has demanded a strong role on the international stage by contesting other dominant political leaders, including the US President Donald Trump and the Russian President Vladimir Putin.

Emanuel Macron’s speeches are constructive. He avoids using extremal concepts, marked on the right or on the left of the political spectrum. He never hesitates to tap into a positive and emotional vocabulary far from the ideological struggle. We note in him the catchphrase of dreams, hope, youth, the future. «Est-ce que vous entendez le murmure du printemps? C’est le bruit du page de la vie politique qui est en train de se tourner, que vous allez tourner» (Do you hear the whisper of spring? It’s the noise of the page of political life that is turning, that you are going to turn). In this metaphorical phrase, he announces the beginning of a new policy.

The French President’s discourse abounds with figurative expressions in the *franglais* style (lexical innovations constructed through the fusion of French and English, which is very popular in present in the modern French linguistic community). Such a figurative expression of the president as “bottom up de la terre”, literally meaning “bottom-up social responsibility” has already become practically winged (“Bottom up”: when Macron takes his feet in *franglais*, 2018).

If we compare the tone of the speech and the grammatical level of the two candidates, we will see that Emmanuel Macron’s speeches are based on consensus and unity, they are deeper and more convincing. «Mon seul souci c’est vous, mon seul combat c’est pour vous, notre seule bataille c’est pour la France» (My only concern is you, my only fight for you, our only battle for France). The objective of these sentences is to calm the event of the yellow vests. Here we notice that the repetition gives a harmony effect.

Along with the above-mentioned features of the political discourse, the French President is also characterized by the use of familiar, sometimes vernacular and rude vocabulary, mainly when communicating with the least protected layers of

French society. E. Macron is often criticized in this regard and accused of arrogance, the so-called *mépris social*, “contempt for society,” which, in particular, is very colorful in an article in the periodical of the “Le Monde” in the “Macron states: les risques de l’isolement”, “Macron: Risks of Alienation,” October 13, 2018. The French president is even called “le président des riches”, “the president of the rich.” The use of lexemes such as “bordel”, “mess”, “cavardak”, “house of tolerance”, “des fainéants”, “loafers”, “parasites” addressed to corporate employees and protesters by the president, along with expressions such as “Les gens qui ne sont rien”, “Incompetent people”, “Vous dites des bêtises”, “You utter nonsense”, said in the address of the nurse who asked the President a question regarding medical equipment testifies to the neglect of E. Macron to the middle social class (Macron Report – The three languages of the President, 2018).

Of all the presidential contenders, E. Macron is the one who uses personal pronouns the most. On average, for 10,000 words, he uses more than 90 “I”, when Marine Le Pen uses about 50 times. For many years, the pronoun of the first person of singular was almost a taboo. The pronoun “we” was more used. An exception to this rule is “Je vous ai compris”(I understood you) by Charles de Gaulle, a phrase he uttered against the French in Algeria on June 4, 1958. For ten years of speech, between 1929 and 1939, the former secretary-general of the PCF, Maurice Thorez, used it only 15 times. Assertiveness begins in the 1980s with the arrival of television, the beginnings of the celebrity press and, most importantly, the fall of great ideological systems like communism. “It is at the time of the death of ideologies that the personal pronoun arises”. (Lorriaux, 2017) E. Macron’s strategy expands and emphasizes this evolution.

Somewhere we can compare Macron’s similar linguistic manifestations with the language skills of the former US President Barack Obama, and Marine Le Pen’s sharp and laconic speech with Donald Trump’s direct speech that is close to the people’s whim. But there is a big gap in the speeches of Marine Le Pen and Donald Trump. Trump’s speech carries a provocation strategy, and Marie Le Pen’s speech is more constructive. Both candidates represent new political divisions. For E. Macron, it is progressive against conservatives, for Marine Le Pen, it’s patriots against globalists. They can both certainly claim to stand for the people and against an established political norm, but Marine Le Pen has a homogenous programme which maintains a close bond with the past. Emmanuel Macron has a more diversified programme which falls within a more classic political tryptic: one that highlights political action (want, duty, power), mobilizes a collective (we) and prioritizes Europe.

No matter how constructive the words of Marine Le Pen are, people prefer a more democratic candidate with a non-conservative, constructive, tolerant idea, for which the doors of France are always open.

Armenian politicians' speech difference conditioned by gender

The situation in Armenia is quite different. The “velvet, non-violent revolution” of the Republic of Armenia led by opposition leader Nikol Pashinyan in 2018 was a major event in the Republic of Armenia, as a result of which his rhetoric and influential expressions were a new word in the political life of the Armenian people. For decades, the Armenians have not had a female leader, so it will be a little difficult for us to analyze the difference between male and female leader politicians. However, we will try to analyze the speech behavior of the current Prime Minister of Armenia Nikol Pashinyan and the Member of the National Assembly Naira Zohrabyan, who stands out with his active politics.

The speeches of the Armenian politicians differ from those of the former regime politicians. If the latter's speech was more complex, even incomprehensible for many people, full of terminology and complex sentences, yet the speech of current Armenian politicians is more clear and understandable. The Armenian political speech is not distinguished by its wide use of different rhetoric devices. The leaders are fond of metaphorical language. They use also the repetition which is a universal stylistic device used in political speech all over the world. The frequent use of these devices is conditioned by the fact that repetition helps the politicians achieve their goals. Used in speech, repetition not only makes it easy for the audience to follow what the speaker is saying but also gives a strong rhythmic quality to the speech and makes it more memorable. Repetition helps to achieve the function of coherence in discourse and the function of reinforcement in mood and emotion. We can say that repetition is a stylistic device often found in Nikol Pashinyan's speech. The humor is almost absent in Armenian political discourse. Analyzing the Armenian political field, we will have the courage to oppose R.Lakoff's opinion that emotions are a woman's specific behavior since most of the speech of Prime Minister Nikol Pashinyan (and not only) are full of emotional nature. In Armenia intolerance is mainly observed inside the country against former authorities accused of corruption, electoral fraud, unfair work in the judiciary, and much more. Although corruption is a global threat and all countries are certainly struggling against this disaster, it is deeply rooted in Armenia. The overriding task of the present government is to eradicate it with his metastases.

Strangely enough, intolerance, in this case, is a positive thing. The only Armenian political leader who has shown real intolerance against corruption in recent years is N. Pashinyan:

«Ես ինձ համարում եմ գենետիկորեն անհամարելիի քաղաքական գործիչ ընդդեմ կոռուպցիայի» (Pashinyan N. , 2019): (I consider myself a genetically incompatible anti-corruption politician).

«Նույնիսկ մեր ամենամերձավոր քաղաքական ընկերները չեն ունենալու որևէ ներում և բեկում կոռուպցիայի մեջ ներգավվելու պարագայում»: (Pashinyan N. , 2019) (Even our closest political friends will not have any forgiveness if they are involved in corruption).

About former president:

«Մերժ Սարգսյանի ընտանիքը պրոֆեսիոնալ կոռուպցիոն ընտանիք է եղել, իրենք բոլորը պետք է իրենց թալանածը վերադարձնեն»: (Pashinyan N., Serzh Sargsyan's family was a professionally corrupt family., 2019) (*Serzh Sargsyan's family has been a professionally corrupt family, and everyone must return their loot*).

From these sentences, it can be seen that the Prime Minister of Armenia stands out with his unbiased views. N. Pashinyan's intolerant attitude toward corruption is not only against the former president but also against his own relatives and team members who will be involved in corruption. He is also intolerant towards the current state system and ministries, accusing them of inaction.

«Այսօր ինչ հաջողություն մենք ունենք, ամբողջը ի հեճուկս պետական համակարգի է, ի հեճուկս, ի հեճուկս»: (Whatever success we have today is all in spite of the state system, in spite of it, in spite of it). We mentioned above that N. Pashinyan's speech is full of repetitions, which helps to make his speech even more impressive and convincing. «Ամբողջ պետական համակարգը հեղափոխությանը դիմադրում է, դիմադրում է ամբողջ պետական համակարգը, և այդ դիմադրությունը ես ջարդելու եմ»: (Pashinyan N. , 2019) (*The whole state system is resisting the revolution, the whole state system is resisting, and I will break that resistance*).

So, we see that with the threat he wants to achieve justice in every possible way. N. Pashinyan also shows intolerance towards criminal subcultures.

«Մեր քաղաքական թիմը ձևավորել է քաղաքական խնդիր, որ Հայաստանում քրեական ենթամշակույթի քարոզչությունը և հերոսացումը պետք է արմատախիլ անել, որովհետև դա կոռուպցիայի ամենամեծ ուղեկիցն է»: (Pashinyan N. , No one should try to threaten a deputy in a mediated way. Lay the asphalt, let the ears ring, 2019) (*Our political team has formulated a political issue that the propaganda and heroism of the criminal subculture in Armenia should be eradicated because it is the greatest companion of corruption*).

Thus, we note that N. Pashinyan is making every effort to eradicate all the vicious phenomena that threaten the country and its development.

However, despite all this, it should be noted that Armenian Prime Minister Nikol Pashinyan is also known for his tolerant and constructive policy. He sent a message on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the ceasefire in Karabakh:

«Անհրաժեշտ է զերծ մնալ արեւելության միջավայրի, անհանդուրժողակալության և լարվածության կուրակումներից ուղղված քայլերից: ... Համոզված եմ, որ հայ և ադրբեջանցի ժողովուրդներն արժանի են խաղաղության ու առաջընթացի, ուստի կոչ եմ անում բոլորիս գործել հանուն այս նպատակների»: (Pashinyan N. , 2019) (*It is necessary to refrain from steps towards an atmosphere of hatred, intolerance and tension. ... I am convinced that the Armenian and Azeri peoples deserve peace and progress, so I urge all of us to act for these goals*).

It is clear from these sentences that the latter, displaying tolerance, urges the Azeri people to refrain from hatred and intolerance, convincing that the both

nations deserve peace and progress. Another similar example that also shows an image of his tolerant personality.

It should be noted that the Armenian Prime Minister is fluent in several languages and the latter addresses in Russian to the Azeri blogger who has permeated the Armenian church.

“Я хочу констатировать, что вы – азербайджанец, который вошел в армянскую церковь, где находятся армяне, и вы задали вопрос премьер-министру Армении. Хочу констатировать, что невозможно представить, чтобы у армянина была возможность поехать на встречу, в которой участвует президент Азербайджана”. (Pashinyan N. , New.am, 2019)

(I want to state the fact that you are an Azerbaijani who entered the Armenian church where the Armenians are and you asked the Prime Minister of Armenia a question. I want to state that it is impossible to imagine that an Armenian had the opportunity to go to a meeting where the president of Azerbaijan takes part).

We see that in this sentence he repeats the phrase “I want to state”, thereby emphasizing that no such thing was recorded anywhere, and that the Armenian does not have the opportunity to enter a place where the President of Azerbaijan is present.

So, analyzing Nikol Pashinyan’s speech, we came to the conclusion that his speech behavior is quite mixed. On the one hand, he demonstrates intolerance towards vicious phenomena, on the other, we cannot fail to notice his tolerant policy when he calls for peace with the Azerbaijani people, urging them to refrain from hatred and intolerance.

If in the past the Armenian woman was guided by stereotypes, and her main function was the family and the upbringing of the children, the contemporary Armenian woman has broken that stereotype and is moving at a fast pace, leaving behind national traditions. An example of such an Armenian woman is Naira Zohrabyan, who is actively involved in politics,– she is influential, has political experience, and also understands the people’s language.

«Համաժողովրդական այս շարժումն արժանապարհիվ առիթ է վերջապես դուրս գալու այս համակարգային ճահճից, որից վաղուց անբարենշի գարշահորություն էր գալիս և վերածվել էր բնապահպանական աղետի»: *(This national movement is a worthy occasion to finally get out of this systemic swamp, which smelled of unbearable stench and turned into an environmental disaster).*

«Էլի նորից հանրապետական: Հերիք չի գոյություն չունեցող քաղաքական ուժերի ուրվականներով, որոնք իմ վստահ համոզմամբ քաղաքական ռեինկարնացիա են, որևէ հնարավորություն, շանս չունեն, վախեցնել...»: *(Again Republican. It is not enough with ghosts of non-existent political forces, who in my strong conviction are political reincarnation, have no chance, no chance, to frighten ...).*

She expresses her intolerance towards the former regime considering it a systemic swamp, ghosts and political reincarnation. Almost most of his sentences contain metaphorical meaning, they are rich in repetition.

Being against the mandatory funded pension system N.Zohrabyan accuses the Constitutional Court of extorting money. Thus, she addresses people:

«Միայնակ որևէ հարց չի լուծվելու, մենք միասնական պիտի լինենք, միասնական մենք հաղթելու ենք, միասնական ձեզ հետ միասին մենք բեկելու ենք այս պետական ջեբկիրությունը»: (No problem will be solved alone, we must be united, together we will win, together with you, we will break this robber (about constitution)).

She opposes the government's plan to dismiss the Chairman of the Constitutional Court and six members and allocate a large monthly allowance.

«Այս նախագծով դուք լեգիտիմացնում եք պորպարությունը, Դուք մարդկանց, ում համարում եք հանցագործ, որ նրանց պիտի այրել, որ նրանց պիտի գնդակահարել, ... Դուք պարգևատրում եք փարիսեր շարունակ հսկայական գումարով, իրավական ճանապարհով դուք հաշվեհարդար չեք կարող տեսնել և գնում եք քաղաքական գործարքի այս ճանապարհով»: (Zohrabyan, Hrayr Tovmasyan will sit on the couch and receive 1,375,000 AMD per month, 2019) (With this project, you are legitimizing parasitism, people that you consider a criminal, instead of burning, and executing, you reward them with huge money for many years, you can't retaliate by legal means, you choose this way of the political deal).

In her speech the parallelism is manifested through the use of three clauses: you are legitimizing, you reward, you choose. Parallelism plays an important role in persuading, convincing and carrying the audience along. It is a great way to make a connection between ideas and claims and to advance an argument. (Mukhef, 2017)

By repeating the personal pronoun “you”, she emphasizes the wrong position of the government who awards them instead of hanging or executing. The use of words “to burn” and “to shoot” testify to her zero-tolerance.

Within the discussion of the report “Role of political leaders in the fight against racism and intolerance in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe”, she said:

«Երբ Ալիևը հայտարարում է, որ իր թշնամին համայն հայ ժողովուրդն է եւ Դուք լռում եք, Եվրոպայում ռասիզմի եւ անհանդուրժողականության աճի պատասխանատու դառնում եք նաեւ Դուք, եւ պատահական չէ, որ երեկ այսօրվա Լեյլա Յունուսը հայտարարեց, որ Ալիևին Հայաստանի հետ խաղաղություն պետք չէ»: (“When Aliyev announces that his enemy is the entire Armenian nation and you are silent, you also become responsible for the rise of racism and intolerance in Europe, and it is no accident that yesterday Leyla Yunus announced that Aliyev does not need peace with Armenia).

Here she shows her intolerant attitude towards the PACE, whom she accuses of being silent, as well as of promoting racism and intolerance.

«Երբ Ադրբեջանի օմբուդսմենը հայտարարում է, որ քնած հայ սպային կացնահարած մարդասպան Ռամիլ Սաֆարովը հայրենասիրության օրինակ պետք է լինի յուրաքանչյուր ադրբեջանցու համար, երբ Ադրբեջանի

նախազահը հայտարարում է, որ իրենց թշնամին համայն հայ ժողովուրդն է եւ մեր Վեհաժողովը լռում է, արելության ու անհանդուրժողականության աճը սկսում է դառնալ իրապես տագնապալի»: (Zohrabyan, In Europe you are also responsible for the rise of racism and intolerance, 2019)(*When the Ombudsman of Azerbaijan declares that Ramil Safarov, the murderer who murdered a sleeping Armenian officer, should be an example of patriotism for every Azeri, when the President of Azerbaijan declares that their enemy is all Armenian nation and our Assembly is silent, the growth of hatred and intolerance is becoming truly alarming.*) (Zohrabyan, 2019)

She expresses her concern, as the silence of the Assembly is an impetus for a significant increase in hatred and intolerance. She has an intolerant attitude towards inhumane acts, national discrimination, and the Assembly's indifference. Her speech is characterized by logical structure and consistency.

As we notice, the content of Nikol Pashinyan's speech was almost no different from Naira Zoharbyan's speech, and the two approaches to the same issues were practically the same. The speeches of both politicians have an intolerant attitude towards the former regime and every vicious phenomenon. However, in this case, we have to note that if we consider Donald Tramp's and Marine Le Pen's point of view intolerant, which has a negative tendency, the intolerant expressions of Armenian politicians have a positive outlook that works for the benefit of the country and the people. Hence, we can give our definition: the approaches of politicians may seem like two sides of the same coin, yet are two separate things altogether.

Summarizing the analysis of the speeches of male politicians, several conclusions can be drawn. First, the speeches of male politicians are quite different in form and content. However, there are some common features. Male politicians tend to speak more reasonably and balanced, try not to show emotions, and often use repetitions to have a greater impact on the audience. In turn, the speeches of women politicians are more emotional, many adjectives are used here.

Conclusion

Thus, analyzing the debates of American, French and Armenian politicians, we came to the conclusion that in order to get power in politics men and women should possess several speech features which may make them be influential as political leaders, and among them the following characteristics are worth to be cultivated and used so as to reach the communicative and the political goals:

The persuasive ability which is the basis of political rhetoric.

The orientation strategy, which we think includes information and interpretation strategy

We will add one more strategy from our side:

Ability to show the audience the true face and beliefs which are especially needed for women politicians who enter the political arena and adopt a masculine image, concealing the true image of their femininity.

For example, sometimes women imitate men's words in order to appear more

persuasive and to take a firm stand in the political debate which hinders to show their real personality.

Analyzing the speech and discussions of American, French and Armenian politicians, we came to the conclusion that politicians in these countries have different views on the same phenomenon. Drawing parallels between Donald Trump and Marine Le Pen, we notice that the two points of view coincide with each other. Both stand out for their intolerant policies. Hillary Clinton's tolerant approach is close to Macron's ideology. We have seen that the situation in Armenian politics is different. Both politicians whose speeches have been analyzed in this article are intolerant characteristics with a positive tendency close to the demands of the Armenian people.

Thus, the manifestation of tolerance/intolerance is conditioned not by gender, but by the type of the person, and his/her approach to the phenomenon.

We have also noticed that both male and female politicians use the same stylistic devices to express intolerance/intolerance, the frequent use of which makes a politician's speech more persuasive and effective.

Bibliography

- “Perlimpinpin”, “. (2017). The short glossary of the Macron–Le Pen debate. *BFM TV*.
- “Bottom up”: when Macron takes his feet in franglais. (2018, 04 01). *Parisien*.
- “Le Pen president would be a ‘total disaster’”. (2017). *Marianne*.
- At Debate, Clinton Calls Out Trump For Calling Women “Pigs, Slobs, And Dogs”. (2016). *BuzzFeed.New*.
- Baghdasaryan, M. (2011, 08). *Linguistic and Non-Linguistic in Political Speeches*. Retrieved 10 28, 2019, from http://publications.yzu.am/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/2Askarian_Vanesyan.pdf
- Borisoff, D. (1988). *The power to communicate*. Waveland Press.
- Chozick, C. C. (2008, 01 22). Clinton, Obama Exchange Harsh Words In South Carolina Debate. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Clinton, H. (2008). Hillary Rodham Clinton's Democratic Convention Speech. *The New York Times*.
- Clinton, H. (2013, 01 23). Hillary Clinton Nearly Tears Up At Benghazi Hearing.
- Clinton, H. (2016). ‘Today is My Granddaughter's Second Birthday’: Why I Think Hillary Clinton ‘Trumps’ Donald at Public Speaking. *B2C*.
- Clinton, H. (2018). Hillary Clinton Biography. *Biography*.
- Clinton, H. R. (2016). Remarks on Trump's Birtherism and Divisive Rhetoric at the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. *IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY*.
- Dijk, v. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *D&S*, 359–383.
- Dravigny, J. (2017). *PRÉSIDENTE MACRON ET IMMIGRATION : LA CONTINUITÉ EN?* (In France) Emmanuel Macron's European ambitions by 2024. (2017 , 09 26). *BFMTV*.
- Frostenson, E. C. (2016, 10 27). Trump interrupted Clinton 51 times at the debate. She interrupted him just 17 times. *VOX*.
- Galimatias, P. (2017). The flourishing lexicon of Emmanuel Macron. *Ouest France*.

- Grigoryevich, T. V. (2018). Linguocultural Image of a Woman–Policy in the Election Picture of France.
- Irving, M. (2019). Even today, women candidates have a delicate balance to maintain between seeming unwomanly or appearing too feminine. *Options Politiques*.
- K, V. N. (2006). Discourse and manipulation.
- Kara–Ghazaryan, T. (n.d.). *About the features of the rhetoric of Hillary Clinton*. Retrieved 10 10, 2019, from DOGPLAYER: <https://docplayer.ru/64866885-T-v-kara-kazaryan-ob-osobennostyah-ritoriki-hillari-klinton-posle-togo-kak-klinton-vystupila-s-rechyu-v-kotoroy-obyavila-o-vhozhdenii-v-prezidentskuyu.html>
- Khmeltsov, A. (2004). *When “They” speak About “Us”: Political Discourse Analysis And Semiotics of Foreign Policy in an Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Получено 10 10 2019 г., из Russian communication association: usscomm.ru/rca_biblio/h/hmeltsov.shtml
- Le Pen présidente serait une «catastrophe totale». (2017, 03 09). *Tribune de Geneve*, p. 106.
- Lorriaux, A. (2017, 10). The “I” of Emmanuel Macron. *SCIENCES HUMAINES*.
- Macron Report – The three languages of the President. (2018, 04 21). *Les Echos*.
- Macron, E. (2017, 09 26). Europe is “too weak, too slow, too inefficient. *France24*. Retrieved 10 15, 2019, from Twitter: <https://www.france24.com/fr/20170926-macron-leurope-est-trop-faible-trop-lente-trop-inefficace>
- Marine Le Pen will do everything to accredit the idea. (2017). *Marianne*.
- Mukhef, P. D.–A. (2017). Aspects of Political Language and Parallelism. *Education and Practice*.
- Pashinyan, N. (2019 , 12 09). *panorama am*. Retrieved 11 15, 2019, from <https://www.panorama.am/am/news/2019/12/09/%D5%86-%D5%93%D5%A1%D5%B7%D5%AB%D5%B6%D5%B5%D5%A1%D5%B6/2208259>
- Pashinyan, N. (2019, 12 9). *ARM INFO*. Retrieved 11 18, 2019, from https://arminfo.info/full_news.php?id=47772&lang=lv
- Pashinyan, N. (2019, 11 29). *New.am*. Retrieved 12 15, 2019, from <https://news.am/rus/news/545571.html>
- Pashinyan, N. (2019, 11 13). No one should try to threaten a deputy in a mediated way. Lay the asphalt, let the ears ring. *Journal.am*.
- Pashinyan, N. (2019). *Serzh Sargsyan’s family was a professionally corrupt family*. Retrieved 10 14, 2019, from youtube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ilFk1Xugd0s>
- Pashinyan, N. (2019, 12 05). *The prime minister of Armenia*. Retrieved 12 20, 2019, from <https://www.primeminister.am/hy/statements-and-messages/item/2019/05/12/Nikol-Pashinyan-Congratulations/>
- Pashinyan, N. (2019, 12 12). What success we have today is all in spite of the public administration system. *AURORA*.
- Pen, M. L. (2017, 04 17). “For many French people, massive immigration is an oppression. It is not a” chance for France “but a drama.”. Retrieved 10 15, 2019, from Twitter: https://twitter.com/mlp_officiel/status/854056552763990016
- Sheigal, E. I. (02 10 200 г.). *SEMIOTICS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE*. Получено 07 11 2019 г., из Academia.edu: academia.edu/9556373/Шейгал_Политический_дискурс
- Trump. (2016, 09 26). Retrieved 10 11, 2019, from you tube: <https://www.youtube.com/>

watch?v=sgD-rLmXuWY

Trump. (2016, 10 29). *Donald Trump's Bizarre Speech: 'You Are The Smartest People'*. Retrieved 10 11, 2019, from LBC: <https://www.lbc.co.uk/politics/us-election/donald-trump/donald-trumps-bizarre-speech-smartest-people/>

Trump. (2016). *youtube*. Retrieved 10 10, 2019, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2J9y6s_ukBQ

Trump calls CNN reporter a 'rude, terrible person' during explosive press conference. (2018, 11 7). *CNBC*.

Trump. (n.d.). *Presidential debate*. Retrieved 10 10, 2019, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DBhrSdjePkk>

Trump to Clinton: 'You Do Have Experience, B. I. (2016, 10 19). *you tube*. Retrieved 10 19, 2019, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4XYSxKAmG64>

Trump, D. (2017). *Political Campaign Communication*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, London: Robert Denton.

Vinacur, N. (2017, 05 02). Marine Le Pen makes globalization the enemy. *Politico*.

Zimmerman, D. a. (1975). *Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation*. Retrieved 11 14, 2019, from <https://web.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/zimmermanwest1975.pdf>

Zohrabyan, N. (2019, 04 10). *ARMENPRESS*. Retrieved 01 05, 2020, from <https://armenpress.am/arm/news/970820.html>

Zohrabyan, N. (2019). *Hrayr Tovmasyan will sit on the couch and receive 1,375,000 AMD per month*. Retrieved 10 11, 2019, from youtube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1t7aKC6mcGk&t=1s>

Zohrabyan, N. (2019, 04 10). In Europe you are also responsible for the rise of racism and intolerance. *NEWS.am*.

Էլյա Դավթյան

*Եվրասիա միջազգային համալսարանի
Օրսար լեզուների ամբիոնի դասախոս, հայցորդ
Էլ. huugte`davtyanelya@gmail.com*

**ՀԱՆԴՈՒՐԺՈՂԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ/ԱՆՀԱՆԴՈՒՐԺՈՂԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ
ԱՐՏԱՀԱՅՏՈՂ ՔԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆ ԱՌԱՋՆՈՐԴՆԵՐԻ ԵԼՈՒՅԹՆԵՐԸ
ՊԱՅՄԱՆԱՎՈՐՎԱԾ ՍԵՌՈՎ (ԱՆԳԼԵՐԵՆԻ, ՖՐԱՆՍԵՐԵՆԻ ԵՎ
ՀԱՅԵՐԵՆԻ ՀԱՄԱԴՐՈՒԹՅԱՄԲ)**

«Գենդեր» հասկացությունը վերջին տարիների ամենաքննարկվող, քննադատվող և շահարկվող հասկացություններից մեկն է, որը հետաքրքրություն է ներկայացնում տարբեր տեսանկյուններից՝ մշակութային, սոցիոլոգիական, քաղաքական, լեզվաբանական, հոգեբանական և այլն: Գենդերը յուրովի է արտացոլվում քաղաքական դիսկուրսում: Կանանց և տղամարդ-քաղաքական գործիչների խոսքի վերլուծությունը բացահայտում է գենդերային մոտեցումների առանձնահատկությունները քաղաքական հաղորդակցության մեջ: Կանանց և տղամարդկանց խոսքի միջև ակնհայտ տարբերու-

թյուններ կան: Դրանք պայմանավորված են սոցիալական և կենսաբանական դերերով, ինչպես նաև կարծրատիպերով: Մեր աշխատանքում վերլուծել ենք ամերիկյան, ֆրանսիական և հայկական որոշ քաղաքական գործիչների բանավեճերն ու ելույթները՝ պայմանավորված գենդերային հիմունքներով: Ուսումնասիրությունների ընթացքում օգտագործված համատեքստային վերլուծությունը հնարավորություն է տալիս պարզել խոսքն ունի գենդերային առանձնահատկություններ, և խոսքի լեզվական ինչպիսի՞ ռճական հնարքներն են հնարավորություն տալիս պարզել խոսքի մեղմ, կոպիտ, հանդուրժող կամ անհանդուրժող լինելը:

Հիմնաբառեր. Քաղաքական խոսույթ, հանդուրժողականություն, անհանդուրժողականություն, ռճական հնարքներ, խոսքի վարք, խոսքի տարբերություն:

Эля Давтян

*Преподаватель и аспирант кафедры иностранных языков и литературы
Международного университета Евразия
Эл. адрес: davtyanelya@gmail.com*

ПРОЯВЛЕНИЕ ТОЛЕРАНТНОСТИ/НЕТОЛЕРАНТНОСТИ В РЕЧИ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ДЕЯТЕЛЕЙ, ОБУСЛОВЛЕННОЕ ПОЛОВЫМ ПРИЗНАКОМ (РАССМАТРИВАЕТСЯ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ДИСКУРС НА АНГЛИЙСКОМ, ФРАНЦУЗСКОМ И АРМЯНСКОМ)

Концепция «гендер» – одна из наиболее обсуждаемых, критикуемых и спекулятивных концепций в последние годы, которая представляет интерес с разных точек зрения – культурных, социологических, политических, лингвистических, психологических и т.д. Гендер получает уникальное проявление в политическом дискурсе. Анализ речи женщин и мужчин–политиков позволяет выявить особенности гендерных подходов в политической коммуникации. Есть очевидные различия в речи мужчин и женщин. Они обусловлены социальными и биологическими ролями, а также стереотипами. В своей работе мы проанализировали дискуссии и выступления некоторых ключевых фигур в американской, французской и армянской политике по гендерному признаку. Контекстный анализ, используемый в исследованиях, определяет: имеет ли речь специфические гендерные особенности и какие языковые средства в речи позволяют говорить о том, например, является ли речь мягкой или грубой, толерантной или нетолерантной.

Ключевые слова: политический дискурс, толерантность, нетерпимость, стилистические приемы, речевое поведение, речевые различия.

Հոդվածը խմբագրություն է ներկայացվել՝ 2021թ. հունվարի 31-ին:
Հոդվածը հանձնվել է գրախոսման՝ 2021թ. մարտի 21-ին
Հոդվածն ընդունվել է տպագրության՝ 2021թ. ապրիլի 2-ին