



Raimonda Mikašauskienė – humanitarinių mokslų daktarė, Klaipėdos universiteto Socialinių ir humanitarinių mokslų fakulteto Filologijos katedros lektorė

Moksliniai interesai: diskurso analizė, lyginamoji kalbotyra

El. paštas: raisaryte@gmail.com

Raimonda Mikašauskienė – PhD in philology, lecturer in the Department of Philology of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Klaipėda University

Research interests: discourse analysis, comparative linguistics

E-mail: raisaryte@gmail.com



Margarita Čiročkina – Klaipėdos universiteto Socialinių ir humanitarinių mokslų fakulteto Filologijos katedros asistentė

Moksliniai interesai: diskurso analizė, vertimas

El. paštas: m.cirockina@yandex.ru

Margarita Čiročkina – assistant in the Department of Philology of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Klaipėda University

Research interests: discourse analysis, translation

E-mail: m.cirockina@yandex.ru

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina

Klaipėda University

RHETORICAL ELOCUTION IN THE PUBLIC SPEECHES OF AMERICAN BUSINESS LEADERS

Abstract

The article explores the rhetorical elocution of speeches given by the most famous American business leaders, seen from the point of view of persuasiveness. The aim of the research is to analyse the figurative expression of the speeches in question, to determine and generalise the most common elements of their rhetorical stylistics. Fifty speeches by American business leaders, given on various occasions in the period 1981 to 2020, were chosen and analysed for this article. The research is intended to reveal how various rhetorical figures used by contemporary orators serve as tools for persuasion and emotive argumentation.

KEY WORDS: rhetoric, elocution, persuasion, figurative expression, persuasive discourse, leadership.

Anotacija

Straipsnyje analizuojama Amerikos verslo lyderių sakytinių kalbų retorinė elokucija ir dominuojanti figūratyvioji raiška, padedanti sukurti įtaigumo efektą. Tyrimo tikslas – išanalizuoti elokucinę šių kalbų topiką: nustatyti ir apibendrinti verslo lyderių kalbose dominuojančius retorinės elokucijos komponentus. Tyrimui pasirinkta 50 žymiausių Amerikos verslo lyderių kalbų, pristatytų

įvairiomis progomis 1981–2020 metais. Šiuo tyrimu siekiama išsiaiškinti, kaip įvairios retorinės figūros tampa įtaigumo ir emocinės argumentacijos instrumentais.

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: retorika, elokucija, įtaigumas, figūratyvioji raiška, paveikūs diskursas, lyderystė.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15181/rh.v28i0.2395>

Introductory remarks

Communication in its various forms dominates today's business environment, as more and more business leaders become aware of the importance of developing successful interpersonal communication skills. According to Patricia Bizell and Bruce Herzberg, speeches are a format that allows a speaker to find the greatest opportunity to persuade, and evoke 'the sensual power of word magic to create belief' (2001, 5). The Roman author and philosopher Cicero once claimed that rhetoric is the art of *bene dicendi* ('speaking well'), which should be perceived in a variety of senses: speaking correctly, presenting one's view eloquently, and employing the right rhetorical style. Speaking well in this regard starts with the basic building blocks of words used in expressing an argument, and ends with the very structure of the argument itself. The main object of rhetoric to 'communicate, make a verbal impact and convince' (Buckley, 2006, 19) is one of the fundamental pillars a speaker can rely on to construct a persuasive, substantiated and vivid speech to have the intended impact on the target audience.¹ Making a long-lasting appeal to the audience is one of the main objects of persuasive discourse, which can be characterised by the 'attempt of one participant to change behaviour, feelings, intentions or viewpoint of another by communicative means' (Lakof, 1992, 28). To achieve this, any public speaker has to look for the most suitable expressive means to reveal his or her argument. To put it simply, it is not enough to know what to say, one must also know how to say it, in order to stimulate and manipulate effectively the mental processes of the audience.

¹ It should be stated that rhetoric is not the only field that focuses on various aspects of persuasive language. Speech act theory, developed by John L. Austin (1962) and John Searle (1969), approaches communication as a co-operative undertaking between a writer and a speaker that can be seen as either locutionary (the speaker), illocutionary (the message), or perlocutionary (the effect of the message) (see Austin, 1962, 94–101). Another dimension of successful speech comes from the Conversational Maxims provided by Herbert P. Grice (1975), generally known as the Cooperative Principle, which should be taken into account when seeking to achieve success in conversation. One more methodological framework that has witnessed a steady growth in recent years is discourse analysis, which focuses on cognitive and social processes, and strategies of discourse regarded as 'a mode of interaction in highly complex situations' (Van Dijk, 1985, 1; for a more thorough overview of methodologies in discourse research, see Kyland, Paltridge, 2011).

Conveying a persuasive and powerful message is part of one of the five basic canons² of rhetoric, rhetorical *elocution*, or style, which deals with identifying and codifying features of language that might enhance its power over audiences. For the Romans, *Elocutio* was a system for producing and thereafter performing persuasive acts of discourse (Burke, 2014, 24). Sarah Spence notes that the focus on style has come to include a study of how language can do more than name. With the realisation that the choice of word can represent and enhance the nuances of an argument through various stylistic means, the study of style has become seen as an aspect integral to the argument (2012, 45).

It is common to associate rhetoric with the aesthetic expression and embellishment of speech: throughout the history of rhetoric, the figurative use of language has been referred to as bringing speech to life, or making language visible. Figurative language is indeed lively and playful: it helps the speaker make an argument more appealing (Spence, 2012, 15). However, extensive studies of persuasive discourse³ have proven that rhetorical stylistic means function primarily as a tool for persuasion and appeal, leading to greater attention, preference and memorability on the part of the audience (Mcquarrie, Mick, 1999, 37–39). Modern rhetorical studies acknowledge rhetorical figures of speech as cognitive and manipulative instruments, displaying elements of semantic and syntactic transposition (Gabrėnaitė, 2010, 142).

A rhetorical figure of speech can be defined as the smallest structural unit of rhetorical stylistics.⁴ More than that, it is commonly regarded as an artful deviation (Corbett, 1990). A figure of speech occurs when an expression is not rejected as nonsensical or faulty, and the deviation conforms to a template that is unvarying across a variety of content and context (McQuarrie, Mick, 2009, 287–312). A figurative expression takes longer to process and understand, so the discourse is more easily recalled and memorised by the audience.

² Five canons, or tenets, of rhetoric are traditionally regarded as a template for creating and preparing an effective and persuasive speech. These canons are generally considered to 'facilitate a rhetorical process that enables the rhetor to communicate effectively' (Kirsch, 2014, 4). According to Gerald M. Phillips, the canons of classical rhetoric have 'stood the test of time' and 'represent a legitimate taxonomy of processes' (1991, 70). Nowadays, these canons are typically used to constitute an organisational structure, and are thus thought of as being five logical steps or stages that any person who is to give a speech should go through.

³ Among the earliest studies covering rhetorical figures of speech in persuasive discourse was the research implemented by Geoffrey N. Leech (1969), Roland Barthes (1985) and Jacques Durand (1987). Over recent years, studies of persuasive discourse have expanded to cover as diverse approaches as business negotiations (Bulow-Moller, 2005), advertising (Patpong, 2009), political speeches (Halmari, 2009), and even the ceremonial speeches of popular world figures (see Loudenslager, 2012).

⁴ For the relationship between rhetorical elocution (rhetorical stylistics) and literary stylistics, see Gabrėnaitė, 2010, 139; Fahnestock, 2011, 12–13.

There are many ways rhetorical figures of speech can be classified. One of the most common is the division into tropes and schemes, terms that can be traced back to Quintilian himself.⁵ While schemes⁶ tend to alter the arrangement of elements and involve the re-patterning of words (altering the normal ways in which words are expected to come together to make meanings), tropes have literally false meanings: they alter the meanings of words by altering the way in which they mean (Kelen, 2007, 9). It should be stated, however, that the relationships between rhetorical figures of speech are not always easy to classify. As Christopher Kelen notes, personification appears to be a type of metaphor with a particular kind of content. A simile is easily thought of as a metaphor made explicit. In this respect, a metaphor can be seen as a superordinate trope (2007, 9). In general, the inherent incongruity of rhetorical devices allows them to carry additional meaning, and is the basis for the persuasive impact they exhibit. Figurative language helps the speaker to express intentions and attitudes, beliefs and knowledge. More than that: figuration reflects the way our brain processes information, leading to greater attention, preference and memorability.

This article **aims** to examine rhetorical figures of speech employed in public speeches given by American business leaders, and to reveal how different rhetorical stylistic techniques determine the success of public speaking and serve as a tool of persuasion. Together with an analysis of the rhetorical disposition of the speeches in question (see Mikašauskienė, Čiročkina, 2020, 270–289), the present study provides a complex analysis of the strategic and persuasive uses of rhetorical practices exploited by the most renowned businesspeople with authorial credibility in business and entrepreneurial leadership in the United States of America.

In order to achieve the aim of the article, the empirical and analytical methods are employed: rhetorical figures of speech used in the collected speeches have been accumulated, verified and evaluated. Rhetorical analysis is implemented in order to approach the study of rhetoric and persuasion. The quantitative method is also applied, in order to determine and indicate how many times a particular rhetorical device has been used in speeches by business leaders.

⁵ For Quintilian, the term ‘figure’ refers to linguistic effects which involve either the substitution of one word for another that affects meaning (‘trope’), or a change in syntactic structure for emphasis or ornament (‘scheme’) (Richards, 2007, 47).

⁶ Jeanne Fahnestock presents a more detailed classification of schemes into schemes of words, involving small phonological/orthographical variations on the words themselves bearing significant means for persuasion, schemes of sounds, exploiting aural similarities among words to create peculiar patterns (2011, 127), and syntactic schemes, or frames (223).

The scope of empirical data. Fifty speeches given by famous American business leaders on various occasions in the period 1981 to 2020 have been selected and analysed for this article.

Rhetorical elocution

As is stated above, rhetorical elocution concerns techniques of language that make a speech distinctive and memorable. Various rhetorical devices and instruments, traditionally divided into two main groups, tropes and schemes, are widely used to adorn and furnish a speech, place emphasis, highlight the main points, help the audience better understand the information provided, and, most importantly, help the speaker to win favour, convince and persuade the audience, and thus achieve the goal.

1. Tropes

A trope is a traditional rhetorical term that encompasses a whole range of figurative language. According to Robert Cockcroft and Susan Cockcroft, tropes tend ‘to turn meanings in words via a less direct mode of expression’ (2005, 167). Accordingly, meaning is presented through the perception of similitude, association, or opposition, which may be achieved by using the main kinds of trope: metaphor, personification, metonymy and synecdoche.

1.1. Metaphor

The use of metaphor has a long history, and its study can be traced back to Aristotle, who claimed metaphor was a rhetorical phenomenon, a literary device that was understood in its simplest form as the ‘transference of a term from one thing to another: whether from genus to species, species to genus, species to species, or by analogy’ that allowed a person to ‘best get hold of something fresh’ (Aristotle, 2010, 135). George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, pioneers of the cognitive approach to metaphor, believed that metaphor is ‘pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action’, and that the ordinary conceptual system of a person ‘in terms of which [one] both think[s] and act[s]’, is ‘fundamentally metaphorical in nature’, and thus can be considered a ‘powerful cognitive tool that helps people conceptualise the surrounding world’ (1980, 3; see also Martin, 2014; Partington, Taylor, 2018; Cockcroft, Cockcroft, 2005; Kheovichai, 2015, Dalalau, 2009; Langer, 2015). Metaphors involve ‘understanding and experiencing something abstract in terms of something more concrete’ (Partington, Taylor, 2018, 126). It is not surprising, therefore, that the analysis of speeches given by American business leaders has revealed that all the

speakers employed metaphors: 654 sentences containing metaphors were found in the speeches analysed.

With regard to the function of metaphor in business discourse, Baramee Kheovichai concludes that metaphor performs three functions in business presentations, the first and the most obvious being textual decoration (2015, 107), as it embellishes speech, and adds spice and colour to the language, and thus allows the speaker to achieve more persuasion. Consider the examples:

(1) *Don't let the noise of others' opinions **drown out your own inner voice*** (Jobs, 2005).

(2) *As a State Department, we are **bound together by that oath*** (Tillerson, 2018).

The second function that metaphors perform in business discourse, as noted by Kheovichai, is organising and structuring the oral or written discourse, thus 'providing cohesion, highlighting important information and making text more memorable' (2015, 97). Moreover, metaphors allow speakers to adhere to the principle of language economy, when the employment of metaphors allows for the maximum result (including persuasion) by putting in the minimum amount of effort:

(3) *As I **weighed my opportunity** to work in Uganda [...] (Desmond-Hellmann, 2018). Compare: As I **considered and assessed all the positive and negative arguments for or against** [...].*

(4) *The **market hit bottom** in April 1942 [...] (Buffett, 2008). Compare: The **market reached the lowest or worst point of a decline** in April 1942 [...].*

The last and most important function of metaphor in business discourse is to provide understanding: it is considered to be an essential tool for persuasion, as it is widely used to conceptualise business ideas and 'represent a novel way of viewing the world that offers some fresh insights' (Kheovichai 2015, 96). An analysis of speeches given by American businessmen revealed a tendency for various abstract notions to be associated and presented in terms of more specific ones. Table 1 presents metaphorical expressions found in the speeches analysed and grouped in accordance with prevailing source domains.

The largest group of conceptual metaphorical expressions is the group *metaphors of living organisms*. Business leaders tend to speak about particular concepts, even the business itself, as plants or animals, which tend to grow and share properties characteristic of animate objects. Moreover, speakers use animate metaphors to conceptualise economy, business and other concepts in terms of health or being a patient.

Table 1

Metaphors classified according to source domains

Source domain	Examples
Metaphors of living organisms (44%)	(5) <i>GE employees have already sunk their roots into the community and begun volunteer efforts</i> (Welch, 2001). (6) [...] <i>and economic growth was higher under Biden and Obama than under Trump</i> (Bloomberg, 2020). (7) <i>Our democracy has become sclerotic at a time when these crises require boldness</i> (Gore, 14 December 2007).
War metaphors (27%)	(8) <i>Joe's economic plan will create clean energy jobs that help fight another crisis that Trump is ignoring: climate change</i> (Bloomberg, 2020). (9) <i>Americans rise to the occasion, willing to risk their very lives to defend freedom and preserve our nation</i> (Romney, 2007).
Liquid metaphors (15%)	(10) <i>Forces for the flow of knowledge, trade and immigration against those who would slow them down</i> (Zuckerberg, 2017). (11) [...] <i>the traditional sales, net and cash flow measurements will follow, as will our relative stock market performance</i> (Welch, 2000).
Money and economic transaction metaphors (14%)	(12) <i>In an environment like that, you'll spend most of your time navigating corporate politics [...]</i> (Weiner, 2018). (13) <i>And remember that your integrity is priceless when unquestioned ... but worthless, or worse, when it isn't</i> (Barra, May 2014). (14) <i>In return, you would be rewarded with trust and loyalty you could take to the bank</i> (Murdoch, 2008).

The element of the concept of *war* is employed by speakers to evoke particular emotions among the audience: to inspire fear, provide understanding, describe challenges that are being encountered, or imply that engaging in war with something or someone is necessary to survive, defend something, or achieve a certain aim.

Metaphorical expressions containing the concept of *liquid* imply that water is an element that is directly associated with life, and an essential substance that symbolises the *prima materia* of the whole universe. Water can change its form and transform itself, acting as a material from which all other things are created. Accordingly, the analysis of speeches revealed that business leaders tend to understand particular notions in relation to water as being of significant importance.

Finally, the conceptual group of metaphorical expressions of *money and economic transactions* illustrates the idea that time plays an important role, and is a 'valuable commodity' in the lives of ordinary people in general, and business-

people in particular (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980, 8); therefore, the conceptualisation of time as money enables orators to speak of time being spent, invested or wasted. Nonetheless, some speakers tend to conceptualise abstract notions, such as integrity, trust and loyalty, effort, curiosity and intuition, and talent, in terms of money.

All three functions that metaphors tend to perform (to embellish a speech, to organise and structure a text, and to provide an understanding of the information presented) are closely interrelated, and indicate that metaphors in general help to hold the audience's attention, have a strong emotional appeal, and make them ponder the information or arguments provided by the speaker long after the speech is actually given, thus making them accept the point of view of the speaker.

1.1.1. Personification

Personification is a rhetorical figure that is used to ascribe features, qualities or characteristics of a human being to lifeless concepts, and 'entails that inanimate objects, non-human entities, and abstract concept become humanized' (Glaz, Kowalewski, Weremczuk, 2012, 91). Most modern authors prefer and tend to regard personification as a particular type of ontological metaphor (see Burke, 2014; Glaz, Kowalewski, Weremczuk, 2012; Lakoff, Johnson, 1980). The analysis of speeches given by American business leaders has shown that personification was used in 157 sentences, in which speakers made things, ideas or abstract concepts appear humanised:

(15) *Our friend Bono who says **capitalism needs to be tamed*** (Moynihan, 2020).

The employment of personification and the portrayal of non-human objects or ideas in human terms can be understood as 'an artful deviation from the expectation' (Delbaere, McQuarrie, Phillips, 2011, 121) which leads the audience to believe that these things are alive, just as human beings can perform certain actions, provide help, make promises, have a physical appearance or express certain feelings and even demonstrate some mental capacities. Consider the examples:

(16) ***Platforms and algorithms that promised to improve our lives can actually magnify our worst human tendencies*** (Cook, 2018).

(17) ***If prices keep looking attractive, my non-Berkshire net worth will soon be 100 percent in United States equities*** (Buffett, 2008).

(18) ***But we will leave it up to each network to decide what approaches they believe will work best to address their biggest challenges. They might decide, for example, to focus on student interventions in middle school . . . or adapting new***

and more rigorous curricula . . . or **improving** support for certain groups of students in the transition from high school to college (Gates, October 2017).

Properly employed, personification allows the audience to comprehend the wide variety of complex phenomena and experiences taking place in the world in human terms. Accordingly, personification can be viewed as a ‘tacit and implicit attempt at persuasion’ (Delbaere, McQuarrie, Phillips, 2011, 123), when the audience does not need to be told what to do or how to behave. By presenting information by means of personification, the speaker evokes certain emotions, positive and/or negative, and expresses ideas in a resourceful, clear and convincing manner.

1.2. Metonymy

Metonymy is a stylistic figure of speech which ‘reveals a quite unexpected substitution’ of one thing, idea, or concept for another on the ‘ground of some kind of association’ (Жуковська, 2010, 94). Nowadays, metonymy is not only generally considered to be a ‘master trope’, but also a fundamental cognitive and linguistic phenomenon (compare Enos, 1996; Panther, Radden, 1999; Nerlich, Clarke, 2001). Despite the fact that metonymy is mainly considered to be a referential figure of speech, Lakoff and Johnson claim that it also ‘serves the function of providing understanding’, and metonymic concepts ‘structure not just our language, but our thoughts, attitudes, and actions’, and are grounded in the experience of a person (1980, 36–39). The table below presents the prevailing models of metonymy used by speakers:

Table 2

Types of metonymic expression in the speeches of American business leaders

Types	Examples
Institution-for-people-responsible (53%)	(19) <i>This Company is committed to keeping itself as bureaucracy-free as any big institution that has ever existed</i> (Welch, 2001). (20) <i>In the years since 2005, the Internet has continued to evolve and the FCC has issued a number of important decisions involving openness</i> (Genachowski, 2009).
Place-for-institution (30%)	(21) <i>When Europe experienced doldrums and dislocations in the early '90s, we moved quickly to partner with European firms whose future we believed in</i> (Welch, 2000) (reference to economic institutions). (22) <i>At least in science, Australia has a pretty strong tradition</i> (Murdoch, 2008) (reference to research institutions).

Types	Examples
Container/containment (7%)	(23) <i>Even as we face difficult fiscal realities, we will budget not only with our heads but with our hearts</i> (Bloomberg, January 2010). (24) [...] <i>his powerful testimony in Congress touched the heart of our nation</i> (Trump, July 2019).
Place-for-inhabitants (6%)	(25) <i>These projects didn't just provide purpose for the people doing those jobs, they gave our whole country a sense of pride that we could do great things</i> (Zuckerberg, 2017). (26) <i>The whole world witnessed the might and resilience of our nation in the extraordinary men and women of the New York Fire Department</i> (Trump, July 2019).
Symbolic references (4%)	(27) <i>They had the audacity to renew the Lord's call and were joined by Pope John Paul II, who [...] may have had a little more of a direct line to the Almighty</i> (Hewson, 2006). (28) <i>We are one team and one people, proudly saluting one great American flag</i> (Trump, January 2019).

Most metonymic expressions used are the group *institution-for-people-responsible*, which is a toponymical form of metonymy. There were 80 sentences in which business speakers used the names of various companies, organisations and foundations or general notions to provide information about decisions or actions made by specific people working in those particular institutions. As noted by Kheovichai, the application of metonymy in this regard can 'construct a positive corporate identity' and convince all workers and staff members to 'identify themselves with the brand image' of the organisation or company (2015, 113). Another prevailing group in speeches by American business leaders is the *place-for-institution* group of metonymic substitutions (a term coined by Kovescses, 2010, 172), with which the speakers mention specific or more general locations to refer to government, industrial, medical or other institutions. In the examples above, the substitute names not only endow more status and 'give political authority and its decisions a distinct sense of place' (Martin, 2014, 79), but also enable the speaker to achieve brevity.

The third location-based group of metonymic substitutions is the *place-for-inhabitants* group. Littlemore notes that this type of metonymy is 'rarely neutral' and 'often ha[s] a strong hyperbolic feel to it' (2015, 33). The metonymy of this type generates a strong emotive element: it is employed effectively to reveal the 'intangible human qualities that characterize an individual or social group' (Cockcroft, Cockcroft, 2005, 170), and to evoke a sense of unity and support.

One more group of metonymic expressions refers to the concept of *containment*. In the examples, metonymy is not used to mean a specific body part of a person, but rather to name a concept that is related to that particular part. Words that are related to the body of a person are actually employed to refer to abstract notions that are associated with the following words, and are used metonymically to depict the container/containment relationship between the instrument and its association. Accordingly, in the sentences provided above, the word 'heart' is a substitute for emotions and feelings, 'head' is associated with reasoning and rationality, 'hand' stands for support and cooperation, and so on.

Finally, the use of metonymy can also be employed for a number of symbolic comparisons. Indeed, Lakoff and Johnson also note that 'national and religious symbolism' is frequently used in metonymic expressions (1980, 40). Accordingly, some speakers metonymically mention God or attributes, and one speaker mentioned the American flag, which is actually a national symbol and a reference to the country it represents.

1.2.1. Synecdoche

Synecdoche, another key element in the persuasive repertoire, is a 'conceptual transfer phenomenon based on the semantic inclusion between a more comprehensive and a less comprehensive category' (Panther, Radden, 1999, 92). The application of synecdoche is a controversial issue, as the reduction of things, ideas or people to only one aspect of their many features diminishes the importance of others; but if used properly, this literary device can have a powerful effect, as it 'defines the qualities of a thing by eliminating all complexity and magnifying one trait over others' (Martin, 2014, 80). Accordingly, the analysis of speeches delivered by business leaders revealed that in total there were 165 cases when speakers used various types of synecdoche, presented in the table below.

Regarding the fact that synecdoche is considered to be a figure of substitution that takes two inverse forms, either substituting the part for the whole or the whole for the part, Cockcroft and Cockcroft recognise the *part-whole/whole-part* type of synecdoche (2005, 172). The analysis of the speeches in question revealed that there were 17 instances when speakers mentioned America in their spoken discourse, but actually referred only to a part; there were 13 instances in which speakers employed the part-whole type of synecdoche to refer to the United States, or simply states that are a part of America. Moreover, the part-whole type of synecdoche may be observed in sentences when speakers refer to people by simply mentioning certain parts of their body or other qualities.

Table 3

Types of synecdoche used in speeches by American business leaders

Types	Examples
Whole-part/ part-whole (14%)	(29) <i>And I say to our fellow members of the world community, let no one see this contest as a sign of American weakness. The strength of American democracy is shown most clearly through the difficulties it can overcome</i> (Gore, 2010). (30) <i>Amid these many diverse and competing voices, readers want what they've always wanted: a source they can trust</i> (Murdoch, 2008).
Unifying trait of a particular group (14%)	(31) <i>He has failed the American people catastrophically</i> (Bloomberg, 2020). (32) <i>These radical Islamists do their preaching not by reason or example, but in the coercion of minds and the shedding of blood</i> (Romney, 2007).
Abstract-concrete/ concrete-abstract (72%)	(33) <i>And together, let us pray that this land may always be blessed, 'with freedom's holy light'</i> (Romney, 2007). (34) <i>Let me assure you that no authorities of my church, or of any other church for that matter, will ever exert influence on presidential decisions</i> (Romney, 2007).

Another common use of the synecdoche device is to refer to the whole group or community by distinguishing one feature of it. When the element of group identity is defined as the 'unifying trait' of that particular group, the use of synecdoche in such cases provides a 'recognizable shorthand that can be either narrowly reductive or helpfully clear, depending on how they are employed' (Martin, 2014, 80). Accordingly, there were 17 instances when speakers referred to a group of people by their nationality or religious preferences.

Synecdoche can be employed in *generalisation* or *specialisation* (Panther, Rad-den, 1999, 118) or to reveal the abstract-concrete/concrete-abstract relationship. Accordingly, the analysis of speeches revealed that this type of synecdoche was the predominant one (used in 90 instances). In the examples presented above, abstract concepts refer to concrete ones, to specific members, employees, or officials, as well as individual subjects and even countries. This type of synecdoche can be an essential 'ideological weapon', by means of which people, issues or ideas 'can be effectively marginalized by omitting to mention them' (Martin, 2014, 172).

To sum up, regardless of the particular type of synecdoche that the speaker uses, the resulting effect is the reinforcement of a deeper meaning and the urge for the listener to reflect and consider a wider viewpoint presented by the speaker.

2. Schemes

A scheme is a classic term applied to the structure or arrangement of rhetorical figures of speech. According to Cockcroft and Cockcroft, it is 'impossible to examine the whole range of schematic devices' (2005, 176), so the following section seeks to present only the most frequently encountered devices, such as antithesis, repetition and various syntactic devices.

2.1. Antithesis

Antithesis is a 'structure containing two parts which are parallel in structure but at the same time somehow opposed in meaning' (Partington, Taylor, 2018, 103). Indeed, it is much easier for the audience to understand the message of the speech and be convinced if the speaker presents two sides of the issue, since the placing of contrasting ideas side by side introduces 'a sharp and forceful way of measuring difference' (*ibid.*), and promotes critical thinking by the audience.

McGuigan suggests that antithesis can be constructed on three levels, and the choice of a particular level depends on the purpose and intentions of the speaker. First of all, the easiest and the most common way to indicate the contrast is to 'keep the structure of the sentence identical, but use two opposing words' (McGuigan, 2008, 22). Consider this example:

(35) *Never underestimate the effect that you can have on others ... in actions **large and small*** (Barra, May, 2014).

The second level involves a change in 'entire clauses to contrast with one another' (*ibid.*):

(36) *If we **don't develop the talent of our teachers**, we're going to **waste the talent of our students*** (Gates, 2010).

(37) *That is why we reclaim these spaces for the United States of America, because we are **one nation, not two**; indivisible with liberty and justice **for all, not some*** (Landrieu, 2017).

One business speaker managed to combine the two above-mentioned levels in one sentence, which resulted in an even greater, more powerful and evocative effect of the statement:

(38) *We are in an era of unprecedented **creative destruction**, but there is far more being **created** than there is being **destroyed*** (Murdoch, 2008).

Finally, a speaker may wish to have 'whole sentences oppose one another throughout the course of a paragraph' and the subsequent level of contrasting will have a very powerful effect (*ibid.*):

(39) *The pivotal impact of the teacher does not mean that parents, principals, and administrators **have fewer obligations**. It means they **have greater obligations** – to support better teaching* (Gates, 2010).

(40) *And **it's not just the number of degrees**. It's the skills of the students **getting the degrees*** (Raikes, 2010).

All in all, antithesis is used to stress a contrast and emphasise the opposition between two concepts, ideas or things. Not only does antithesis add vividness and provide rhythmic harmony and linguistic brevity to the piece of the spoken discourse, it also gives force and intensifies the message, appeals to the emotions of the listeners, creates a strong impression in their minds, and provides a possibility to choose a way of resolving a conflict between opposing ideas or concepts expressed by the speaker.

2.2. Repetition

Repetition is the 'reiteration of the same word or phrase to lay an emphatic stress on certain parts of the sentence' (Жуковська, 2010, 132). By repeating the same element or elements which the speaker considers to be the most important, (s)he not only attracts listeners' attention and makes the composition coherent and orderly, but also persuades the audience to accept the ideas and concepts being discussed.

Various linguists and authors agree that repetition can be divided into certain types (Cockcroft, Cockcroft, 2005, 182; Zhang, 2005, 118-128; Enos, 1996). The analysis has shown that repetition is a very popular rhetorical device in the speeches of American business leaders: 579 instances of repetition and different types of it have been found in total (see table below).

As can be seen, repetition not only helps speakers to interlace their ideas, enhance the rhythmic aspect of the utterance, and reveal their emotional attitude to the issues being discussed, but also to place great emphasis on the most important points or notions that shape the audience's process of reasoning, and thus persuade them to choose a desired perspective or take an intended action.

Table 4

Types of repetition in speeches by American business leaders

Intermittent or random repetition (ploche) (45%)	(41) <i>We now serve more than two billion people around the world, and every day people use our services to stay connected with the people that matter to them most</i> (Zuckerberg, 2018).
Initial repetition (anaphora) (38%)	(42) <i>It doesn't tell anyone what to think; it doesn't tell you what to read; it doesn't tell you how to teach</i> (Gates, 2014).
Epiphora (10%)	(43) <i>City school-based afterschool programs are closed. Senior centers are closed. Public libraries are closed</i> (Bloomberg, 2012).
Anadiplosis (4%)	(44) <i>Your planet, I'll remind you, is not the center of its solar system; your solar system is not the center of its galaxy; your galaxy is not the center of the universe</i> (McCullough, 2012).
Symploce (2%)	(45) <i>When churches started demonstrating on debt, governments listened – and acted. When churches started organizing, petitioning, and even that most unholy of acts today, God forbid, lobbying on AIDS and global health, governments listened – and acted</i> (Hewson, 2006).
Antimetabole (1%)	(46) <i>Be fearful when others are greedy, and be greedy when others are fearful</i> (Buffett, 2008).

2.3. Syntactic devices

Syntactic devices belong to the category of schematic language, carrying the textual function 'to make the text cohere and comprehensible' (Cockcroft, Cockcroft, 2005, 178). On the other hand, syntactic figures should not be considered only as ornaments or embellishments of a text or speech, as skilfully and properly chosen syntactic structures 'can be instruments of thought and feeling', and 'add persuasive strength' (*ibid.*). The table below presents prevailing syntactic devices in the speeches analysed:

The most preferred device used by American business leaders was *enumeration*. According to Yefimov and Yasinetskaya, enumeration is a syntactic device of 'naming objects so that there appears a chain of homogenous parts of the sentence', where the chain of enumerated words allows for 'the effect of great quantity of objects', which 'raises the expressiveness' of the oral discourse, and makes it dynamic and informative (2011, 78). Another device, *listing* (or *heaping-up*), is an important persuasive syntactic tool that consists of enumerating words within a sentence that 'replicat[e] a sense of emotional, intellectual or sensory pressure in the audience' (Cockcroft, Cockcroft, 2005, 181). The use of *enumeration* and *listing* allows the speaker to place an emphasis on particular ideas or concepts in order to elaborate them further.

Table 5

Types of syntactic device employed in the speeches analysed

Enumeration (76%)	(47) <i>We regard it as a privilege to contribute to Macao's success in realizing its objectives of diversifying its economy, supporting the growth of local businesses and providing meaningful career development opportunities [...] and reaching its full potential as Asia's leading business and leisure tourism destination</i> (Adelson, 2018).
Listings (16%)	(48) <i>Instead, the Internet's open architecture pushes decision-making and intelligence to the edge of the network – to end users, to the cloud, to businesses of every size and in every sector of the economy, to creators and speakers across the country and across the globe</i> (Genachowski, 2009).
Chiasmus (3%)	(49) <i>There has been a lot of research done about the impact of effective teaching, but little research has been done on what makes teaching effective</i> (Gates, 2010). (50) <i>Remember: hard work beats talent ... if talent doesn't work hard</i> (Barra, May 2014).
Inversion (3%)	(51) <i>That I will not do</i> (Romney, 2007). (52) <i>And professionals they are</i> (Trump, January 2019).
Aposiopesis (1%)	(53) <i>If you really experience an emergency, 911</i> (Bloomberg, 2012).

A notably less popular syntactic device that is employed to stress particular ideas or thoughts, and place an emphasis on particular arguments or statements, is *chiasmus*, defined as a 'special form of contrasting pairs where the elements of the first part are switched around in the second' (Partington, Taylor, 2018, 105). By using this device, the speaker can balance the sentence structure and create a sense of connection, by highlighting a statement which is worthy of closer attention.

By deliberate deviation from a familiar arrangement of words, or inversion, the speaker attracts the attention of the audience, and 'emphasize[s] the words that have been reversed' (Enos, 1996, 11). Finally, *aposiopesis*, or breaking off a sentence, represents the speaker's deliberate failure to complete a sentence, when the audience are expected to complete the sentence by themselves, waiting for a further explanation to be provided.

The employment of syntactic devices in speech enables the speaker to present information or arguments in a concise form, provide an understanding of the information presented, and stress the most important parts, thus attracting listeners' attention. Syntactic devices are widely employed in spoken discourse

‘to build up emphasis, subjectivity and emotionalism’ (Bernotienė, 2017, 35), which all together result in the audience paying more attention to the information expressed, and persuade them that the information expressed deserves to be taken into consideration.

Conclusions

1. An examination of the rhetorical style of the speeches investigated has revealed the general principles and tendencies existing and functioning in speeches by American business leaders. The most widely employed figure of speech that holds the dominant position is metaphor (654 cases), which, by introducing a comparison between two different domains, tends to expand the language and give it shape. Speakers tend to conceptualise metaphors in terms of living organisms (79), war (48), liquid (28), and money and economic transactions (25). Personification, as an ontological type of metaphor, was found in 157 sentences. Stylistic figures of substitution, synecdoche and metonymy, were employed by business leaders 165 and 150 times respectively. These tropes enable speakers to convey their ideas in a persuasive, concise and expressive manner.

2. The analysis of the encountered schematic figures of speech revealed that the most frequently employed device was repetition (579 cases), explained in its different types. The figure of opposition, antithesis, was used by speakers 68 times. Other syntactic devices (enumeration, chiasmus, inversion, etc) were also used to attract listeners’ attention. These figures of speech not only lend playfulness, but also help win approval, promote critical thinking, and even assist in holding the listener’s attention. In this respect, they act as manipulative tools aimed at persuasiveness.

3. It can be concluded that various rhetorical stylistic means are not only creative, decorative linguistic elements, but also cognitive tools that allow speakers to present their arguments and their ideas in a clear and persuasive manner, put an emphasis on the statements or arguments presented, stimulate the imagination, and manipulate the emotions of the audience, which all results in the successful achievement of the speakers’ persuasive intention and/or aim. In this way, figures and tropes can be approached as a part of logical and emotive argumentation.

Primary sources

Adelson, Sheldon. Las Vegas Sands Fourth Quarter 2017 Earnings Conference Call. Delivered January 24, 2018.

Barra, Mary. General Motors to the Orion Assembly Autonomous Vehicle Announcement. Delivered June 13, 2017.

- Barra, Mary. Commencement speech to University of Michigan students. Delivered May 3, 2014.
- Barra, Mary. Remarks to employees at a town hall meeting. Delivered June 5, 2014.
- Bezos, Jeff. *We are What We Choose*. Commencement speech to Princeton's Class of 2010. Delivered May 30, 2010.
- Bloomberg, Michael. *Don't Rehire a Failed President*. Delivered August 21, 2020.
- Bloomberg, Michael. Press Update on Hurricane Sandy. Delivered October 29, 2012.
- Bloomberg, Michael. Address in Support of Religious Tolerance and New York City Mosque. Delivered August 3, 2010.
- Bloomberg, Michael. Third Mayoral Inaugural Address. Delivered January 1, 2010.
- Buffett, Warren E. *Buy American. I Am*. Delivered 2008.
- Buffett, Warren. Speech at the University of Nebraska. Delivered 1993.
- Burns, Ursula M. Commencement address for MIT's 145th Commencement. Delivered June 3, 2011.
- Burwell, Sylvia Mathews. *Reinventing the Toilet*. Delivered July 19, 2011.
- Cook, Tim. Address at the 40th International Conference of Data Protection and Privacy Commissioners. Delivered October 24, 2018.
- Desmond-Hellmann, Sue. *From "Me" to "Us"*. The Ohio State University Commencement. Delivered May 6, 2018.
- Dorsey, Jack. Opening Statement to the House Energy and Commerce Committee on Twitter Transparency and Accountability. Delivered September 5, 2018.
- Gates, Bill. Speech delivered at the Reaching the Last Mile Global Health Forum. Delivered November 15, 2017.
- Gates, Bill. Council of the Great City Schools. Delivered October 19, 2017.
- Gates, Bill. Teaching & Learning Conference 2014. Delivered March 14, 2014.
- Gates, Bill. Speech to the American Federation of Teachers. Delivered July 10, 2010.
- Genachowski, Julius. Brookings Speech on Broadband & the Internet. Delivered September 21, 2009.
- Gore, Albert Arnold. *Political Will Is A Renewable Resource*. Address to the United Nations Bali Climate Change Conference. Delivered December 14, 2007.
- Gore, Albert Arnold. Nobel Lecture. Delivered December 10, 2007.
- Gore, Albert Arnold. Concession Speech. Delivered December 13, 2000.
- Hewson, Paul David (Bono). Address at the 54th National Prayer Breakfast. Delivered February 2, 2006.
- Jobs, Steve. Commencement Address at Stanford University. Delivered June 12, 2005.
- Jobs, Steve. From the International Design Conference in Aspen in 1983. Delivered June 15, 1983.
- Landrieu, Mitch. On Confederate Monuments Removal in NOLA. Delivered May 19, 2017.
- McCullough, David Jr. Wellesley High School Commencement Speech. Delivered June 1, 2012.
- Moynihan, Brian. *What Does Society Want From We CEO's?* Delivered October 22, 2020.
- Murdoch, Rupert. *Who's afraid of New Technologies?* Delivered November 16, 2008.
- Murdoch, Rupert. *The future of newspapers: moving beyond dead trees*. Delivered November 16, 2008.
- Page, Larry. Commencement Address to the students of the University of Michigan. Delivered May 2, 2009.
- Raikes, Jeff. *Foundations of Science*. Delivered March 2, 2010.
- Romney, Mitt. *Faith in America*. Delivered December 6, 2007.
- Sandberg, Sheryl. Opening Statement to the Senate Intelligence Committee on Facebook and Foreign Influence. Delivered September 5, 2018.
- Tillerson, Rex. Farewell Remarks at the State Department. Delivered March 13, 2018.
- Tillerson, Rex. Statement on the 2016 Religious Freedom Report. Delivered August 15, 2017.

- Tillerson, Rex. Address to State Department Employees on “American First” Foreign Policy. Delivered May 3, 2017.
- Trump, Donald. 9/11 Victims Compensation Bill H. R. 1327 Signing. Delivered July 29, 2019.
- Trump, Donald. Address to the Nation on Immigration Plan Compromise to End the Government Shutdown. Delivered January 19, 2019.
- Trump, Donald. Paris Climate Accord Address. Delivered June 1, 2017.
- Weiner, Jeff. *Be Compassionate*. Commencement address at the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania Delivered May 13, 2018.
- Welch, John Francis (Jack). Annual Shareowners Meeting. Delivered April 25, 2001.
- Welch, John Francis (Jack). *GE and the Internet*. Presented at the General Electric Company 2000 Annual Meeting. Delivered April 26, 2000.
- Welch, John Francis (Jack). Key Annual Speech to Shareholders. Delivered 1981.
- Whitman, Meg. Speech at the Republican National Convention. Delivered September 3, 2008.
- Winfrey, Oprah. Cecil B. DeMille Award Acceptance Address. Delivered 7 January 7, 2018.
- Zuckerberg, Mark. Opening Statement to the Senate Judiciary and Commerce Committees on Facebook Data Privacy. Delivered April 10, 2018.
- Zuckerberg, Mark. Commencement address at Harvard University. Delivered May 25, 2017.

List of references

- Aristotle 2010 – Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Translated into English under the editorship of W. D. Ross. NY: Cosimo, Inc.
- Austin 1962 – John Austin. *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Barthes 1985 – Roland Barthes. The Rhetoric of the Image. *The Responsibility of Forms*. New York: Hill and Wang, p. 21–40.
- Bernotienė 2017 – Liolita Bernotienė. Colloquial Syntactic Rhetoric of the English Public Speeches. *Tarp eilučių: lingvistikos, literatūrologijos, medijų erdvė TELL ME 2016. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys*. Vilniaus universitetas, p. 27–39.
- Bizzel, Herzberg 2011 – Patricia Bizzel, Bruce Herzberg. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston, Bedford.
- Buckley 2006 – Irena Buckley. *Retorikos tradicija XIX amžiaus lietuvių literatūroje*. Vilnius: Versus Aureus.
- Bulow-Moller 2005 – Anne Marie Bulow-Moller. Persuasion in Business Negotiations. In: H. Halmari & T. Virtanen (Eds.). *Persuasion across Genres*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, p. 27–58.
- Burke 2014 – Michael Burke. *The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics*. NY: Routledge.
- Cockcroft, Cockcroft 2005 – Robert Cockcroft, Susan Cockcroft. *Persuading People: An Introduction to Rhetoric*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Corbett 1990 – Edward Corbett. *Classical rhetoric for the modern student* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dalalau 2009 – Daniela Dalalau. The Use of Metaphors in Business Press Articles. *The Proceedings of the “European Integration–Between Tradition and Modernity” Congress, 3, p. 1193–1200*.
- Delbaere, McQuarrie, Phillips 2011 – Marjorie Delbaere, Edward McQuarrie, Barbara Phillips. Personification in Advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 40(1), p. 121–130.
- Durand 1987 – Jacques Durand. Rhetorical Figures in the Advertising Image. In: *Marketing and Semiotics*. New York: de Gruyter, p. 295–318.
- Enos 1996 – Theresa Enos. *Encyclopaedia of Rhetoric and Composition*. UK: Routledge.
- Fahnestock 2011 – Jeanne Fahnestock. *Rhetorical Style. The Uses of Language in Persuasion*. NY: Oxford University Press.

- Gabrėnaitė 2010 – Eglė Gabrėnaitė. *Reklamos topika: persvazijos instrumentai*. Daktaro disertacija. Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04 H). Vilnius, 2010.
- Glaz, Kowalewski, Weremczuk 2012 – Adam Glaz, Hubert Kowalewski, Anna Weremczuk. *What's in a Text? Inquiries into the Textual Cornucopia*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Grice 1975 – Herbert P. Grice. Logic and conversation. In: P. Cole and J. Morgan (Eds.). *Syntax and semantics*, Vol. 3. New York: Academic Press, p. 41–58.
- Halmari 2005 – Helena Halmari. In Search of “Successful” Political Persuasion. In: Halmari, H. & Virtanen, T. (Eds.). *Persuasion across Genres: A linguistic approach*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins, p. 105–134.
- Hyland, Paltridge 2011 – Ken Hyland, Brian Paltridge. *The Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis*.
- Kelen 2007 – Christopher Kelen. *An Introduction to Rhetorical Terms*. Penrith: Humanities.
- Kheovichai 2015 – Baramee Kheovichai. Metaphor in Business English. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*, Vol. 15(1), p. 93–130.
- Kirsch 2014 – Sharon J. Kirsch. *Gertrude Stein and the Reinvention of Rhetoric*. The University of Alabama Press.
- Kovecses 2010 – Zoltan Kovecses. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lakof 1992 – Robin Lakof. Persuasive discourse and ordinary conversation, with examples from advertising. In: *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*, p. 25–42.
- Lakoff, Johnson 1980 – George Lakoff, Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langer 2015 – Tomas Langer. Metaphors in Economics: Conceptual Mapping Possibilities in the Lectures of Economics. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Vol. 25, p. 308–317.
- Leech 1969 – Geoffrey N. Leech. *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. English Language Series. Longmans, Green and Co. London.
- Littlemore 2015 – Jeannette Littlemore. *Metonymy: Hidden Shortcuts in Language, Metonymy: Hidden Shortcuts in Language, Thought and Communication*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Loudenslager 2012 – Michael W. Loudenslager. What we can learn about the art of persuasion from candidate Abraham Lincoln: A rhetorical analysis of the three speeches that propelled Lincoln into the presidency. *Mercer Law Review*, Vol. 64(2), p. 521–572.
- Martin 2014 – James Martin. *Politics & Rhetoric. A Critical Introduction*. NY: Routledge.
- McGuigan 2008 – Brendan McGuigan. *Rhetorical Devices: Rhetorical Devices: A Handbook and Activities for Student Writers*. USA: Prestwick House, Inc.
- McQuarrie, Mick 2009 – Edward F. McQuarrie, David Glen Mick. A laboratory study of the effect of verbal rhetoric versus repetition when consumers are not directed to process advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 2, p. 287–312.
- McQuarrie, Mick 1999 – Edward F. McQuarrie, David Glen Mick. Visual rhetoric in advertising: text-interpretive, experimental, and reader-response analyses. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 6(1), p. 37–54.
- McQuarrie, Mick 1996 – Edward F. McQuarrie, David Glen Mick. Figures of rhetoric in advertising language. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 22(4), p. 424–438.
- Mikašauskienė, Čiročkina 2020 – Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina. The Structural Arrangement of the Public Speeches of American Business Leaders. *Res Humanitariae*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 270–289.
- Nerlich, Clarke 2001 – Brigitte Nerlich, David Clarke. Serial Metonymy: Serial Metonymy: A Study of Reference-Based Polysemisation. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, Vol. 2(2), p. 245–272.
- Panther, Radden 1999 – Klaus-Uwe Panther, Günter Radden. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Partington, Taylor 2018 – Alan Partington, Charlotte Taylor. *The Language of Persuasion in Politics: An Introduction*. NY: Routledge.
- Patpong 2009 – Pattama Patpong. Thai Persuasive Discourse: a Systemic Functional Approach to an Analysis of Amulet Advertisements. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, Vol. 22, p. 195–217.
- Phillips 1991 – Gerald M. Philips. *Communication Incompetencies: A Theory of Training Oral Performance Behavior*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Richards 2007 – Jennifer Richards. *Rhetoric*. Routledge.
- Searle 1969 – John Searle. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spence 2012 – Sarah Spence. *Figuratively Speaking: Rhetoric and Culture from Quintilian to the Twin Towers*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Van Dijk 1985 – Teun A. Van Dijk. *Handbook of discourse analysis: Dimensions of discourse*. London: Academic Press.
- Vasiloiia, Gaisoa, Vergara 2011 – Mihaela Vasiloiia, Michelle Gaisoa, Nora Vergara. Metaphors Business Linguistic Metaphors Business Linguistic Culture Lives By. *Economy Transdisciplinarity Cognition*, Vol. XIV(1), p. 231–240.
- Yefimov, Yasinetskaya 2011 – Leonid Yefimov, Olena Yasinetskaya. *Practical Stylistics of English*. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha Publishers.
- Zhang 2005 – Xiuguo Zhang. *English Rhetoric*. *English Rhetoric*. China: Tsinghua University Press.
- Жуковська 2010 – Вікторія Жуковська. *English Stylistics: Fundamentals of Theory and Practice*. Житомир: Вид-во ЖДУ ім. І. Франка.

Raimonda Mikašauskienė, Margarita Čiročkina

AMERIKOS VERSLO LYDERIŲ SAKYTINIŲ KALBŲ RETORINĖ ELOKUCIJA

Santrauka

Straipsnyje analizuojama Amerikos verslo lyderių sakytinių kalbų retorinė elokucija ir dominuojanti figūratyvioji raiška, padedanti sukurti įtaigumo efektą. Tyrimo tikslas – išanalizuoti elokucinę šių kalbų topiką: nustatyti ir apibendrinti verslo lyderių kalbose dominuojančius retorinės elokucijos komponentus. Tyrimui pasirinkta 50 žymiausių Amerikos verslo lyderių kalbų, pasakytų įvairiomis progomis 1981–2020 metais. Šiuo tyrimu siekta išsiaiškinti, kaip įvairios retoriinės figūros tampa įtaigumo ir emocinės argumentacijos instrumentais.

Verslo lyderių kalbų analizė parodė, kad stilistinės retoriinės priemonės padeda kalbėtojams aiškiau ir išraiškingiau perteikti savo mintis, vaizdingiau pateikti savo argumentus. Dominuojanti pozicija tropų atžvilgiu tenka metaforoms (654 atvejai), kurių šaltinis yra skirtingų reiškinių gretinimas, grindžiamas menamu jų santykiu. Kalbėtojams šis tropas padeda natūraliai praplėsti kalbą, suteikti jai pavidalą, vaizdingai, tačiau glaustai paaiškinti plėtojamą mintį. Gerokai rečiau tirtose kalbose vartota metonimija (150 atvejų), kuri suteikia gyvumo, ekspresyvumo, o išreikštai minčiai – talpumo.

Dominuojančios figūros verslo lyderių kalbose – kartojimas, antitezė ir išvardijimas. Šios figūros ne tik suteikia skambesio, vaizdingumo, bet ir leidžia paveikti, įkvėpti, įtikinti adresatą – jos skatina kritiškai mąstyti, provokuoja ir net tampa auditorijos dėmesio kontroliavimo įrankiais. Laužydamos įprastines sintaksines sakinio struktūros taisykles, sintaksinės figūros leidžia stilistiškai modifikuoti ir neįprastai aktualizuoti išreikštą mintį.

Apibendrinant galima pasakyti, kad retorinės stilistinės priemonės yra ne tik kalbos puošmenos, bet ir kognityviniai-pragmatiniai instrumentai, leidžiantys aiškiai bei įtaigiai reikšti mintis ir funkcionuojantys kaip retorinio įtaigumo dėmenys, kuriais pasiekiamas optimalus adresato susidomėjimas kalba.