

DISCURSIVE PRAGMATICS VIA CLASSICAL RHETORIC IN THE EUROPEAN DISCOURSE OF ASSISTENCE TO UKRAINE (BASED ON ENGLISH-LANGUAGE SPEECHES OF GERMAN POLITICIANS)

Nataliia Kravchenko*,

nkravchenko@outlook.com

Viktoriia Blidchenko-Naiko**,

viktorianaiko@ukr.net

Oleksandr Yudenko***

yudenko29@gmail.com

Abstract: *The specificity and conjugation of discursive pragmatics and classical rhetoric manifests itself when politicians are faced with the need for evasive formulations to mitigate a potential threat to their face. To substantiate the conceptual basis of discursive argumentation, the article differentiates between “topoi-integrators” and “topoi-arguments”. The topos-integrator “responsibility”, actualized at the local and global discursive levels, appeal to ethos, supporting the logos-based argumentation by involving the ethos-based moral foundations of the speaker's position. Topoi-arguments “responsibility”, “threat”, “reliability” and “law” are rhetorically based on enthymeme as figures of reasoning that appeal to logos as well as on auxiliary figures of digressio, Past Fact / Future Fact, exergasia, climax, congeries, hyperbole and apagoresis, appealing to logos, ethos, and pathos. Pragmatically, the restoration of implicit premises and conclusions of enthymemes corresponds to explicatures, which become the basis for the generation of implicatures, provided that the speakers flout cooperative maxims. Disobeying the maxim of quantity of information is based on the figures of exergasia, climax, congeries, the maxim of relevance - on digressio, Past Fact / Future Fact, and the maxim of quality - on hyperbole and apagoresis. Through rhetorical figures and the corresponding pragmatics, the speakers implement the strategies of transferring and reducing responsibility,*

* Prof. PhD. Hab., Doctor of Science, Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv.

** Associate Professor, Department of Ukrainian Studies, O.O. Bogomolets National Medical University, Kyiv.

*** Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Foreign Languages, National Academy of Fine Arts and Architecture, Kyiv.

substitution of arguments, mitigation, partial distortion by exaggeration, simplification, etc.

Keywords: *political discourse, pragmatics, topoi-integrators, topoi-arguments, rhetorical figures, explication, conversational implicature.*

Introduction

The impetus for writing this article was N. Fairclough's "soft" objection to Sauer's conclusion about the need to use classical rhetorical analysis in the analysis of political discourse along with critical discursive analysis based on the heterogeneity of political discourse, combining rhetoric and modern political communication. While polemizing with this point of view, Fairclough nevertheless agrees that "orientation to the specifics of discursive events includes an orientation to how it processes the social resources of the existing discursive order", which involves the use, among other things, pragmatic and rhetorical analysis¹.

As far as we know, no attempt has yet been made to establish a methodological framework within which classical rhetorical techniques can be integrated into modern discourse analysis. This article attempts to partially fill this gap by focusing on a set of classical rhetorical devices that underpins the discursive pragmatics of political speech.

The choice for the analysis of the discourse of assistance to Ukraine is motivated by the complexity of the discursive construction of a policy based on the ambivalent interpretation of the topos "responsibility", balancing between caution (protection of "one's own" group) and justice (protection of the victim of injustice, which determines the special relationship between rhetorical models and pragmatics).

The purpose of the article is to clarify the specifics and correlations of discursive pragmatics and classical rhetoric in the actualization of topos "responsibility", arguing the discourse of circumspect assistance to Ukraine.

Materials and methods of research

The research material includes contemporary English-language discourse of German politicians associated with assistance to Ukraine, including the speech by Foreign Minister Baerbock in the German Bundestag², a DER SPIEGEL Interview with German Chancellor Olaf

¹ N. Fairclough, 'Rhetoric and Critical Discourse Analysis: A Reply to Titus Ensink and Christoph Sauer', *Current Issues in Language and Society*, vol. 3, no. 3, p. 286.

² Speech by Foreign Minister Baerbock in the German Bundestag on the situation in Ukraine in the light of Russia's illegal war of aggression and its impact on Germany and Europe, 16.03.2022.

Scholz³, and Policy Speech by Christine Lambrecht⁴ and relating to different periods of the ongoing Russian-Ukrainian war. The underlying in the article is the classical rhetorical analysis⁵ combined with the method of analysis of implicatures⁶ and explicatures⁷, and elements of pragmatic analysis of discursive mitigators⁸.

Literature Review

Considering the purpose of the article, its theoretical and methodological basis covers rhetorical and pragmatic approaches, which contributed to the development of the conceptual and methodological framework of the study.

In the perspective of classical rhetoric, the article relies on the one hand, (a) on the rhetorical categories of ethos, logos, and pathos⁹, to which pragmatic means appeal, and on the other hand, (b) on rhetorical figures that implement these categories and correlate with discursive pragmatics¹⁰.

Logos, which refers to the logical content and explication of the ideas of politicians, is considered in the article in several figures of reasoning. Primarily, it is an enthymeme or “truncated syllogism” as an informal way of reasoning, in which either a major or minor premise is presented in an implicit form. Enthymeme is used for analysis as the most frequent figure in the discourse under consideration as its implicit premises and inferences contain implicit motives-arguments of unpopular ideas or actions that could potentially damage the speaker's face if explained. In other words, enthymeme form non-preferred, structurally complex speech moves, offering the addressees to “complete” the missing components of the propositional form and clarify the propositional attitude. The restoration of the complete syllogism coincides with the decoding of the explicature, which, in the appropriate context, can become the basis for the inference of the discursive implicature.

³ a Der Spiegel Interview with German Chancellor Olaf Scholz, conducted by Melanie Amann and Martine Knobbe, April 22, 2022.

⁴ Policy Speech by Christine Lambrecht Federal Minister of Defense on the National Security Strategy of the Federal Republic of Germany, 12 September 2022.

⁵ Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric*, (Transl. by J. H. Freese). Loeb Classical Library XXII, no. 193, Cambridge, MA: *Harvard University Press*, 1982.

⁶ H.P. Grice, ‘Logic and Conversation’, In *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, Speech Acts, P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (eds.). Morgan. New York: Academic Press, 1975, p. 32-33.

⁷ R. Carston, *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2002.

⁸ C. Caffi, Mitigation, In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier, 2006, pp. 171–175.

⁹ William M.A. Grimaldi, *Aristotle: Rhetoric II: A Commentary*, NY: Fordham University Press, 1993.

¹⁰ Aristotle, *op. cit.*

In turn, the actualization of the implicit premises of the enthymeme in the analyzed political speech often relies on other rhetorical figures, including digression – departure from logical progression in a speech, exergasia – repetition of the same idea, changing either its words or its delivery, the figure of past fact / future fact, when reference to the past enables to predict what will happen in the future, apagoresis as an argument against a certain action, which demonstrates its negative future, consequences. etc.

Ethos, which refers to the trustworthiness of the speaker, his reliability and respect for the values of the audience, is explored in the article in two groups of means that are frequent in the analyzed texts. To this end, to clarify ethos-based argumentation, the article involves, on the one hand, the rhetorical figures of Authorities, Witnesses, Maxims (in rhetorical sense), Law, etc. subcategorized into the concept of Testimony. On the other hand, Ethos involves the actualization by the speaker of common values with the audience such as justice, democracy, reliability, the shared ideas of good and evil that are acceptable for any argument. In this sense, the use of concepts associated with ethos is a manipulative technique of replacing the logical argumentation of actions and decisions by transferring them into the sphere of ethical values.

Since such concepts are very close both to the *topoi* identified in critical discourse analysis and to Aristotle's *Special Topics*, an important methodological aspect of the article is the distinction between these concepts in relation to the objectives of our study.

The concept of *topos* we understand in two planes – not only as ready-made argument that sets the audience in a favorite frame of mind¹¹ and appeals to “universal values or normative reference points (the idea of God, law, justice, morality)”, which function as “the components in the argumentative models”¹², providing the transition from argument to conclusion¹³, but also as signifiers, modeling the way events and decisions are understood in the public mind.

In the first sense, the understanding of *topos* is consistent both with Aristotle's special *topoi* as “premises of a very general kind”¹⁴, on which most preferences and choices are based, and with a notion of *topoi* in

¹¹ Sara Rubinelli, *Ars Topica. The Classical Technique of Constructing Arguments from Aristotle to Cicero*, Berlin: Springer, 2009, p. 148.

¹² N. Kravchenko, ‘Manipulative Argumentation in Anti-Ukrainian Discourse of Russian Politicians: Integration of Discourse-Analytical and Classical Rhetorical Approaches’. *Cogito: Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, vol. XIV, no 3, 2022, p. 227.

¹³ M. Kienpointner, *Alltagslogik*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-holzboog, 1992, p. 194.

¹⁴ C. Perelman, L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969, p. 84.

discursive-historical approach of CDA¹⁵ that emphasizes the study of argumentation when considering discursive practices¹⁶.

In the second, broader sense, we use the notion of topoi to denote values, beliefs, which are (a) a discursive construct, (b) means of the global conceptual and semantic coherence of discourse, which integrate heterogeneous elements into a relatively stable whole, and (c) means of construction and maintenance public opinions, ideologies, and identities. It can be assumed that the discourse of military assistance to Ukraine will be integrated by the topoi “responsibility”, “caution”, and “threat”. From this viewpoint, topoi correspond to the privileged signifiers or nodal points¹⁷, which provide articulation and unification of discourse, binding together initially disparate moments¹⁸ because any “discourse is constituted as an attempt ... to arrest the flow of differences”.¹⁹

Such an approach to understanding topoi not only as part of an argumentative model, but also as key concepts-ideas that model social consciousness through discourse, is in turn consistent with critical discourse-analysis in its socio-semiotic framework²⁰, considering discourse “as a cognitive-semiotic integrity with world-modeling properties in the identification, construction and transformation” of values²¹. Values-based topoi construct the ideational stratum of discourse and determine the way of further signification in discursive semiosis.

In this vein, the topoi determine both the argumentative strategies and the pragmatics of discourse and are also projected onto pragmatics of “out-of-discursive” actions in support of the OWN group. They are

¹⁵ Ch. Hart, P. Cap, *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies*. London; New York: Bloomsbury, 2014; R. Wodak, *The Discourse of Politics in Action*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

¹⁶ M. Reisigl, R. Wodak, *The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)*. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 2008, p. 112.

¹⁷ E. Laclau, C. Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso, 1985, p. 106.

¹⁸ M.W. Jorgensen, L. PHILLIPS, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage, 2002, p. 26; J. Torfing, *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe, and Žižek*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999, p. 98.

¹⁹ E. Laclau, C. Mouffe, *Op. cit.*, p. 112.

²⁰ K.C. Dunn, I.B. Neumann, *Undertaking Discourse Analysis for Social Research*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016; T. Van Leeuwen, *Introducing Social Semiotics. An Introductory Textbook*. London: Routledge, 2005; N. Kravchenko, M. Goltsova, I. Kryknitska, ‘Politics as Art: The Creation of a Successful Political Brand’, *Journal of History, Culture and Art Research*, vol. 9, no 3, 2020, pp. 314-323.

²¹ N. Kravchenko, T. Pasternak, Institutional Eco-pragmatics vs. Anthropo-pragmatics: Problems, Challenges, Research Perspectives. *Cogito: Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, vol. 12 no. 2, 2020, p. 21.

communicatively oriented and sets the model for the development of events.²²

Since the article uses *topoi* in both above meanings - on the one hand, as rhetorical devices, and, on the other hand, as ideologemes that determine the way of designating reality in discourses and through discourses, we propose to introduce two different terms to distinguish between these two types: *topoi*- arguments and *topoi*-integrators.

Pathos is aimed at evoking the audience's emotional response and relies on such rhetorical devices as climax – the arrangement of words, phrases, or sentences in ascending order of importance and emotional tension, congeries – the accumulation of words of differing meaning but with the same emotional effect, rhetorical questions, etc.

Given that classical rhetorical devices are studied in the article in their relationships with pragmatic techniques and manipulative strategies, the methodological basis of the study includes some fundamental pragmatic concepts for establishing such an interface.

In particular, the article uses the concepts of explicature and discursive implicature. A comparison of the definitions of explicature and enthymeme allows us to assume a certain correlation between these pragmatic and rhetorical phenomena as, respectively, the content and form of its expression. Thus, Aristotle defines an enthymeme as a syllogism derived from a probable or from an attribute²³, seeing the criterion for the acceptability of premises in the hearer's experience: if any of the premises is known, then it does not need to be provided, as the listener himself adds it. This definition is consistent, in our opinion, with the understanding of explicature as the communicated assumption which is inferentially developed from one of the incomplete conceptual representations (logical forms) encoded by the utterance²⁴.

Comparison of such an understanding of the explicature with the definition of the enthymeme enables to see a correlation of these concepts, since “incomplete conceptual representations” are actually premises related to particular or obvious / general knowledge, which is restored in the communicated assumption – the conclusion from the enthymeme. Both in enthymeme and in explicature, the restoration of completed meaning is based on semantic and pragmatic premises that are common to communicators and provide the listener with information intended by the speaker.

²² N. Kravchenko, *op. cit.*, p.228.

²³ M. Burnyeat, *Enthymeme: Aristotle on the Rationality of Rhetoric*, in A.O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1996, pp. 88–115.

²⁴ R. Carston, *op. cit.*, p. 377,

In addition to explicature, the article uses the concept of conversational / discursive implicature as a contextual assumption intended (implicitly communicated) by the speaker and usually marked by his / her disregard for cooperative maxims²⁵.

In contrast to explicature, which is the "filling in" of a propositional form with missing elements (similar to restoring a complete syllogism from an enthymeme), an implicature is a meaning that can come from an explicature, but does not coincide with it, since its inference depends on various optimally relevant contexts – background knowledge, interviewer questions, presuppositions formed by previous texts, textual context, etc.

Considering that rhetorical figures cover a wide range of strategies by which interlocutors soften the interactional parameters of their speech, one of the aspects of the theoretical basis of the study is the concept of mitigation, understood as a "comprehensive category used in pragmatics" aimed at reducing the "vulnerability" of the speaker and saving his face²⁶. In particular, the article uses the classification of mitigators presented by C. Caffi²⁷, who distinguishes three types of mitigating devices, including bushes, which "hide" the true meaning of an utterance, thus affecting its propositional content, hedges that show the speaker's lack of commitment to the truth of the proposition, thus affecting the illocutionary force of the utterance, and shields, which "defocuses" the speaker and his/her intentions by means of deictic markers of agent, time or place²⁸.

Discussion

From a pragmatic perspective, the specificity of the analyzed discourses is resulted from the desire of speakers to mitigate refusals, uncertainty, and other non-preferential acts. For this purpose, they use strategies for distancing from one's own discourse, which, as a rule, are accompanied by a structural complication of utterances, deviations from the topic, numerous mitigation devices thus flouting the maxims of quantity, transparency, and relevance of information. Disregard of maxims triggers, in its turn, discursive implicatures that implicitly either formulate an unpopular measure or contain its motivation-argument. The data under consideration has shown that in the rhetoric perspective, deviations from cooperative maxims with updating of implicatures often correspond to various rhetorical figures. Thus, the flouting the maxim of relevance relies on digression – a departure from logical progression as in (1) and in (2).

²⁵ H.P. Grice, *op. cit.*

²⁶ C. Caffi, Mitigation, In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier, 2006, pp. 171–175.

²⁷ C. Caffi, 'On mitigation', *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 31, no. 7, 1999, pp. 881-909.

²⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 882.

(1) *When it comes to an issue as contentious as arms deliveries, there are, of course, many who have a different opinion than mine and also express that publicly. That is part and parcel of a good democracy*²⁹ (answer to the question “You have dismissed critics who are calling for the delivery of heavy weapons as “boys and girls” who have googled their knowledge”).

(2) *Permit me a quick digression, for this question has moved me, too. I've also wondered whether we should react tomorrow or not. We watched a video message from [Ukrainian Foreign Minister] Kuleba at the NATO Foreign Ministers meeting and afterwards debated whether we should or not. Of course, we are racking our brains. I think that at a time like this, being able to listen is a true strength. Listening and letting what has been said stand, even letting the reproaches which will come stand. I think at such a moment it is a truly great achievement – being aware of our strength, which also lies in diplomacy*³⁰.

In (1), the digressio implements the strategy of avoiding a direct answer by transferring the topic from the realm of actions and promises to the realm of values marked by the idiom *part and parcel* and the nomination with diffuse semantics (empty signifier) *a good democracy* – as semantic bushes, aimed at mitigating the speaker's face-protecting refusal to respond to the journalist's remark. From manipulative perspective both means are persuasive devices because they provide agreement, unity of opinion between the speaker and his audience, referring to their shared knowledge – human values and the idiom-based universal wisdom. Drawing on topos-argument (or a special topos, in Aristotle's terms) “democracy”, the speaker not only lends credibility to his words but also implements the manipulative tactics of the “argument substitution”. The persuasive function of the idiom (as well as the proverbs, gnomes, aphorisms, apothegms, sententia, similar in functions) was mentioned by Aristotle, when he said that they always seem to be correct, as if everyone agrees with them”³¹.

In (2) the speaker explicates his intention to use digression (*Permit me a quick digression*), which expresses an ethos-based tactic of approaching the audience with the establishment of sincere and trusting relations with it. As in (1), the politician implements the strategy of

²⁹ DER SPIEGEL Interview with German Chancellor Olaf Scholz, conducted by Melanie Amann and Martine Knobbe, April 22, 2022.

³⁰ Speech by Foreign Minister Baerbock in the German Bundestag on the situation in Ukraine in the light of Russia's illegal war of aggression and its impact on Germany and Europe, 16.03. 2022.

³¹ D. DiLeo, ‘Aristotle's Manipulative Maxims’, *The Review of Politics*, vol. 82, no 3, 2020, pp. 371 – 392.

avoiding "ticklish" direct answers by moving from the realm of decision-making to the safer topic of "listening and accepting criticism" by replacing action verbs with non-agent mental state verbs. The "active" aspect is further mitigated by the "mental" metaphor *we are racking our brains* and the axiom-like argument *being able to listen is a true strength*, translating the interpretation of the concept of "strength" from the sphere of military assistance to the sphere of diplomacy and mental abilities.

In a pragmatic sense, the use of digression, which implements the strategy of evasion, violates the maxim of the relevance of information, triggering an implicature aimed at restoring the logical-semantic coherence and contextualized with the interviewer's question in (1) and with the call for military support in (2). In (1) the implicature is that the speaker simply does not have an answer about the need and timing for the delivery of heavy weapons and (2) contains an implicit refusal of military assistance in favor of diplomatic methods.

In (1) and (2) the speakers use an ethos-related persuasion model as they demonstrate commitment to universal human values / wisdom and a reasonable style of behavior, inspiring the trust and disposition of the audience.

At the same time, the political discourse under consideration is most characterized by logos-based rhetorical model that relates to logical argumentation based on enthymeme or a "truncated syllogism", in which either a major or a minor premise or even the conclusion remain implied.

The features of the correlation between enthymeme and pragmatic devices in the development of the argumentation model are displayed by (3).

(3) *For Germany, it was a profound change of course when I announced that we would supply weapons to this war zone. (...). But in this situation, we need a cool head and carefully considered decisions, because our country bears responsibility for peace and security throughout Europe. I do not think it is justifiable for Germany and NATO to become parties to the war in Ukraine³².*

In (3), the speaker uses a disclaimer – manipulative move of "disagreement under the guise of agreement", in which the apparent agreement to the delivery of heavy weapons is weakened by (a) a marker of an indefinite modality "but" in combination with (b) markers of transferring a promise into the sphere of collective responsibility and (c) semantic bush "carefully", specifying the condition under which decision-making is feasible, and thereby softening the commissive component of the speaker's speech act: We make a decision about supplies, but only on the condition that it is carefully considered (which implies duration and

³² Der Spiegel, *Interview with German Chancellor Olaf Scholz*, April 22, 2022.

precludes a quick decision). Uncertain modality is reinforced by the hedge *I do not think* “transforming a statement to an understatement”³³.

The disclaimer, transferring the topic from the sphere of obligations to the sphere of reservations, appeals to the topos-integrator “responsibility” – an implicit argument against weapons delivers, and its causal-purpose correlates *peace and security*. Flouting the cooperative maxim of relevance at the level of logical-formal cohesion, the disclaimer, however, contributes to this maxim adherence at the level of conceptual-semantic cohesiveness, provided by the topoi of responsibility, threat and security. Moreover, the disregard of maxims results in the actualization of these topoi at the implicit level. From viewpoint of rhetoric strategies, deviating from the topic with flouting the maxim of relevance corresponds to the technique of digression. The speaker also flouts the maxim of quality of information using the manipulative technique of simplification-based exaggeration regarding the consequences of help.

Rhetorically, (3) relies on the probabilities-based truncated syllogisms, which are linked together, forming a sorite.

The missing premises are the following:

(i) For Germany, the decision to supply weapons to this war zone was already a profound change of course (Minor stated premise 1).

(ii) Previously, Germany followed a different course (Minor implicated premise 1)

(iii) A deep change of course in politics is associated with difficulties for any country (Major implicated premise1)

(iiii) The most important thing is to keep peace and security (Major implicated premise 2)

(iiiii) Assistance with the supply of weapons can be regarded by Russia as entry into the war (Minor implicated premise 2)

Germany is responsible for peace and security in Europe (Minor stated premise 2).

The complete syllogism would be: Since Germany is responsible for peace and security in Europe, it must be especially careful when supplying weapons to Ukraine so that not to be seen as a side of the war, which would endanger global peace and security.

From viewpoint of the main rhetorical strategy of amplification a pattern of the argument development is based on the identification of an antecedent (assistance in full, that is as much as Ukraine requests) and its consequence (Germany and NATO becoming parties to the war).

³³ R. Giora, O. Fein, J. Ganzi, N.A. Levi, N., H. Sabah, ‘On negation as mitigation: The case of negative irony’, *Discourse Processes*, vol. 39, no 1, 2005, p. 85.

Implied premises of the enthymeme correspond to explicatures that extend the content of utterances based on shared presuppositions of speaker and audience, as well as on the “enrichment” of logical forms containing semantically or grammatically incomplete constructions – to clarify the speaker’s propositional attitude, considering the illocutionary force of his indirect directive-warning.

However, the explicature-based restoration of meanings is a preceding stage for the inference of the conversational implicature, the search for which is triggered by the insufficient transparency of what is being reported, marked by the flouting of cooperative maxims of relevance, and quality (exaggeration) indicated above. The discursive implicature “Germany are not ready to supply heavy weapons” is restored based on the explicature and its contextualization with the interviewer’s questions, previous co-text and background knowledge of the audience based on discourses with similar topoi-integrators “responsibility” and “threat”.

The reason-based persuasive technique of Logos is combined in (3) with the Ethos rhetoric by linking reasoning to the topos-argument of moral responsibility for others, which, due to its repeated actualization, becomes a topos-integrators that ensures the conceptual coherence of the entire discourse.

As shown by data, the specificity of the political speech under consideration lies in the fact that not only one or several premises leading to the conclusion are omitted, but the conclusion itself can also be implied as in (4).

(4) *Part of our country's tradition is the knowledge of the dramatic consequences of two world wars that originated in Germany, which forms the framework of our policy*³⁴.

The missing premises in the syllogism are the following:

(i) The two previous world wars were originated in Germany (Minor stated premise 1).

(ii) Both world wars had dramatic consequences (Minor stated premise 2).

(iii) German policy is formed within the framework of the principle of responsibility for previous world wars (Minor implicated premise 1)

(iiii) If there have already been two world wars, a third is possible. There is a possibility of a third world war (Major implicated premise 1)

Implicated conclusion: This time Germany has no right to be a source of danger to the world.

To facilitate the inference of the implicated premises, the syllogism involves the topos-argument of Past Fact / Future Fact, based on

³⁴ Der Spiegel, *Interview with German Chancellor Olaf Scholz*, April 22, 2022.

intertextual allusions connotating the meanings of “threat” and “responsibility”. The topic of Past Fact / Future Fact, in turn, overlap with other Aristotelian topoi of Possibility and Evidence, putting forward precedents from the past as an argument about the likelihood of their repetition in the future.

The restored conclusion becomes an explicature, which, in turn, contributes to the implicit premise of the subsequent discursive implicature underlying the conceptual and semantic coherence of the entire text: since a war in Ukraine could trigger a third world war, Germany must be especially responsible (that is “careful”) in the policy of providing military assistance to the party to the conflict. In (4) the speaker combines the techniques of enthymeme-based logos (Germany's behavior is consistent, as it relies on the country's historical experience), ethos (the use of historical precedents for persuasion) and pathos (appeal to the feeling of fear using an epithet *dramatic* and evoking contextual connotation based on the meaning the whole sentence)

From a pragmatic point of view, the speaker uses the technique of “complexity reduction” since the country's policy cannot be based only on historical experience. Correspondingly, not providing as much information as is necessary for an unambiguous conclusion, the speaker flouts the maxim of transparency (manner) of information, which becomes the trigger of the above implicature.

Similarly, fragment (5) represents a probabilities-based enthymeme, in which both the implied conclusion and the partly omitted premises are associated with the topoi of “threat” and “responsibility”.

(5) *we must do everything possible to avoid a direct military confrontation between NATO and a highly armed superpower like Russia, a nuclear power. I am doing everything I can to prevent an escalation that would lead to a third world war. There cannot be a nuclear war*³⁵.

The missing premises in the syllogism are the following:

- (i) World War III will be nuclear (Minor implicated premise 1).
- (ii) There cannot be a nuclear war (Major stated premise 1).
- (iii) Russia is a nuclear power, a source of a nuclear threat to the world (Minor stated premise 2).
- (iiii) Escalation of conflicts usually leads to wars (Major implicated premise 1).
- (iiiii) The escalation of the conflict would be the result of a direct confrontation (Minor implicated premise 2).

³⁵ Der Spiegel, *Interview with German Chancellor Olaf Scholz*, April 22, 2022.

(iiiiii) A direct military confrontation with Russia can be avoided (Minor implicated premise 3).

A pattern of the argument development is based on the identification of an antecedent (a direct military confrontation between NATO and Russia)) and its consequence (nuclear war).

The full formal syllogism would be as follows: since the escalation of the conflict will lead to a direct military clash between NATO and Russia, which could end in a nuclear war, the primary task is to prevent a third world war (explicature). Accordingly, assistance to Ukraine should be so reasonable as not to lead to a direct confrontation with Russia, which is tantamount to a nuclear war (the implicature based on explicature).

In addition to the “truncated syllogism” (5) also employs exergasia, which, like enthymeme, is an amplification figure from the category of Thought or Subject Matter but is used here to actualize the implied premises in the “truncated syllogism”.

Exergasia, as a repetition of the same idea, is manifested by synonymic words and expressions such as (a) *a direct military confrontation, an escalation*, (b) *to avoid, to prevent*, (c) *we must do everything possible, I am doing everything I can*, (d) *a third world war, a nuclear war*.

As part of the enthymeme, exergasia appeals to logos, although in (5) it is expressed by figures of pathos aimed at evoking an emotional response. These figures include (a) congeries - an accumulation of words with different meanings, but similar in emotional effect: *the third world war, nuclear war*, and (b) climax – the intensification of the emotional impact associated with the topos "threat", evoked by the accumulation of attributes to designate Russia as a source of a nuclear threat: *a highly armed superpower, a nuclear power*.

Congeries and climax, in turn, promote manipulative tactics of appealing to negative emotions, evoking connotations of fear. From a pragmatic point of view, these rhetorical figures are based on lexical-semantic redundancy, which leads to a violation of the maxim of quantity of information - with the actualization of the discursive implicature associated with the key macro-proposition "aid to Ukraine should not lead to direct confrontation with Russia", which is tantamount to a nuclear war.

In addition, exergasia through reinforcing repeated information underlies the manipulative technique of “unobtrusive” building of a presupposition that invariably links aid to Ukraine with the threat of nuclear war with a nuclear superpower.

Exergasia is realized not only by synonymous words and phrases, but also by whole statements that reinforce key ideas, as in (6), and actualize the same topoi, providing a global semantic and semantic coherence of texts.

(6) *Especially our Allies on the eastern flank are counting on our reliability, and the Chief of Defense and I have once more discussed all possible options at the weekend. Of course, there will be more support for Ukraine, but we must all be clear about the fact that we will be honouring our obligations and our Allies will be able to rely on us*³⁶.

In (6), exergasia is embedded in two enthymemes and actualizes the topoi-argument *reliability* and *responsibility*, which becomes the premise and the main argumentative component in the omitted conclusion “support for Ukraine should not interfere with Germany's obligations to the countries of the alliance”. An additional implied argument is a topos-argument “law”, which is marked by a word “*obligation*” and constitutes one of the figures of Testimony: since military assistance to the countries of the alliance is enshrined in agreements, it is a priority.

The components of two enthymemes, rhetorically connected by exergasia and semantically by the topos “responsibility”, can be represented as follows.

(i) The allies on the eastern flank count on German help (Minor stated premise 1).

(ii) We are responsible to those who rely on us (Major implicated premise 1)

(iii) Germany must be a reliable partner for the allies (Minor stated premise 2).

(iii) Obligations under agreements take precedence over moral obligations (Major implicated premise 2)

(iiii) Assistance to allies is prescribed by agreements / obligations (Minor implicated premise 1).

(iiii) Ukraine can count on Germany's support (Minor stated premise 3).

Aid to Ukraine should not interfere with aid to allies in the alliance (implicated conclusion).

In pragmatic terms, the quoted fragment includes a manipulative move of apparent agreement with numerous markers of indefinite modality and is argued on the exergasia-supported topoi “reliability” and “responsibility”, as well as on the implicit topos-argument “law”.

In semantic-syntactic terms, the uncertain modality is based on (a) a hedge – an impersonal construction *there will be more support for Ukraine* that reduces the illocutionary force of the indirect act of commissive-promise due to the “removal” of the promiser from the position of the phrasal subject, (b) a bush – a semantic mitigator *all*

³⁶ Policy Speech by Christine Lambrecht Federal Minister of Defense on the National Security Strategy of the Federal Republic of Germany, 12 September 2022 Berlin.

possible options moving actions from the sphere of reality to the realm of possibility and (c) a shield – role-playing deixis aimed at "sharing" responsibility (*the Chief of Defense and I*) for subsequent information and at indexing joint responsibility through generalized inclusive pronouns *we, us, our*. An additional mitigating tool is implicit intertextuality – a reference to the "voice" of the "allies on the eastern flank", who "count on our reliability." In terms of rhetoric, this type of Testimony is closest to the figure of an eyewitness, which consists in referring to someone else's experience to confirm one's arguments.

A more explicit form of Testimony is represented in (7) in the figure of "authorities" to bring credibility to speaker's argument.

(7) *I understand that in his recent, much-cited statements the NATO Secretary General called upon us all to find ways of further and more extensively supporting Ukraine. But not at the expense of what we have just pledged in Madrid: to further increase German contributions, be a reliable partner and thus strengthen the trust placed in us. This is what I gathered from his words, and this is also something that defines us*³⁷.

In (7), by using the figure of "authorities" as an indirect quotation of an authoritative opinion, the speaker implements two manipulative tactics, i.e. (a) of shifting/sharing responsibility for the implicated meaning (face-threatening for the speaker) that support for Ukraine should not come at the cost of reducing the defense capability of Germany and NATO and (b) "apparent effort" in a model "We do everything we can, but...", in which the scope of efforts associated with the provision of assistance is initially limited by major circumstances: **Germany will look for ways to further and broader support for Ukraine < But > Wider support could prevent Germany from increasing investment in its defense and the defense of the alliance countries.**

The figure of "authorities" underlies the enthymeme with several implied premises:

(i) Germany cannot break promises made at NATO meeting in Madrid (Minor stated premise 1).

(ii) Germany promised to increase its contribution to the defense capability of the alliance (Minor stated premise 2).

(iii) It is necessary to justify the trust of those who rely on you (Major implicated premise 1).

(iiii) Improving defense capability requires significant investment (Minor implicated premise 1).

(iiiii) Broad assistance to Ukraine will divert investments intended for the defense of the alliance countries (Minor implicated premise 2).

³⁷ Policy Speech by Christine Lambrecht Federal Minister of Defence on the National Security Strategy of the Federal Republic of Germany, 12 September 2022 Berlin.

Implicated conclusion: aid must be commensurate with the alliance's higher priority goals.

Even though enthymeme is a figure of reasoning that appeals to logos, the way of contextualizing “authoritative” opinion also involves the ethos-based persuasive model by appealing to authority and to topoi of “trust” and “reliability”: be *a reliable partner* and thus strengthen *the trust placed in us*.

Enthymeme or truncated syllogism is identified in all texts under consideration. In a discursive perspective, such a rhetorical specificity can be explained by the fact that in its implicit premises or conclusions, enthymeme contains topoi of responsibility, threat, and security as argumentative components of subsequent discursive implicatures aimed at communicating unpopular decisions in a form that does not threaten the face of the speaker.

In (8) the politician's answer to the journalist's question was given in the form of a discursive implicature based on the truncated syllogism in compliance with the same phases of inference – from the enthymeme-based explicature to the restoration of the implicature.

(8) *It is a difficult balancing act that we constantly have to conduct together with our partners, because the threat to NATO territory from Russia persists. This is what we are hearing from our Baltic partners, in particular, who are asking us for an increased Bundeswehr presence. We are therefore heavily engaged with units in Slovakia and Lithuania, among other countries. NATO's stated goal is that we must be able to hold out for 12 days with our ammunition and equipment in the event of a conventional attack*³⁸.

The missing premises are the following:

(i) The threat to NATO territory from Russia is real (Minor stated premise 1).

(ii) The issue of assistance to Ukraine from Germany should be agreed with the alliance (Minor implicated premise 1).

(iii) Alliance states ask for help to strengthen their security (Minor stated premise 2).

(iiii) Germany actively assists the countries of the alliance in strengthening their defense capability (Minor stated premise 3).

(iii) In case of danger, you protect yourself / your group first, and not others (Major implicated premise 1).

(iii) The security of the Alliance must come before aid to Ukraine (Minor implicated premise 2).

³⁸ Der Spiegel, Interview with German Chancellor Olaf Scholz, April 22, 2022.

The last premise, in addition to the means of direct denotation, is supported by nominations *hold out*, *a conventional attack*, etc. connotating the seme “threat”.

A complete syllogism can be formulated as follows: in the event of a danger that is now real, a priority task is to protect the security of the alliance and especially those of its members who need to strengthen their security.

This information becomes an explicature, underlying a discursive implicature “in the current situation, Germany is not ready to constantly supply its deployable equipment”, contextualized with the discursive argumentative model, based on the topoi “responsibility”, “security” and “threat” and with the question of the journalist (Kyiv is proposing that Germany continuously supply its deployable equipment from the Bundeswehr and then gradually replace it. What are the arguments against that?).

In the pragmatic perspective a discursive implicature is triggered by the flouting of the cooperative maxim of relevance as the speaker deviates from the topic related to the journalist's question, shifting the response from the sphere of assistance to Ukraine to the sphere of assistance to the alliance. In doing so, he uses a reference to someone else's opinion as a technique to transfer the focus of responsibility: *This is what we are hearing from our Baltic partners, in particular, who are asking us for an increased Bundeswehr presence*. In terms of rhetorical devices, this reference to the requests of Baltic partners represents narrative intertextuality, which correlates with the Testimony, defined by Cicero as “everything that is brought in from some external circumstance in order to win conviction.”³⁹ Since the Testimony is not intrinsic or inherent to the subject matter at hand and are brought from external circumstances, it also correlates with digression – a deviation from the logical-semantic sequence in speech thus violating the maxim of relevance.

In addition to the figures of Testimony, digressio, Past Fact / Future Fact and Possibility / Evidence, aimed to “prompt” the minor implicated premise in truncated syllogism, the speaker also uses apagogesis as an argument against a certain action, demonstrating its negative consequences as in and (9).

(9) *Second, you are presuming that it is all about making money for us. But the point is that we want to avoid a dramatic economic crisis, the loss of millions of jobs and of factories that would never open again. This would have major consequences for our country, for all of Europe, and it would also severely affect the financing of Ukraine's reconstruction. As*

³⁹ Cicero, *Topica* (Transl. by T. Reinhardt). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003, p. 437-438.

such, it is my responsibility to say: We cannot allow that to happen. And third, is anyone actually thinking about the global consequences?

In response to a journalist's question about the need to introduce the Russian gas embargo, the speaker refers to three negative consequences - for Germany, for Europe and for Ukraine applying apogoresis in combination with rhetorical exaggeration - hyperbole to enhance the effect of negative consequences.

From the point of view of discursive pragmatics, the figure of apogoresis combined with rhetorical hyperbole ensures the implementation of several manipulative tactics at once: reversal of roles of Ukraine from beneficiary (benefiting from sanctions against Russia) to the damaged (sustaining a loss from sanctions against Russia), technique of partial distortion of information by its exaggeration, simplification and shift of emphasis, the statement under the guise of a question (corresponding to rhetorical device of eroteme - affirmation a point strongly by asking it as a question) and creating a situation of imaginary choice – when only one, certain attitude towards the subject is implied.

Conclusion

The article reached the main conclusions that the basic rhetorical device in the discourse under consideration is a set of enthymemes as figures of reasoning that appeal to logos. The restoration of the implied premises and conclusions is carried out by means of explicatures that expand the propositional content with the missing semantic elements. The restored explicatures become the basis for the inference of conversational implicatures, triggered by the speakers' deviation from the cooperative maxims of quantity, quality, transparency, and relevance of information. Rhetorically, such violations of maxims rely on the figures of exergasia, climax, congeries (violation of the maxim of quantity), digressio, Past Fact / Future Fact (disregard of the maxim of relevance), hyperbole, exaggeration, apogoresis (flouting the maxim of quality). In terms of manipulative strategies, the identified pragmatic and rhetorical devices correspond to the use of disclaimers, transfer and reduction of responsibility, argument substitution, mitigation, partial distortion of information by its exaggeration, simplification and shift of emphasis, the statement under the guise of a question, creating a situation of imaginary choice, etc.

Implicatures are used to implicitly convey information related to unpopular measures or other sensitive issues where the explication of ideas may be face-threatening to the speakers. It is revealed that implicatures are based on the discursive topos-integrator "responsibility", which, in turn, relies on topoi-arguments "threat", "reliability", "law", etc.

that become the main argumentative components to ensure consistency of discourses in the argumentative and conceptual planes. Actualized both at the local and global discursive levels, a topos “responsibility” relates to ethos, reinforcing the logos-based rational argumentation of the speakers with an appeal to the moral foundations of their position taken in the interests of “one’s own” group.

References:

- Anderson, A. Я., Belnap N.D., (1961), Entymemes. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 58 (23), 713-723.
- Aristotle, (1982), *The Art of Rhetoric* (Transl. by J. H. Freese). Loeb Classical Library, XXII (193). Cambridge, MA: *Harvard University Press*.
- Burnyeat, M., (1996), Enthymeme: Aristotle on the Rationality of Rhetoric, in A.O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle’s Rhetoric*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1996, 88–115.
- Caffi, C., (2006), Mitigation, in K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier, 171–175.
- Caffi, C., (1999), On mitigation, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1999, 31 (7), 881-909.
- Carston, R., (2002), *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2002.
- Cicero, (2003), *Topica* (Transl. by T. Reinhardt). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DiLeo, D., (2020), Aristotle’s Manipulative Maxims, *The Review of Politics*, 82 (3), 371 – 392.
- Dunn, K.C., Neumann, I.B., (2016), *Undertaking Discourse Analysis for Social Research*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016;
- Fairclough, N., (1996), *Rhetoric and Critical Discourse Analysis: A Reply to Titus Ensink and Christoph Sauer*. *Current Issues in Language and Society*, 3 (3), 286–289.
- Giora, R., Fein, O., Ganzi, J., Levi, N.A., & Sabah, H., (2005), On negation as mitigation: The case of negative irony. *Discourse Processes*, 39(1), 81-100.
- Grice, H. Paul., (1975), Logic and Conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics*, 3, Speech Acts, Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.). New York: Academic Press, 1975, 32-33.
- Grimaldi, W. M., (1993), *Aristotle: Rhetoric II: A Commentary*. NY: Fordham University Press.
- Hart, Ch., P. Cap, P., (2014), *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies*. London; New York: Bloomsbury.

Jorgensen, M.W., Phillips, L., (2002), *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.

Kienpointner, M., (1992), *Alltagslogik*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-holzboog.

Kravchenko, N., (2022), Manipulative Argumentation in Anti-Ukrainian Discourse of Russian Politicians: Integration of Discourse-Analytical and Classical Rhetorical Approaches. *Cogito: Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, XIV (3), 224–247.

Kravchenko, N., Goltsova, M., Kryknitska, I., (2020), Politics as Art: The Creation of a Successful Political Brand. *Journal of History, Culture and Art Research*, 9 (3), 314–323.

Kravchenko, N., Pasternak, T., (2020), Institutional Eco-pragmatics vs. Anthro-po-pragmatics: Problems, Challenges, Research Perspectives. *Cogito: Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12 (2), 24–39.

Laclau, E., Mouffe, C., (1985), *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.

Madden, E. H., (1952), The enthymeme: *Crossroads of logic, rhetoric, and metaphysics*. *Philosophical Review*, 61 (3), 368–376.

Perelman, Ch., Olbrechts-Tyteca, L., (1969), *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

Reisigl, M., Wodak, R., (2008), The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications, pp.87–121.

Policy Speech by Christine Lambrecht Federal Minister of Defence on the National Security Strategy of the Federal Republic of Germany, 12 September 2022 Berlin. Available at:

<https://www.bmvg.de/en/news/policy-speech-on-the-national-security-strategy-5497180>

Rubinelli, Sara, (2009), *Ars Topica. The Classical Technique of Constructing Arguments from Aristotle to Cicero*. Berlin: Springer.

Speech by Foreign Minister Baerbock in the German Bundestag on the situation in Ukraine in the light of Russia's illegal war of aggression and its impact on Germany and Europe, 16.03.2022. Available at: <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/newsroom/news/baerbock-bundestag-ukraine/2517778>

There Cannot Be a Nuclear War. *DER SPIEGEL Interview with German Chancellor Olaf Scholz*, conducted by Melanie Amann and Martine Knobbe, April 22, 2022. Available at:

<https://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/interview-with-german-chancellor-olaf-scholz-there-cannot-be-a-nuclear-war-a-d9705006-23c9-4ecc-9268-ded40edf90f9> (accessed 25 April 2022).

Torring, J., (1999), *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe, and Žižek*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

Van Leeuwen, T., (2005), *Introducing Social Semiotics. An Introductory Textbook*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Wodak, R., (2009), *The Discourse of Politics in Action*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

© 2023. This work is published under
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>(the
“License”). Notwithstanding the ProQuest Terms and
Conditions, you may use this content in accordance with the
terms of the License.