UDC 811.111'373
DOI 10.32837/2312-3192/12/12

MANIPULATING CATEGORIES IN PUBLIC SPEECHES AND THEIR TRANSLATIONS: COGNITIVE RHETORICAL APPLICATION OF VANTAGE THEORY

Serhiy Potapenko[1]

Abstract

The article applies Vantage Theory, which studies the ways of categorization with respect to human orientation in space-time, to revealing three types of manipulating categories structuring the addressee's worldview: overcategorization, decategorization and new category construction. It is found that overcategorization, aimed at intensifying the parameters constituting the categorical focus, is reflected in the use of words denoting the utmost intensification of the focal categorical parameters, while partial categorization is expressed by the lexical units intensifying focal parameters to a certain degree. Decategorization is shown to reflect five ways of diminishing focal parameters. Similarly to overcategorization, the absolute and partial decategorizations reflect the utmost and fractional loss of focal features respectively; the situational decategorization concerns the reduction of the focal parameters denoted by the inclusive deictic unit *we*; the generalizing variant is rendered by the units extending the limits of a particular category; the universal type refers to the superordinate categorization level. New category construction consists in representing novel entities by word formation in the Russian original and by construction formation in the English translation with the sender being more daring in these passages than the translator who in the majority of other cases follows the vantage construction suggested by the speaker.

Keywords
Category, manipulation, public speech, translation, cognitive rhetoric, vantage theory, overcategorization, decategorization, new category construction.

1. Introduction. One of the promising contemporary linguistic trends is cognitive rhetoric proposed by Mark Turner in his book *Reading Minds. The Study of English in the Age of Cognitive Science*[2] and further distinguished from cognitive poetics at the 2010 *Texts and Minds* conference[3].

At present the definition of cognitive rhetoric depends on the researchers' focus either on the linguistic signs or communication participants. The sign definition interprets cognitive rhetoric as a study of linguistic devices and strategies employed to affect the recipient's viewpoint[4] while the participant-related approach sees it as a study of fundamental cognitive processes at both giving and receiving ends[5]. The latter trend seems to follow the traditions of ancient rhetoric: its canons of invention, disposition, elocution, memory and pronunciation[6] focus on the speaker's activity while ways of persuasion – ethos, pathos and logos[7] – concentrate on the addressee relating him to the speaker's activity, too.

So far cognitive rhetoric has been studying the persuasive potential of texts drawing on communication participant' conceptual structures which construe reality at different levels of generalization: image schemas, i.e. recurring dynamic patterns of our perceptual interactions and motor programs[8] which are derived from the perceptual reality; force dynamics, regarded as a fundamental semantic category in the realm of physical force[9] generalized into the domains of internal psychological relationships and social interactions[10]; conceptual metaphor providing understanding for a more abstract concept (target domain) through a more concrete one (source domain)[11]. However, cognitive rhetoric lacks techniques capturing inter- and intracategorical semantic shifts though speakers often resort to manipulating categories. This niche is filled in by the Vantage Theory suggested by the American anthropologist and linguist Robert MacLaury: it explains both color categorization in Mesoamerica[12] and categorization at large drawing on human orientation in space-time[13].

The target of this paper is to reveal cognitive rhetorical application of vantage theory to the analysis of public speeches and their translations. The object is the verbal categorization of extralinguistic phenomena in public speeches and their translations, the subject is vantage-theoretic procedures of categorization.

2. Methodology. As has been noted, this paper applies the vantage theoretic approach to the cognitive rhetorical analysis of categorical shifts in public speeches and their translations.

2.1. Vantage Theory (VT) claims that color differentiation is based on principles governing catego-

[1] Prof. Dr. S. I. Potapenko, Gogol State University at Nizhyn, Grafska Str., 2, 16002 – Nizhyn, Ukraine, Email: serhiy.potapenko@ndu.edu.ua. ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8623-3240

[2] Turner 1991, 247

[3] Kwiatkowska 2012, 8

[4] Kwiatkowska 2012, 9

[5] Tabakowska 2012, 275

[6] Burke 2016, 2

[7] Burke 2016, 3

[8] Johnson 1987, xiv; Potapenko 2016; Turner 1991

[9] Talmy 2000, 409

[10] Oakley 2005, 451

[11] Hamilton 2012, 201

[12] MacLaury 1997

[13] MacLaury 2013, 76

rization at large[14] which in its turn rests on human orientation in space-time[15]. The method links the immobility of space, or slow speed[16], to the formation of the dominant vantage with a strong similarity to the categorical focus while the mobility of time is related to the recessive vantage nearing the category margin[17] with a further shift to adjacent categories.

The simplest example of category formation cited by the VT proponents is represented by the RED category which rests on three coordinates. The focus is represented by pure red (R) distinguished in VT according to the Munsell chart, i.e. a standard by which color categorization is measured relative to the purest examples of basic colors (white, black, red, green, yellow and blue)[18]. The dominant vantage is based on the similarity (S) to the focus while the recessive vantage rests on the difference from the focus (D).

According to VT, the RED category is constructed at two levels. At the first one, the focus R is treated as a ground, i.e. a less prominent coordinate, and the dominant vantage S is regarded as a figure, a more conspicuous coordinate. S determines the color shades other than the pure R, i.e. encompasses a certain range of color. At the second level, the recessive vantage D stops the range from extending indefinitely, marking the boundaries of the category.

Levels	Fixated Coordinates	Mobile Coordinates	Entailments
1	R	S	focus, range
2	S	D	breadth, margin

Consequently, we can distinguish three types of vantage construction differing in degree of similarity to the focus or difference from it. They are dominant, recessive, and substitutional. The dominant vantage encompasses the main focal parameters which due to slow speed can be intensified within a category range without any outside shifts. The recessive vantage presupposes the deintensification of focal parameters with a gradual shift to neighboring categories. The substitutional type consists in the replacement of one category by another.

2.2. Material. This article discusses the three types of vantage construction outlined above drawing on the «Address of President of Russian Federation» of 18 March 2014. The paper compares the original address published in Russian (http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/20603) and its English translation (http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/20603). According to one view, the address falls into eight sections: Crimea as an unquestionable part of Russia; demonizing Ukrainian authorities; nostalgia over Soviet times; Crimean people's right to self-determination; defining rivalry with the West; presenting the Russian way as diplomatic and non-military; struggle over Russian status in global affairs; annexation is legitimized by the Russian public[19]. However, in accordance with rhetorical disposition those eight parts can be pinned down to five sections making the structure of the address more symmetrical. They are: *introduction* claiming that Crimea has always been an unquestionable part of Russia; *semantic sections* addressing three sets of problems: those of Ukraine by demonizing its authorities and being nostalgic over Soviet times; those of Crimea, claiming its right to self-determination; those of international community covering rivalry with the West, presenting the Russian way as diplomatic and non-military, depicting struggle over Russian status in global affairs; *conclusion* returning to the annexation legitimization by Russian public.

3. Results and Discussion. The application of VT to the analysis of the address under discussion reveals that linguistic units distinguish three types of vantage construction: overcategorization, based on the dominant vantage; decategorization linked to the recessive vantage; new category formation presupposing category substitution.

3.1. Overcategorization based on the dominant vantage construction consists in the intensification of focal parameters due to slow speed[20]. Intensification can either be absolute, i.e. covering the whole category, or partial, concerning separate parameters.

3.1.1. Absolute overcategorization rests on the utmost intensification of the focal parameters, emphasizing the highest degree of their revelation, mainly in the introduction to the address. This way of vantage construction is rendered by the pronoun *все* in the Russian original and its equivalent *all* in the English translation as well as by a number of adjectives and their English variants: *полный «full»; подавляющее «overwhelming»; абсолютный «absolute»*.

The pronoun *все «all»* emphasizes the extent of the audience at the beginning of the address under discussion, e.g.

Сегодня мы собрались по вопросу, который имеет жизненно важное значение, историческое значение для всех нас.

We have gathered here today in connection with an issue that is of vital, historic significance to all of us.

The adjective *полный «full»* underscores the legal status of the referendum relative to the DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURES category, e.g.

Он прошел в полном соответствии с демократическими процедурами и международно-правовыми нормами.

[14] ibid

[15] MacLaury 2013, 76

[16] MacLaury 2002, 495

[17] ibid

[18] Głaz 2012, 20-22; MacLaury 2002, 498

[19] Remizov 2015, 49

[20] MacLaury 2002, 495

A referendum was held in full compliance with democratic procedures and international norms.

The Russian adjectives *подавляющее* «overwhelming» and *абсолютное* «absolute» as well as their English equivalents indicate the numbers of the voters and Russian citizens who were in favor of the «reunification» though the latter group did not express their attitude by any legal means, e.g.

Таким образом, и подавляющее большинство жителей Крыма, и абсолютное большинство граждан Российской Федерации поддерживают воссоединение […].

Thus we see that the overwhelming majority of people in Crimea and the absolute majority of the Russian Federation's people support the reunification […].

In the conclusion of the original address the adjective *абсолютное* «absolute» is repeated twice while in the translation it occurs only once, e.g.

Здесь, как и в любом демократическом обществе, есть разные точки зрения, но позиция абсолютного – я хочу это подчеркнуть, абсолютного большинства граждан также очевидна.

Here like any other democratic country, people have different points of view, but I want to make the point that the absolute majority of our people clearly do support what is happening.

The lack of repetition of the adjective *absolute* in the translation is made up for by additional linguistic means contributing to the dominant vantage construction: the units *clearly* and *do* as well as the subordinate clause *what is happening.* In terms of dominant vantage construction *clearly* indicates the absence of hindrances, *do* intensifies the *SUPPORT*-category akin to the POSITION-category denoted in the original by the noun *позиция* while the subordinate clause *what is happening* indicates the process of category construction.

3.1.2. Partial overcategorization rests on the dominant vantage construction concerning separate focal parameters. It is indicated by the pronoun *более «more»*, the adverb *преимущественно* «predominantly» and their English equivalents.

The partial overcategorization substantiates the speaker's views on various issues in different sections of the address.

In the *introduction* the adverb *более* «*more*» underscores the number of the referendum participants and the quantity of those who voted in favor of the «reunification», e.g.

В голосовании приняло участие более 82 процентов избирателей. Более 96 процентов высказались за воссоединение с Россией.

More than 82% of the electorate took part in the vote. Over 96% of them spoke out in favor of reuniting with Russia.

In the text body the partial overcategorization is meant to substantiate the speaker's thesis about Ukrainians' dependence on their earnings in Russia:

По некоторым оценкам, объем их заработка в 2015 году в России составил более 20 миллиардов долларов, порядка 12 процентов ВВП Украины.

According to some sources, in 2013 their earnings in Russia totaled over $20bn, which is about 12% of Ukraine's GDP.

However, it is evident that the fuzzy reference to the sources of those arguments by the indefinite quantifier *некоторые «some»* reduces the force of that categorical intensification in the cited example.

The adverb *преимущественно* «predominantly» intensifies the number of Crimean Ukrainians speaking Russian, e.g.

350 тысяч украинцев, которые преимущественно считают русский язык своим родным языком.

350,000 are Ukrainians who predominantly consider Russian their native language.

The absolute and partial overcategorizations are quite important since they are constructed within existing categories. However, they are less frequent than decategorization reconstructing the existing categories and creating novel ones.

3.2. Decategorization rests on the reduction of focal parameters resulting in the shift to the adjacent categories which is exemplified by situational, generalizing, partial and absolute decategorization types.

3.2.1. Situational decategorization is rendered by the inclusive deictic unit *мы* «*we*» or its derivatives in combination with different words. The situational dominant vantage as the starting point of categorization is indicated by the combination of the inclusive deictic *мы* «*we*» with the verbs denoting sensori-motor activity, i.e. related to a particular situation, cf. *сегодня мы собрались – we have gathered here today*.

The situational decategorization is based on two recessive vantages bordering on the NATION category indicated by the combination of the inclusive *we* or its derivatives with the units extending the number of participants and widening the situation by forming multi-national and transnational vantages.

The multi-national recessive vantage extends the meaning of the deictic unit *нашей* used in the word combination *нашей общей историей «our shared history»* at the beginning of the second paragraph to refer to the unity of Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians indicated at the end of that paragraph by the phrase *народы России, Украины и Белоруссии «peoples of Russia, Ukraine and Belarus»*:

В Крыму буквально все пронизано нашей общей историей и гордостью. Здесь древний Херсонес, где принял крещение святой князь Владимир. Его духовный подвиг – обращение к православию – предопределил общую культурную, ценностную, цивилизационную основу, которая объединяет народы России, Украины и Белоруссии.

Everything in Crimea speaks of our shared history and pride. This is the location of ancient Khersones, where Price Vladimir was baptized. His spiritual feat of adopting Orthodoxy predetermined the overall basis of the culture, civilization and human values that unite the peoples of Russia, Ukraine and Belarus.

The opposite shift from the multi-national recessive vantage indicated by the construction *наше общее достояние «our common historical legacy»* to the mononational recessive vantage denoted by the ethnic nomination *российский* «*Russian*» occurs in the following passage:

«*Крым это наше общее достояние и важнейший фактор стабильности в регионе. И эта стратегическая территория должна находиться под сильным, устойчивым суверенитетом, который может быть только российским*».

Crimea is our common historical legacy and a very important factor in regional stability. And this strategic territory should be part of a strong and stable sovereignty, which today can only be Russian.

The transnational recessive vantage is denoted by nouns extending the unity of the three nations to a bigger entity nearing the EMPIRE category named by the word combination *Российская держава* in the original and the construction *Russian Empire* in the translation. The latter phrase encompasses not only the three Slavic nations mentioned before but also other ethnic groups which used to be under Russian rule. This difference in vantage construction in the original and in the translation is demonstrated by the following example:

В Крыму могилы русских солдат, мужеством которых Крым был взят под Российскую державу. […] *Каждое из этих мест свято для нас, это символ русской воинской славы и невиданной доблести.*

The graves of Russian soldiers whose bravery brought Crimea into the Russian empire are also in Crimea. […] *Each one of these places is dear to our hearts, symbolizing Russian military glory and outstanding valor.*

3.2.2. Partial decategorization. The two recessive – deintensified – vantages indicating the loss of the integrity by the NATION category include territorial and linguistic.

The *territorial* recessive vantage is indicated by the noun *территории* «territories» in the word combination *наши исторические территории* «our historical territories», e.g.

Мы против того, чтобы военная организация хозяйничала возле нашего забора, рядом с нашим домом или на наших исторических территориях.

We are against having a military alliance making itself at home right in our backyard or in our historic territories.

A more general territorial vantage is offered by the noun *земля «*land» to categorize the territory as historically Russian, cf. *Крым – это исконно русская земля. – Crimea is historically Russian land.*

The territorial recessive vantage is frequent in the international section of the address. Its construction is performed according to the pattern «people of a particular country», i.e. begins with the PEOPLE category and ends up with the territory a nation occupies, e.g. *народ Китая «people of China»; народ Соединенных Штатов «people of the United States»; народ Украины «the people of Ukraine».*

Against this background the dominant vantage is evoked by the ethnic nominations of Europeans and Germans, cf.

Верю, что меня поймут и европейцы и, прежде всего, немцы. – I believe that the Europeans, first and foremost, the Germans, will also understand me.

The dominant vantage representing Germans is employed in the context of «reunification»:

А наша страна, напротив, однозначно поддержала искренне, неудержимое стремление немцев к национальному единству.

Our nation, however, unequivocally supported the sincere, unstoppable desire of the Germans for national unity.

However, the final appeal is made by construction *the citizens of Germany* which is supposed to be more impressive due to the iconicity rule claiming that more form presupposes more meaning[21], cf.

Уверен, что вы этого не забыли, и рассчитываю, что граждане Германии также поддержат стремление русского мира, исторической России к восстановлению единства.

I am confident that you have not forgotten this, and I expect that the citizens of Germany will also support the aspiration of the Russians, of historical Russia, to restore unity.

The *linguistic* recessive vantage distinguishing people with respect to the language they speak is constructed by the adjective *русскоязычные* drastically expanding the number of people representing the Russians, e.g.

При этом конечно рассчитывали, что Украина будет добрым соседом, что русские и русскоязычные граждане на Украине, особенно на ее юго-востоке и в Крыму, будут жить в условиях дружественного, демократического, цивилизованного государства.

However we expected Ukraine to remain our good neighbour, we hoped that Russian citizens and Russian speakers in Ukraine, especially its south-east and Crimea, would live in a friendly, democratic and civilized state.

3.2.3. Generalizing decategorization concerns extending the mononational dominant vantage denoted by the unit *русские* «Russians» occurring in neutral – entrenched – contexts:

[21] Van Langendonk 2007, 400

Русские и украинцы, крымские татары и представители других народов жили и трудились рядом на крымской земле.

Russians and Ukrainians, Crimean Tatars and people of other ethnic groups have lived side by side in Crimea.

The intensified dominant vantage rendered by the phrase *русский народ* and its English equivalent *the Russian nation* underline a bigger importance of the unity parameter which is proved by the use of that phrase in the context of a divided nation:

Миллионы русских легли спать в одной стране, а проснулись за границей, в одночасье оказались национальными меньшинствами в бывших союзных республиках, а русский народ стал одним из самых больших, если не сказать, самым большим разделенным народом в мире.

Millions of people went to bed in one country and awoke in different ones, overnight becoming ethnic minorities in former Union republics, while the Russian nation became one of the biggest, if not the biggest ethnic group in the world to be divided by borders.

In the cited passages the ethnic name *русские* from the original is replaced in the translation by the general term *people* referring to a more universal category while the construction *русский народ* underscores the unity of the denoted ethnic group against the background of its division indicated by the word combination *самым большим разделенным народом в мире «if not the biggest ethnic group in the world to be divided by borders»*.

The recessive vantage concerning the loss of historical memory is further emphasized by the predicate *лишить* «*deprive*»:

Раз за разом предпринимались попытки лишить русских исторической памяти.

Time and again attempts were made to deprive Russians of their historical memory.

3.2.4. Universal decategorization rests on the deintensified vantage rendered by the nouns *люди*, *жители* «people» or *граждане* «citizens» referring to the people at large, i.e. the most general terms removing the idea of national belongingness.

Universal decategorization refers to the masses of people poised as an authority, i.e. the most general category, cf.

В сердце, в сознании людей Крым всегда был и остается неотъемлемой частью России. – In people's hearts and minds, Crimea has always been an inseparable part of Russia.

У людей, конечно же, и тогда возникали вопросы, с чего это Крым оказался в составе Украины. – People, of course, wondered why all of a sudden Crimea became part of Ukraine.

The use of the noun *люди* «*people*» in the example above without indication of their territorial affiliation expands the PEOPLE category so far that it is not clear what nationalities are meant: Russians, Ukrainians, Crimeans or the international community.

Reference to the national belongingness is avoided when the noun *people* combines with the names of territories which allows to encompass the biggest possible number of people while mitigating the national parameter:

Понимаю, почему люди на Украине хотели перемен […]. При этом властей предержащих мало интересовало, чем и как и живут простые люди, в том числе, почему миллионы граждан Украины не видят для себя перспектив на родине.

I understand why Ukrainian people wanted change […]. They milked the country, fought among themselves for power, assets and cash flows and did not care much about the ordinary people. They did not wonder why it was that millions of Ukrainian citizens saw no prospects at home.

The translation of the original phrase *люди на Украине* as *Ukrainian people* into English does not seem quite accurate because of the different direction of vantage construction. In the Russian original (*люди на Украине*) the more general PEOPLE category is transformed into that of STATEHOOD while in the translation the NATION category is widened into a more general PEOPLE category.

A similar direction of vantage construction is aimed at reducing the representation of Crimean tartars' suffering due to their inclusion into the more general PEOPLE category, e.g.

От репрессий тогда пострадали многие миллионы людей разных национальностей и прежде всего, конечно, русских людей. Крымские татары вернулись на свою землю.

There is only one thing I can say here: millions of people of various ethnicities suffered during those repressions, and primarily Russians. Crimean Tatars returned to their homeland.

Both in the original and in the translation of the cited passage the speaker moves from the general PEOPLE category (*millions of people*) to the category of RUSSIANS (*русских людей)* expanded by the noun *люди* «*people*» ending up with CRIMEAN TATARS category (*крымские татары)*.

However, the PEOPLE category is somewhat narrowed by the noun *граждане* in combination with the place name *Украина* «Ukraine» in the following passage and its translation, e.g.

Русские, как и другие граждане Украины, страдали от постоянного политического и государственного перманентного кризиса.

Russians, just as other citizens of Ukraine are suffering from the constant political and state crisis.

3.2.5. Absolute decategorization is symmetrical to the same type of overcategorization based on the recessive deintensified vantage. It is rendered by demonstrative pronouns underscoring the absence of any parameters except that of pointing. Therefore this

type of decategorization is applied to refer to large numbers of people with category belongingness indicated by subordinate clauses, cf.

Хорошо понимаю тех, кто с мирными лозунгами вышел на майдан, выступая против коррупции.

I would like to reiterate that I understand those who came out on Maidan with peaceful slogans against corruption, inefficient state management and poverty.

Similar vantage construction is evoked to refer to the so-called organizers of the Ukrainian events, cf.

Но те, кто стоял за последними событиями на Украине, преследовали другие цели.

Those who stood behind the latest events in Ukraine had a different agenda.

The absolute decategorization to refer to the Ukrainian authorities' opponents is aimed at indicating their large numbers with specific parameters spelled out by the subordinate clause, e.g.

Тем, кто сопротивлялся путчу, сразу начали грозить репрессиями и карательными операциями, а также выражать презрение.

Those who opposed the coup were immediately threatened with repression.

The comparison of over- and decategorization shows that the latter goes over more steps revealing varying degrees of deintensification of the focal parameters denoted by particular linguistic units: situational, partial, generalizing, universal, absolute.

3.3. New category construction concerns the representation of the Crimean population as a brand novel nation.

The dominant vantage connecting the denoted group of people with the periods prior to the referendum is rendered by the construction *жители Крыма* «*residents of Crimea*».

Firstly, the construction *жители Крыма* «*residents of Crimea*» refers to the Soviet period, e.g.

Естественно, что в условиях тоталитарного государства у жителей Крыма и Севастополя ни о чем не спрашивали.

Naturally, in a totalitarian state nobody bothered to ask the citizens of Crimea and Sevastopol.

Secondly, the construction *жители Крыма* «*residents of Crimea*» characterizes the inhabitants in the pre-referendum peninsula, e.g.

В связи с этим жители Крыма и Севастополя обратились к России с призывом защитить их права.

In view of this, the residents of Crimea and Sevastopol turned to Russia for help in defending their rights.

The territorial recessive vantage denoted in the next example by the construction *Крым и его жителей* «*Crimea and its residents*» characterizes Russian response to the address of Crimean parliament. This construction reveals the main target of «reunification» focusing first on the territory and then on its contents, i.e. inhabitants, e.g.

Разумеется, мы не могли не откликнуться на эту просьбу, не могли оставить Крым и его жителей в беде.

Naturally we could not leave this plea unheeded; we could not abandon Crimea and its residents in distress.

The recessive intensified vantage meant to live up to the latest events of «reunification» borders on the NATION category named by the Russian unit *крымчане* «Crimeans». In the translation of the paragraphs discussed above the new category is rendered by the word combination *residents of Crimea.* Its use shows that in their word formation procedures the translators are not so daring as the speaker.

During the first use the Russian unit *крымчане* «*residents of Crimea*» refers to the opinion of the population:

Сегодня, спустя уже много лет, я слышал, как крымчане совсем недавно говорят, что тогда, в 1991 году, их передали из рук в руки просто как мешок картошки.

Now, many years later, I heard residents of Crimea say that back in 1991 they were handed over like a sack of potatoes.

During the second use the unit *крымчане* «*residents of Crimea*» is involved in the description of the preparation for the referendum:

Прежде всего нужно было помочь создать условия для мирного и свободного волеизъявления, чтобы крымчане могли сами определить свою судьбу.

First, we had to help create conditions so that the residents of Crimea for the first time in history were able to peacefully express their free will.

However, further on the unit *крымчане* from the Russian original is rendered in the translation by the construction *Crimean people* referring to a nation which is underscored by the opposition of the newly coined word to the ethnic unit *албанцы* «*Albanians*»:

Ведь действия крымчан четко вписываются в эту, собственно говоря, инструкцию. Почему-то то, что можно албанцам в Косово запрещается русским, украинцам и татарам в Крыму».

The actions of Crimean people completely fit in with these instructions. For some reason, things that Kosovo Albanians were permitted to do, Russians, Ukrainians and Crimean Tatars are not allowed.

For reasons unknown, only in the last passage cited above the translator raises the status of Crimeans to a nation thus living up to the idea expounded by the speaker. However, the last statement equating *Crimean people* with *Kosovo Albanians* seems to ruin the speaker's argumentation since, strictly speaking, one nation is opposed to representatives of three nationalities residing in Crimea.

The oppositions between the intensified national vantage (*Crimean people*) and the deintensified territorial vantage (*Крым / Crimea; жители Крыма / people in Crimea*) structures the conclusion of the address. The intensified recessive vantage (*крымчане*) opens up and concludes the first paragraph of the final part of the speech implying the existence of a new nation which is named in the translation by the construction *people of Crimea*:

Понимаю крымчан, которые поставили вопрос о референдуме […]. Крымчане поставили вопрос жестко, бескомпромиссно.

I understand the people of Crimea who put the question in the clearest possible terms in the referendum […]. The people of Crimea thus decided to put the question in firm and uncompromising form.

The recessive vantage construction beginning with the people and shifting to the territory is evoked in the passages describing the situation around the peninsula and the results of the referendum implying the speaker's substantial interest in the territory:

Таким образом, подавляющее большинство жителей Крыма, и абсолютное большинство граждан Российской Федерации поддерживают воссоединение Республики Крым и города Севастополя с Российской Федерацией.

Thus we see that the overwhelming majority of people in Crimea and the absolute majority of the Russian Federation's people support the reunification of the Republic of Crimea.

To sum up, the choice between new category construction and reference to the territorial aspect of the existing category depends on the aim of the speaker in different sections of the text.

4. Conclusions. The manipulation of categories in public speeches rests on three types of vantage construction aimed at changing the structure of categories forming the audience's worldview: overcategorization intensifying the focal parameters of a particular category; decategorization reducing focal parameters which leads to a new category formation. Overcategorization turns out to be the simplest vantage construction procedure since it is represented by the absolute and partial types. Decategorization appears to be the most complicated vantage construction procedure since it consists of five steps: in addition to absolute and partial variants it has situational, generalizing and universal types reflecting varying degrees of shift from the focus towards the categorical margin and adjoining classes. Against the background of different types of decategorization new category construction is meant to represent novel entities.

The perspectives of further investigation consist in studying category manipulation in other types of discourse, especially in the media which often discuss politicians' speeches.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burke M. Discourse implicature, Quintilian and the Lucidity Principle: rhetorical phenomena in pragmatics / M. Burke // Topics in Linguistics. – 2016. – Vol. 17, N. 1. – P. 1-16. Access mode: https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/topling/17/1/article-p1.xml

Głaz A. Extended Vantage Theory in Linguistic Application. The Case of the English Articles / A. Głaz. – Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2012. – 295 p.

Hamilton C. Tony Blair's cognitive rhetoric / C. Hamilton // Texts and Minds: Papers in cognitive poetics and rhetoric. – Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012. – P. 201-225.

Johnson M. The Body in the Mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason / M. Johnson. – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987. – 233 p.

Kwiatkowska A. From the editor / A. Kwiatkowska // Texts and Minds: Papers in cognitive poetics and rhetoric. – Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012. – P. 7-10.

MacLaury R. E. Color and Cognition in Mesoamerica: Constructing Categories as Vantages / R. E. MacLaury. – Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997. – 616 p.

MacLaury R. E. Introducing vantage theory / R. E. MacLaury // Language Sciences. – 2002. – Vol. 24. – P. 493-536.

MacLaury R.E. Vantage theory in outline / R. E. MacLaury // Vantage Theory: A view on Language, Cognition and Categorization. – Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013. – P. 66-136.

Oakley T. Force-dynamic dimensions of rhetorical effect / T. Oakley // From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics. – Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter, 2005. – P. 444–473.

Potapenko S. Cognitive rhetoric of effect: energy flow as a means of persuasion in inaugurals / S. Potapenko // Topics in Linguistics. – 2016. – Vol.17, N. 2. – P. 12-25. Access mode: http://www.topicsinlinguistics.com/index.php/2016-3/

Remizov O. Discourses and Emotions in Narration of the Annexation of Crimean Peninsula by the Russian Federation: Master's thesis / O. Remizov. – Tartu: University of Tartu, 2015. – 96 p.

Talmy L. Force dynamics in language and cognition // Concept Structuring Systems / L. Talmy. – Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press, 2000. – Vol. 1. – P. 409-470.

Tabakowska E. Rhetoric: «the most valuable gift of gods» or «the art of deception»? / E. Tabakowska // Texts and Minds: Papers in cognitive poetics and rhetoric. – Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012. – P. 273-286.

Turner M. Reading Minds. The Study of English in the Age of Cognitive Science / M. Turner. – Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991. – 298 p.

Van Langendonk W. Iconicity / Willy Van Langendonk // The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics. – Oxford – N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2007. – P. 394-418.

REFERENCES

Burke, M. (2016). Discourse implicature, Quintilian and the Lucidity Principle: rhetorical phenomena in pragmatics. Topics in Linguistics, 17, 1-16. Access mode: https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/topling/17/1/article-p1.xml

Głaz, A. (2012). Extended Vantage Theory in Linguistic Application. The Case of the English Articles. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Hamilton, C. (2012). Tony Blair's cognitive rhetoric. Texts and Minds: Papers in cognitive poetics and rhetoric. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 201-225.

Johnson, M. (1987). The Body in the Mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kwiatkowska, A. (2012). From the editor. Texts and Minds: Papers in cognitive poetics and rhetoric. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 7-10.

MacLaury, R. E. (1997). Color and Cognition in Mesoamerica: Constructing Categories as Vantages. Austin: University of Texas Press.

MacLaury, R. E. (2002). Introducing vantage theory. Language Sciences, 24, 493-536.

MacLaury, R.E. (2013). Vantage theory in outline. Vantage Theory: A view on language, cognition and categorization. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 66-136.

Oakley, T. (2005). Force-dynamic dimensions of rhetorical effect. From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics. Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 444–473.

Potapenko, S. (2016) Cognitive rhetoric of effect: energy flow as a means of persuasion in inaugurals. Topics in Linguistics. 17, N. 2, 12-25. Access mode: http://www.topicsinlinguistics.com/index.php/2016-3/

Remizov, O. (2015). Discourses and Emotions in Narration of the Annexation of Crimean Peninsula by the Russian Federation: Master's thesis. Tartu: University of Tartu.

Talmy, L. (2000). Force dynamics in language and cognition. Concept Structuring Systems. Vol. 1. Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press, pp. 409-470.

Tabakowska E. (2012). Rhetoric: «the most valuable gift of gods» or «the art of deception»? Texts and Minds: Papers in cognitive poetics and rhetoric. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 273-286.

Turner M. (1991). Reading Minds. The Study of English in the Age of Cognitive Science. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Van Langendonk, W. (2007). Iconicity. The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics. Oxford–N.Y.: Oxford University Press, pp. 394–418.

Анотація

Застосування у статті теорії побудови перспектив, що пов'язує категоризацію різних явищ з орієнтацією людини у просторі-часі, дозволило окреслити три основні способи маніпулювання категоріями в публічних виступах: надкатегоризація, декатегоризація й побудова нових категорій. Встановлено, що надкатегоризація, спрямована на інтенсифікацію параметрів, які утворюють фокус категорії, передається одиницями, що в оригіналі й перекладі, позначають абсолютну інтенсифікацію внаслідок максимального нагромадження фокальних параметрів, та часткову інтенсифікацію, що посилює фокальні параметри певною мірою. Виявлено, що декатегоризація відображає п'ять способів деінтенсифікації фокальних параметрів. Подібно до надкатегоризації, абсолютна й часткова декатегоризація відбивають максимальне і певне зменшення фокальних параметрів; ситуативна декатегоризація зумовлює розширення значення інклюзивного персонального дейктика we; узагальнювальний варіант передається одиницями, які розширюють межі окремої категорії; універсальний різновид пов'язаний з переходом на суперординатний рівень. Конструювання нових категорій відбивається через словотвір у російському оригіналі й побудові конструкцій в англійському перекладі, передаючи в цьому випадку більшу сміливість мовця порівняно з перекладачем, хоча останній переважно зберігає пропоновану автором послідовність побудови категоріальних перспектив.

Ключові слова

Категорія, маніпуляція, виступ, переклад, когнітивна риторика, теорія побудови перспектив, надкатегоризація, декатегоризація, конструювання нових категорій.