

The manipulative characteristics of the tactics of the implementation of the “subterfuge” strategy in the novel “Catch 22” (by J. Heller)

Irina Ryabtseva^{1*}, and Alexey Chukhno¹

¹Don State Technical University, Gagarin square, 1, Rostov-on-Don, 344000, Russia

Abstract. The article deals with the analysis of the “subterfuge strategy”, ten tactics of its implementation in the novel by J. Heller “Catch-22”. The article focuses on the manipulative potential of these tactics and the language means used to carry it out. The “subterfuge” strategy is treated as a direct violation of the norms of interaction and the main principle of cooperation. Its main goal is to conceal the speaker’s true intention in communicative situations of rivalry, hiding the truth, accusation, threat, aggression, reproach, flattery, silencing, protecting one’s own interests and value orientations, misleading, etc . Pragmatically the “subterfuge strategy” incorporates the characteristics of various types of speech actions such as: assertives, directives, expressives, commissives, orders, demands, etc. All of them convey specific psychological states of the interlocutors. The paper focuses on the implementation of the subterfuge strategy through ten tactics: tactics of ignorance; tactics of expressing open disrespect; tactics of attacking, intimidation (transition to personality); tactics of making aggressive remarks under the guise of a joke and irony; tactics of question-to-question response; tactics of the game on self-esteem; compromising and belittling tactics; tactics of accusation and provoking feelings of guilt; persuasion tactics; tactics of question attack.

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is a “subterfuge strategy” in the novel “Catch 22” (by J.Heller), its manipulative characteristics and ten tactics used for their implementation.

Intensive studies of communication strategies caused by the manipulative potential of the language attract specialists from various fields of knowledge - psychology, political sciences, cultural studies, sociology, different branches of linguistics, pragmatics, etc.

The analysis of the theory of speech influence is contained in the works of V. von Humboldt, A. A. Potebnaya; was continued in the studies of I. A. Sternin, K. Bredemeier, K. F. Sedov, O. S. Issers, Yu. N. Karaulov, and many others. The origins of the Theory of Speech Acts can be found in the works of Yu. D. Apresyan, I. M. Kobozeva, J. Austin, A. A. Romanov, J. Searle, P. F. Stroson, I. P. Susov, F. H. van Eemeren [1], R. Grootendorst [2]. The phenomenon of speech manipulation in different types of institutional discourses

* Corresponding author: irna-17@yandex.ru

was investigated by foreign and domestic scientists R.M Blakar, D. Bolinger, G.P. Grice, T.van Dyck, N. Chomsky, E. V. Argunova, V. G. Baykova, V.I.Karasik, O. L. Mikhaleva, K. V. Nikitina, G. G. Khazagerov, E. I. Sheigal, and many others.

However, there is still a lot to be investigated in the field of speech communication, specific manipulative technologies, their strategies and tactics in different types of discourses. Linguists focus on the role of the language tools, their functional and pragmatic orientation, determined by the specific situation of communication in different types of institutional discourses (political, medical, educational, pedagogical, professional versus non-professional) [3-6]. Recent research papers show a considerable interest of linguists to these issues, for example: pragmatic characteristics of speech acts in the texts of classified advertisements [7], pragmatic features of various speech acts in different contexts (compliment speech act), the pragmatic parameters of the speech act of approval [8, 9], classification of pragmatic communicative functions in short stories for children [10], the prevalence of specific speech acts in the texts of international treaties [11], etc.

In this respect the novel "Catch 22" turns out a fruitful field of research showing a strange world full of bureaucratic tricks and nonsense. Its bureaucratic military machine paralyzes common sense and turns individuals into a faceless mass. The so-called "Catch-22, which has turned into a common name denotes an absurd, hopeless situation. It has become the main "instrument" with the help of which the characters of the novel secretly influence each other, affect their emotional state, thus having an impact on the consciousness of the interlocutors in the course of the conversation and making them behave in the way desired by the addresser. It determines a wide use of the 'subterfuge' strategy and special tactics for its implementation through various speech acts pertaining to specific situations.

Being a speech conflict the "subterfuge" strategy is always focused on the violation of the norms of interaction and the main principle of cooperation. Semantically it is characterized by the following intentions: avoiding the conversation, hiding the truth, accusing, threatening, reproaching, flattering, belittling or emphasizing the significance of what is happening, silencing, protecting one's own interests and value orientations, misleading, seeking to benefit, evading obligations, etc. In this respect it may be looked upon as a destructive form of communication ensuing from the psychological assumptions and the desire to dominate, which is expressed in the manipulation of the interlocutor [12]. Pragmatically it incorporates the characteristics of various types of speech actions typical of the "subterfuge strategy". The most commonly used are: *assertives*, the aim of which is to describe a fact, event, action, and express opinions, the belief of the addresser in the falsity/insincerity of any judgment; *directives* that express the psychological state of the speaker, since their illocutionary orientation consists in the desire of the addresser to give urgent advice, suggest, warn or express a threat; *expressives*, the illocutionary orientation of which is also associated with the expression of the psychological state of the addresser, set by the conditions of sincerity about the state of things, defined within the propositional content.

It is worth noticing that the "subterfuge strategy" is an inseparable part of a more comprehensive strategy of manipulation. Both of them are parts of a more global influence strategy. In this connection it would be appropriate to look at the interdependence and interconnection of these two phenomena - language influence and manipulation.

Based on the fact that any speech behaviour is purposeful, many scientists recognize the leading role of the manipulative function in various types of discourses (Dobrosklonskaya, Volodina; Smetanina, Belyaeva). In the linguistic aspect, manipulation is understood as "speech influence directed at implicit motivation of the addressee to perform some actions implicitly introducing into his consciousness wishes, attitudes, objectives that will serve the

interests of the sender, but will be different from those of the addressee". Speech influence is accepted as a generic term, and manipulation is recognized as one of the varieties of speech influence. In the process of speech influence, the addressee either demonstrates his true intentions (in case of honest persuasion), or hides them (in case of manipulation). In the manipulative discourse, there is no appeal to 'logos', while an appeal to 'pathos' prevails. As A. Akopova stresses emotional manipulation is the expression of the speaker's emotions and acquisition of responsive emotional reaction from the listener that would lead to changes in his behavior [13]. This fact explains why the manipulative strategy of "subterfuge" necessitates an abundant use of the language means with the semantics of lie, unreliability, absurdity, hypocrisy, insincerity and evaluation [14].

The pragmatic component of the lexical meaning of these words reflects the emotional and evaluative attitude of the addresser to the situation, thus making it possible to perform the corresponding speech actions with their help, such as false promises, threats, reproaches or accusations, orders and demands, prohibitions, suggestions or warnings, false argumentation. According to G.G. Matveeva, in the process of communication, communication participants try to effectively use speech influence on each other, understanding it as a verbal influence on the human psyche, in order to influence his consciousness, opinion and model behavior [15].

The choice and proper use of language resources plays a decisive role in the implementation of properly chosen speech tactics. The lexical meaning of the word itself is able to convey enough information about both the subject of the message and the interlocutors taking part in a definite communicative situation. Moreover, the word selected by the speaker reflects various emotional ratings, which might be positive or negative imposing on the addressee a particular attitude towards the situation.

2 Materials and methods

The research is based on an extensive use of the material from the novel by J. Heller "Catch-22".

The purpose of the article determined the following tasks:

- to identify the content and structure of the "subterfuge strategy";
- to single out the main ten manipulative tactics used in different situations aiming at subterfuge;
- to analyse the comprehensive use of different language means (lexico-grammatical, stylistic, etc) enabling these tactics to reach the desired effect;

The methods applied in this research are chosen in compliance with the purpose and tasks of this paper. In order to identify the content and workout the structure of the analyzed strategy and tactics, we based on the hypothetical-deductive, the definitional and descriptive methods of linguistic analysis. To give the comprehensive analysis of the selected examples we based on the method of contrasted analysis of language means of different language levels. Studying the effect produced by the language means in carrying out the exemplified strategy and tactics the method of contextual and interpretative analysis were used. When summarizing and interpreting the examples, we fell back on the data from linguocultural studies to ensure the consistency and authenticity of the presentation. The importance of linguocultural approach to the studies of the strategies and tactics used in a specific linguoculture is underscored by many linguists [16]. It is common knowledge that verbal and non-verbal patterns of behavior in different linguocultural communities are culturally determined. Thus, A.V. Medvedeva stresses that linguocultural approach helps to identify the ways and causes of distortion of the established principles in a specific situation of communication, for example, the implementation of the "subterfuge strategy" [17]. The

statistical method indicates the frequency of usage of various speech acts in specific dialogue super-structures.

3 Results

In the most general sense, the "subterfuge strategy" is a complex phenomenon, consisting of various speech tactics and speech acts and including the application of combined language resources and speech influence methods used in a certain situation of communication.

In a narrower perspective, under the "subterfuge strategy" we agreed to understand a deliberate communicative-pragmatic act with various emotional and expressive shades, aimed at manipulative influence on the addressee through hiding the true intention of the addresser in communicative situations of rivalry, conflict of interests, etc.

There is a huge number of the so-called "rhetorical tricks", which are divided into three groups: procedural, logical and psychological. But at the same time, the last two groups are of particular interest for everyday communication. The logic tricks (tactics) are based on the so-called paradoxes of the language, the imperfection of language models, the possibility of substituting the meaning of a word contained in the original meaning. The third group is purely demagogic, where there is only the appearance of logic. These tricks resemble a game. Psychological tricks are perhaps the most common techniques. If you want to win the favour of a person or audience, or, on the contrary, to make your opponent make mistakes and retreat, then it is psychological tricks that will allow you to do this in the most simple and effective way. The 'subterfuge' strategy and its tactics are based on the last two kinds of the 'tricks': logical and psychological.

Let's go directly to the consideration of the specific tactics for implementing the "subterfuge" strategy in the novel "Catch 22" and consider the features of their language content from the point of view of lexical-semantic, morphological-syntactic, stylistic and pragmatic levels. As a result of the analysis of the novel, we identified the following ten tactics for implementing the "subterfuge" strategy:

1. tactics of ignorance;
2. tactics of expressing open disrespect;
3. tactics of attacking, intimidation (transition to personality);
4. tactics of making aggressive remarks under the guise of a joke and irony;
5. tactics of question-to-question response;
6. tactics of the game on self-esteem;
7. compromising and belittling tactics;
8. tactics of accusation and provoking feelings of guilt;
9. persuasion tactics;
10. tactics of question attack.

All these tactics are based on the destructive communicative behaviour which distorts P.Grice's postulates of communication and which is based on such negative notions as malice, rage, hatred, contempt, revenge, jealousy, black envy.

We have selected 300 samples of dialogues (super-phrasal units) from the novel for analysis. So, let us look at the examples of each specific tactics.

3.1 Tactics of ignorance

(1) "Why don't you ask me to let you write my name and address on a piece of paper so that you will be able to find me again when you come to Rome?" - she suggested. - (2) Why

don't you let me write your name and address down on a piece of paper? - he agreed. – Why? -she demanded belligerently. <.> (3) What the hell are you talking about?"

In this case, we have a chain of three component speech acts - expressives, each of which has its own propositional content and its own illocutionary power, connected with the conveyance of the psychological state of the addresser, which expresses his insincerity about the state of things. In this example, they are represented by expressives in the form of special questions and interrogative-negative constructions (1, 2, 3). Separately, they have no manipulative power. But taken together, they satisfy all the conditions of the successful implementation of the tactics of ignorance.

The dialogue begins with a claim on the part of a belligerent girl, which is expressed in the form of a special question (1), which assumes a full answer, indicating certain reasons and arguments. It is obvious that Yossarian deliberately evades the answer, thereby masking his indifference towards the girl. Therefore, first he ironically imitates the question (2) of the interlocutor (repetition of the structure of a special question, parallel construction, counter-question), and then in response to her violent reaction, he defends himself with the question (3), supported by the slang expression "what the hell", which most clearly expresses the feigned bewilderment and ignorance and enhances the effect of the tactics of ignorance. In the implementation of the tactics of ignorance the speaker resorts to a set of other specific tactics, such as question-to-question response.

3.2 Tactics of expressing open disrespect

(1) "Where are you taking me? - he asked in a voice soft with timidity and guilt <.>. (2) What have I done? – (3) Why don't you keep your trap shut and let us ask the questions? - said the colonel. – (4) Don't talk to him that way, said the major. It isn't necessary to be so disrespectful. – (5) Then tell him to keep his trap shut and let us ask the questions. (6) Father, please keep your trap shut and let us ask the questions,' urged the major sympathetically".

This fragment of the dialogue shows the situation when the chaplain Shipman is forcibly taken away for interrogation concerning the absurd accusation of the air crash and the death of their comrade. You can see that the colonel from the very start avoids explanations, he is overtly rude and familiar, openly shows disrespect to the interlocutor, for which he receives, at first glance, a tactful censure from the major. An insistent repetition of the same question (3,) with the colloquially familiar expression "to keep one's trap shut", a chain of directives (5, 6), are negatively polite and considerably enhance the illocutionary force of disrespect. Absence of logic and the desire to confuse the interlocutor is conveyed through the prevalence of expressives and directives.

3.3 The expression of open disrespect is reinforced by intimidation tactics

"Chaplain, I simply can't understand your thinking process. The chaplain was stumped and at a complete loss for a reply.

(1) 'Why don't we knock his goddam brains out?' he suggested

(2) 'Yes, we could knock his goddam brains out, couldn't we?' the ...major agreed.

'He's only an Anabaptist.'

'No, we've got to find him guilty first,' the officer ...cautioned."

In this fragment, the chaplain, who is confused and lost the thread of the conversation, is brought to complete confusion by repeated indirect threats in the form of expressives (1,2). The interrogative-negative construction of the expressive (1) and its modality (*Yes*,

we could...) speak of the internal reflection of the addresser, his indecision about his further actions.

3.4 Tactics of making aggressive remarks under the guise of a joke and irony

(1) “Does that hole over his mouth ever move? – Now, what kind of a crazy question is that? - the Texan asked uneasily.

(2) – How can you tell it’s a he?

(3) Does he have pads over his eyes underneath that bandage over his face?

(4) Does he ever wiggle his toes or move the tips of his fingers?”

In this example, the hero named Texan is clearly outraged by the dismissive attitude and mocking nature of the questions (1, 2, 3, 4) from the soldiers to his fellow ward member, who was seriously injured. He can't find the right answers to confront the group of scoffers and retreats in confusion. And again the implementation of the specific tactics is achieved through a set of tactics producing the combined effect.

3.5 Tactics of question-to-question response

(1) “Can’t you see that you’re not exactly without blame for the predicament you’re in?” Clevinger had carried on with undisguised relish.–(2) And what about you? - Yossarian had replied. You never got clap in Marrakech and you’re in the same predicament”.

In this fragment of the dialogue, using the tactic of answering a question with a question (1), the hero tries to avoid an unpleasant topic that directly concerns him. Although the addresser puts the question rather tactfully, deliberately softening the direct reproach with a litote (you're not exactly without blame), this does not contribute to the development of the dialogue. Taking a defensive position, Yossarian challenges the interlocutor in the form of a question (2) and thus avoids giving a direct answer. Interrogative-negative construction of the expressive makes it more emotional.

3.6 Tactics of the game on self-esteem

“(1) I don’t see what difference that makes, Milo. It was still your mission. (2) And a damned good one, too, I must say. (3) We didn’t get the bridge, but we did have a beautiful bomb pattern.

–If you insist, sir. –I do insist, Milo. (4) Now, let’s see- you now have a grand total of six missions, which is damned good, Milo, damned good, really. (5) Six missions is an increase of twenty per cent in just a couple of minutes, which is not bad at all, Milo, not bad at all.”

This fragment opens with a chain of assertives, the modality of which indicates the confidence of the speaker and his desire to praise his interlocutor. Using flattery as a trick, the speaker confuses the interlocutor, subtly letting him know that he is personally treated with a special respect. So this tactic is especially effective for influencing people who love praise. This effect is achieved through a succession of assertives conveying praise (1, 2, 3, 4, 5). As it can be seen from the example, the addressee's speech is very emotional (oxymoron *damned good*, *a beautiful bomb pattern*, litote *not bad at all*, emphatic constructions *I do insist*, *we did have a beautiful bomb pattern*, *inversion and exaggeration*), which gives the trick a more convincing power and makes you believe in the sincerity of what was said. Moreover, in almost every remark the speaker refers to the interlocutor by name (Milo), thus involving him into the conversation. It sounds entreatingly and helps to further influence the opponent in the right direction.

3.7 Compromising and belittling tactics

- (1) “Yes, we could knock his goddam brains out, couldn’t we’ <...>.
- (2) - He’s only an Anabaptist.
- (3) - Then you are not a Baptist, aren’t you? <...>
- (4) - Now, Chaplain, to say you’re not a Baptist doesn’t really tell us anything about what you are, does it?
- (5) - You could be anything or anyone.’
- (6) - ‘You could even be, he added, <...>.
- (7) - Washington Irving, couldn’t you?
- (8) - Washington Irving - the chaplain repeated with surprise.
- (9) - Come on, Washington, - the colonel broke in <...>”.

The following fragment of the colonel's interrogation of the chaplain is an example of the tactics of compromise and humiliation. The statement opens with an assertive (1), the modality (subjunctive mood) of which indicates the speaker’s doubt about the correctness of his actions. Trying to find out who the chaplain is by religion, the colonel begins the dialogue with an open threat. Then, he dismissively remarks that he is no more than an Anabaptist, which further confuses the interlocutor. This is followed by the incriminating claim that he could be anyone, even Washington Irving, which the chaplain takes at its face value, and betrays his ignorance (the name refers to the 18th-century American writer). It also shows how a language game with a proper name (Washington Irving) becomes a clever trick and serves to enhance the atmosphere of mistrust and absurdity.

3.8 Tactics of accusation and provoking feelings of guilt

- (1) “Chaplain, this comes as a great shock to me, - the major accused <...>.
- (2) – What does?
- (3) –I can’t tell you how disappointed I am in you.
- (4) –For what? What have I done?
- (5) –For this- replied the major. (6) “This isn’t your handwriting. (7) The chaplain blinked rapidly with amazement. But of course it’s my handwriting.
- (8) –No it isn’t, Chaplain. You’re lying again.
- (9) –But I just wrote it!” <...>. (10) –That’s just it, the major answered bitterly. I saw you write it. You can’t deny that you did write it. (11) A person who’ll lie about his own handwriting will lie about anything.”

This dialogue is represented by a combination of different speech acts (negative assertives, expressives). In this fragment, it is worth noting how the addresser tactfully, gradually and cunningly brings the conversation to a direct accusation. The given dialogue is semantically homogeneous - the lexical units that make it up have the seme "false / unreliable", the seme "indignation, irritation". The effect of feeling guilty is enhanced by epithets (*answered bitterly, blinked rapidly*). The hasty generalization "*A person who'll lie about his own handwriting will lie about anything*" allows the major to finally drive the addressee into the corner and make him believe in his own guilt. The fact that they are built on the principle of gradation increases the illocutionary function of the charge.

3.9 Tactics of persuasion

- (1) “Men, - he began his address to the officers, measuring his pauses carefully. (2) “You’re American officers. (3) The officers of no other army in the world can make that statement. Think about it. These people are your guests!- he shouted suddenly. They’ve traveled over

three thousand miles to entertain you. (4) How are they going to feel if nobody wants to go out and watch them? (5) What's going to happen to their morale? Now, men, it's no skin off my behind. But that girl that wants to play the accordion for you today is old enough to be a mother. (6) How would you feel if your own mother traveled over three thousand miles to play the accordion for some troops that didn't want to watch her? (7) How is that kid whose mother that accordion player is old enough to be going to feel when he grows up and learns about it? We all know the answer to that one. Now, men, don't misunderstand me. (8) This is all voluntary, of course. (9) I'd be the last colonel in the world to order you to go to that U.S.O. show and have a good time, but I want every one of you who isn't sick enough to be in a hospital to go to that U.S.O. show right now and have a good time, and that's an order!" (9)

Persuasion strategies are essential part of a dialogue [18]. The above monologue is an appeal of the colonel to the officers who are being treated in the hospital, the purpose of which is to convince them to go to the concert. The speaker begins his speech with an informal address (Men 1), trying to attract the officers' attention and arouse their interest to his further speech. From the very first words (2) attracts the audience with a compliment, somewhat exaggerated, but touching patriotic feelings (no other army in the world), expressed in the form of an assertive. This is followed by a series of rhetorical questions (3-7) that perform an expressive function. Rhetorical questions serve as a way of argumentation that stimulates the addressee's reflexive activity and encourages him to draw conclusions. Being an indirect way of expressing negation, the rhetorical question may be the starting point in the chain of reasoning, thus contributing to the implementation of the tactics of persuasion. On the other hand, being agonal in nature, they are used as a means of expressing disagreement, because they are aimed at discrediting the opponent, pointing out the discrepancy between words and reality.

The statement ends with a categorical directive (9). The final sentences (7, 8), built on the antithesis (*All this, of course, is voluntary – this is an order; I would be the last colonel in the world to order you to go to this U.S.O. – but I want all of you to <...> go to this U.S.O.*), contribute to the strengthening of the "trick" effect.

3.10 Tactics of question attack

The "mistake of many questions" is that the opponent is "attacked" by a series of different questions under the guise of one and requires an immediate answer "yes" or "no" or an immediate answer in case of a special question 8. The trick is that the sub-questions contained in the given question are directly opposite to each other, which the respondent does not have time to notice. This technique helps to confuse the opponent and mislead him. For example:

(1) "Who is Spain?" (2) Why is Hitler?

(3) When is right?

(4) Where was that stooped and mealy-colored old man I used to call Poppa when the merry-go-round broke down? How was trump at Munich?

(5) Balls! all rang out in rapid succession, and then there was Yossarian with the question that had no answer:

(6) Where are the Snowdens of yesteryear? The question upset them, because Snowden had been killed over Avignon <...>. The corporal played it dumb.

(7) What' he asked.

(8) Where are the Snowdens of yesteryear? The corporal played it dumb".

In this example, Yossarian, in order to interrupt a series of special questions (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) that do not give time to think about and answer, asks an absolutely ridiculous question

(6), which confuses the interlocutor. This is evidenced by the statements (*The corporate played it dumb*).

The statistical analysis of about 300 dialogue entities shows that the usage of speech acts with various intentions in specific tactics differ a lot. (See Table 1):

Table 1.

Tactics	data
ignorance	Assertives - 8 Expressives - 12 Directives - 10
expressing open disrespect	Assertives - 6 Expressives - 15 Directives - 9
open disrespect reinforced by intimidation tactics	Assertives - 10 Expressives - 8 Directives - 12
making aggressive remarks under the guise of a joke and irony	Assertives - 6 Expressives - 14 Directives - 10
question to question response	Assertives - 5 Expressives - 20 Directives - 5
game on self-esteem	Assertives - 15 Expressives - 10 Directives - 5
compromising and belittling	Assertives - 14 Expressives - 16 Directives - 0
accusation and provoking feelings of guilt	Assertives - 14 Expressives - 10 Directives - 6
persuasion	Assertives - 16 Expressives - 12 Directives - 2
question attack	assertives - 4 expressives - 26

The data show that expressives and directives prevail in carrying out the tactics of the ‘subterfuge’ strategy, since they both express the psychological state of the interlocutors and a strong desire of the sender of the message to give urgent advice, suggest, warn or express a threat, a desire to dominate, which once again proves the manipulative potential of the ‘subterfuge’ strategy and tactics of its implementation.

4 Conclusions

The “subterfuge strategy” based on a speech conflict is always focused on the violation of the norms of interaction and the main principle of cooperation and turns out an inseparable part of a more comprehensive strategy of manipulation. In the most general sense, the "subterfuge strategy" is a complex structure based on the use of variety of speech tactics and acts, which involve the application by the speakers of specific speech influence methods in a particular moment and situation.

In a narrower perspective, the "subterfuge strategy" has the form of an intentional communicative-pragmatic act with various emotional and expressive shades of meaning, aimed at manipulative influence on the addressee through hiding the true intention of the addresser in communicative situations of rivalry, conflict of interests, etc.

It has the following intentions: to avoid the conversation, to hide the truth, to accuse, to threaten, to reproach, to express flattery, to belittle or emphasize the significance of what is happening, to silence the truth, to protect one's own interests and value orientations, to mislead, seeking to benefit, evading obligations. These intentions predetermine its power ensuing from the psychological standpoints and the desire to dominate.

The pragmatic effect is achieved by words the lexical meaning of which reflects the emotional and evaluative attitude of the addressee to the situation, thus making it possible to perform the corresponding speech actions with their help, such as false promises, threats, reproaches or accusations, orders and demands, prohibitions, suggestions or warnings, false argumentation. These intentions are conveyed through the speech acts of assertives, expressives and directives. The statistics show that the last two prevail in fulfilling the subterfuge tactics.

We have outlined ten tactics of carrying out the subterfuge strategy: tactics of ignorance; tactics of expressing open disrespect; tactics of attacking, intimidation (transition to personality); tactics of making aggressive remarks under the guise of a joke and irony; tactics of question-to-question response; tactics of the game on self-esteem; compromising and belittling tactics; tactics of accusation and provoking feelings of guilt; persuasion tactics; tactics of question attack. The analysis showed that the subterfuge strategy can be successfully achieved only by a combination of specific tactics.

The language content of the "subterfuge" is reflected at all language levels. The lexico-semantic level includes a variety of words and phrases with the semantics of lie, unreliability, absurdity, hypocrisy, insincerity; evaluative vocabulary. At the morphological and syntactic level, we have identified the forms of the imperative and subjunctive mood, interrogative and exclamatory sentences, categorical negation, complicated syntax. The stylistic level is represented by rhetorical questions, emotionally coloured epithets, repetitions, language play with proper names, gradation and other stylistic devices.

References

1. F. H. van Eeremen, Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse, **308** (2010)
2. R. Grootendorst, F. H. Eeremen, Rules for argumentation in dialogues (2015), doi.10.1007/978-3-319-20955-5_16
3. S. Pervukhina, V. Demchenko, 18033, (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202021018033>
4. S. Pervukhina, G. Matveeva, in Proceedings of the X International Conference "Word, Utterance, Text: Cognitive, Pragmatic and Cultural Aspects", 1064-1074 (2020), doi.10.15405/epsbs.2020.08.124
5. S. Pervukhina, Yazyk I Kultura - Language and Culture, 31-37 (2015), doi.10.17223/19996195/29/4
6. E. Sakharova, N. Revyakina, E3S Web of Conferences, **210**, 18040 (2020), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/20202101804>
7. I. Stroevea, **17(4)**, 429-433 (2013), doi.10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.17.04.12194
8. Y. D. Yunnan, Theory and Practice in Language Studies, **1(4)**, 356-360 (2011), doi.10.4304/tpis.1.4.356-360
9. E. R. Yilmaz, F. Kh. Tarasova, A. Kh. Ashrapova, Journal of Language and Literature, **7(2)**, 195-198 (2016)

10. I. Santoso, E. Tuckyta, S. Sujatna, S. Mahd, *International Journal of Social Sciences*, **19(1)**, 109-118 (2014)
11. N. Kone, *Speech Acts in UN Treaties: A pragmatic Perspective - Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, **10**, 813-827 (2020), doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2020.106051
12. V. Buryakovskaya, *Communicative Research*, **6(3)**, 620–629 (2019)
13. A. Akopova, (IJCRSEE) *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*, **1(2)**, 80 (2013)
14. A. Shyroka, *Ukrainian Catholic University*, **38** (2020), <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344540018>
15. G. Matveeva, A. Lenets, E. Petrova, *Fundamentals of Pragmalinguistics*, **151** (2013), <https://rucont.ru/efd/244435>
16. Y. Ermoshin, N. Alontseva, *Vestnik RUDN*, **4**, 82–92 (2016)
17. O. Nosova, *Russian Journal of Humanities*, **10**, 179-191 (2018), [doi.10.12731/2077-1770-2018-4-3-179-194](https://doi.org/10.12731/2077-1770-2018-4-3-179-194)
18. K. Gudkova, *Communication Studies*, **4(14)**, 83-89 (2017), [doi.10.25513/2413-6182.2017.4.83-89](https://doi.org/10.25513/2413-6182.2017.4.83-89).