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ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ НЕГАТИВНОГО ИМИДЖА В БРАЗИЛЬСКОМ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

В настоящей работе рассматриваются языковые средства, используемые для формирования негативного образа политика в бразильском медиа-дискурсе, а также затрагивается социолингвистический аспект в контексте президентской предвыборной кампании. Внимание уделяется не только языковым средствам, но и их эффективности применительно к современному общественному и социальному строю. Актуальность исследования обусловлена тем, что мы сталкиваемся с новой посткоммуникативной реальностью и анализируем происходящие в ее рамках процессы, в частности в плоскости языка. Работа ставит своей целью выявить лингвистические средства разного уровня, включая макроуровень,
которые нашли широкое отражение в бразильском медиа дискурсе в предвыборный период и использовались с целью формирования негативного образа одного из политиков. Исследование также обращается к топикальности бразильского медиа дискурса в обозреваемый период. Работа отмечает лингвопрагматические особенности исследуемого корпуса текста и опирается на данные, полученные в результате его анализа. Эмпирический материал состоит из авторских статей, опубликованных в ведущих СМИ Бразилии. В ходе исследования для работы с данными использовался статистический подход. В результате были установлены основные языковые уровни и средства конструирования негативного образа политика.
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NEGATIVE IMAGE FORMATION IN BRAZILIAN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

The article considers socio-linguistic aspects of Brazilian political and media discourse and explores some linguistic tools shaping politicians’ negative image. This paper focuses not only on the linguistic means used to shape a negative image of a modern Brazilian politician, but also provides the possibility to measure the results in terms of social response. Moreover, such means are viewed as instruments of influence affecting voting processes. The study aims to identify linguistic means of different levels, including macro-level, commonly used in Brazilian media discourse during the pre-election campaign to shape politicians’ negative image. The study also provides general analysis of the topics raised by Brazilian media outlets at the time of the pre-election campaign. The study is conducted within the scope of lingua-pragmatic and socio-cultural research, further supplemented by discourse analysis of editorial articles. Data
evaluation and analysis is backed by quantitative methods of research. Research findings are presented in the form of scheme and are supported by examples from different sources. Material for the research is obtained from editorials published in Brazilian national and regional/local quality mass media reflecting the views and interests of different social groups.
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Introduction

On October 28, 2018 Jair M. Bolsonaro was elected President of the Federative Republic of Brazil. His pre-election rhetoric was largely based on linguistic expression of verbal aggression, including discussion of sensitive issues such as hatred, intolerance and racism. In the present article verbal aggression is considered not so much as ‘an aggressive form of communication that results in destructive effects on interpersonal relationships’ (Bekiarı & Spyropoulou, 2016), but rather as a linguistic and emotional means with aim to gain an ‘access code’ to electorate. The basic end of this code is to provide an illusion of choice for a person and of possibility to make a personal conclusion based on fact analysis. Language plays an essential role in this process (Abakumova & Slinchenko, 2019). Besides, throughout his pre-election campaign Jair M. Bolsonaro expressed support and admiration for Donald J. Trump as well as shared his views on most socially pertinent issues. The politician’s aggressive behaviour was severely criticised by most Brazilians – moreover, many people compared Bolsonaro with Trump.

Trump has been in office as US president since January 20, 2017. His election campaign polarised American society and exacerbated confrontation concerning such long-standing issues as migration, negative trade balance and terms of globalisation disadvantageous for the United States. The authorities, public administration as well as the financial and international systems faced a new challenge, which the world’s media called ‘The Trump Phenomenon’.

Bolsonaro’s pre-election campaign was accompanied by a barrage of protest. In addition, two antagonistic campaigns with the hashtag ‘ELE NÃO’ (not him) and ‘ELE SIM’ (only him) were launched in mass media. Both campaigns were supported by many celebrities. As a
result, Bolsonaro won the presidential run-off with a narrow majority of 5%, which proves that many Brazilians shared criticism expressed by the media during his pre-election campaign. Political analyst Krastev (2017) explains the success of the right-wing parties, ‘they promise voters what liberal democracy cannot: a sense of victory where majorities – not just political majorities, but ethnic and religious ones too – can do what they please’ (Krastev, 2017, p. 21).

This study aims to analyse Brazilian media discourse in order to describe linguistic means used to shape politicians’ negative image during the pre-election campaign. The research is conducted at different levels of linguistic analysis, including the macrolevel. Considerable attention is given to the notions of ‘image’ and ‘cultural code’, as well as the peculiarities of pre-election rhetoric which are crucial for political and media discourse, being ‘an inherent part of the cultural-national paradigm’ (Lugo-Ocando, 2020, p. 102). The study will show that during the pre-election campaign mass media shift their focus on more politically loaded issues. People equally become more interested in political issues and consequently look for reliable sources of information. Politicians, media and publicity should be regarded as a macrostructure phenomenon; Moreover, the term post-truth has recently appeared in political discourse. The concept of post-truth is viewed as ‘the realm of divided truth, binary thinking, and broken up communication’ (Waisbord, 2018, p. 30). K. Sengul points out the link between populism and post-truth. He stresses the predominance of emotional component ‘over fact-based reason, racist and xenophobic language’, where the expert opinion run counter common-sense (Sengul, 2019, p. 10). Therefore, it is not surprising that most politicians and political discourse of the whole rely on conspiratorial rhetoric and a theoretical interpretation of sociology, advertising means research and political communication lead us to explication of relationship among them.

This study is predicated upon empirical materials, which take a stand against Bolsonaro, tackles certain topics sensitive for Brazilian society, and contributes to further research into the linguo-cultural aspects of language expression. Moreover, the research is conducted within the scope of the post knowledge method, which is applied in logic dynamics (Abarca & Broersen, 2019). This method provides an opportunity to estimate the success of application of different linguistic
Material and methods

The study is conducted within the scope of lingua-pragmatic and socio-cultural research, further supplemented by discourse analysis of editorial articles. Data evaluation and analysis is backed by quantitative methods of research. Research material includes texts of editorial articles of national and regional Brazilian media, such as Brasil de Fato, Correio Brasiliense, Estado de Minas, Folha de Sao Paulo, Gazeta do Povo, Globo, Hoje em Dia, ISTO É, R7, Terra, Veja, Vermelho. All articles were published during the 22 July to 5 October 2018 pre-election campaign. The corpus of material for empirical analysis incorporates 12,000 words.

Theoretical background

Media discourse is described in the humanities as one of the social institutions which is able to provide or set the agenda. In this regard McCombs and Shaw (1972) discuss the agenda-setting function of mass media arguing that they ‘set the agenda for each political campaign, influencing the salience of attitudes toward the political issues’ (McCombs & Shaw, 1972, p. 176). McQuail (2010) discusses the global nature of media discourse and its power to fill the minds with information and beliefs: ‘Our minds are full of media-derived information and impressions. We live in a world saturated by media sounds and images where politics, government and business operate on the assumption that we know what is going on in the wider world’ (McQuail, 2010, p. 33). This view is also shared by Bennett (1988), who observes that media are not only a source of information, but also a tool shaping public opinion: ‘The irony of mediated politics is that being well informed about the issues on the public agenda often means taking cues from familiar sources using the news to frame stories around their partisan viewpoints. When this process works, the news not only tells people what to think about; it can also tell them what to think’ (Bennett, 1988, p. 47).

Scholars also stress the correlation between media as an institution and a newsbreak, and consider such an important feature of media as trust and respect. Media institutions can barely exist without news, and news cannot exist without media institutions. Unlike almost all other forms of authorship or cultural creation, news-making cannot be done privately or even individually. The institution provides both the
machinery for distribution and the organisation for reception, plus a guarantee of credibility and authority (Brennen, 2017). At the same time recent studies attribute credibility crisis to media (Otto & Köhler, 2018), although this study will avoid this issue by intent.

Today, media are discussed in the context of modern information technologies which facilitate the process of communication and their growing importance in the domains of economic, social and any human activity (Koopmans, 2018). The crucial role of media is also stressed by O’Keeffe (2011), who views media discourse as interactions that take place through a broadcast platform, whether spoken or written, in which the discourse is oriented to a non-present reader, listener or viewer.

To conduct an analysis of linguistic means shaping politicians’ negative image, it is imperative to also clarify the concept of ‘image’. In sociology image is defined as ‘holistic, qualitative, definite form of the object which is fixed and reproduced in mass media culture and/or in individual consciousness’ (Giddens & Sutton, 2017, p. 106). Image appears and is shaped as a result of perception and further analysis of the information about this object obtained from external sources, and is affected by a set of existing stereotypes. Image combined social-cultural, social-historical, and cognitive nature as well as reflects a set of values inherent to certain culture. In this regard it is worth emphasizing that image is not only “the reflections of social cultural values” but also an “ideal” form which is opposed to “a really existing object” (Vihman & Romm, 2019). This article studies a set of linguistic means shaping politicians’ image in modern Brazilian media environment and views the concept of image as a dialogue between verbal and pictorial representations constructing the idea, especially when supported and created by advertising and newspaper and television stories taking into account a socio-centric nature of the modern media i.e. a capacity of media to “confirm the values of society” (Koudelkova & Zavadilova, 2019) and the fact that media play an important role in the process of image construction.

Cultural code is another comprehensive concept of relevance to this study. It is defined as ‘specific sign systems that underpin a given society’s kinship, ecology, history, myths, rites and the internal as well as external comparisons between these sign systems’ (Wiseman, 2009, p. 14), or an explosion that is a ‘relationship between two signs’, where
the complex of possible connections between semantic elements creates a three-dimensional concept, which is fully understood only in terms of the relationship between all the elements (Lotman, 2000). This concept also includes so-called ‘imagery code’ which is understood as ‘system of images that are part of an ethnoculture, are established in the practice of communication, are normative in nature and serve as signs of fragments of reality’ (Savitsky, 2019, p. 69).

Another view of the cultural code is that it should be regarded as a ‘taxonomic substrate of its texts, which is a set of culturally marked ideas about the worldview of a certain society including natural objects, artefacts, phenomena, actions and events’ (Teliya, 1999, p. 20-21). This view highlights the relationships between texts which reflect the worldview of a certain society and culture. From this point of view text may represent “a recognizable version of the world we live in” therefore linguistic analysis conducted on different levels shows “symptomatic of a cultural and linguistic malaise” (Barry, 2002, p. 57-58).

Thereby it becomes clear that language as a sign system plays an important role and ensures the vitality of culture, its formation and functioning, acting as a guarantee of existence and preservation of its national specificity, contributing to the formation of the linguistic consciousness of the historically formed community of people on the basis of their ethno-linguistic and national-cultural identity (Dervin & Jackson, 2018). These are at least some definitions of the cultural code. In this paper the cultural code is defined as a system of signs used to codify historical, social political, economic events, etc. and reflected in the worldview of a society.

Last but not least, Discourse Analysis has aroused much interest among scientists, however there is still no unanimity of opinion concerning the issue. This comprehensive concept deals not only with pure linguistic means or an act of speech, it also includes the analysis of all characteristics of the certain situation. Moreover, Discourse analysis touches upon the link between linguistic means and meaning, where text is a small piece of this process Johnstone (2018). Morgan and Sellner (2017) understand discourse as a complex communicative phenomenon which includes not only texts but also extralinguistic factors which are necessary to understand the text. For Van Dijk (1997) political discourse is not only the structural properties of text or talk
itself, but also a systematic account of the context and its relations to
discursive structures.

This paper relies on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) developed
by Van Dijk as the basis for research. First of all, it gives the
opportunity to provide a comprehensive analysis of empirical data in
compliance with the structures, strategies or other properties of text,
talk, verbal interaction or communicative events that play a role in
these modes of reproduction (Van Dijk, 1993). Besides, we apply
macrostructure analysis to consider negative image construction. Here
the term ‘macrostructure’ is regarded as the various notions of global
meaning, such as topic, theme, or gist, i.e. as semantic objects (Van
Dijk, 2019).

Study and results

Linguistic comparison of Bolsonaro vs Trump

Discourse analysis of the corpus of materials obtained from 22 July
to 5 October 2018 media discourse revealed the following dominating
topics: (1) comparison between Bolsonaro and Trump built through the
opposition of linguistic means employed by the two politicians; and (2)
fear concerning the possible return to the times of military dictatorship
as well as the possible threat to liberal and democratic values.

In the course of the analysis, it was found that comparison took
place in two directions: on the one hand, it focused on identifying
features the two politicians had in common, and on the other hand – on
finding differences between them. After the analysis on the lexical,
grammatical, and syntactic levels we found that the vast majority of
cases of comparison was reflected at the lexical level, where
predominantly lexical items belonging to the semantic field
‘comparison’ were used. Most of them contained the Latin roots ‘Simil’
and ‘Compar’, as in:

*Muitos fizeram a comparação com Donald Trump e, claro, há
semelhanças – especialmente no racismo aberto e na misogynia dos
dois políticos.* (There are many persons who compare (Bolsonaro) with
Donald Trump and, of course, there are similarities – especially in the
open racism and misogyny of the two politicians.)

Here the noun *semelhança* is used in combination with the verb
haver, and *comparação* – in combination with the verb *fazer.*
Moreover, the author uses the impersonal pronoun *muitos* as a hedge to
shift responsibility from themselves to the impersonal majority. ‘Open
As semelhanças entre Jair Bolsonaro (PSL) e o presidente dos Estados Unidos, Donald Trump, fazem muitos eleitores e o estilo polêmico de Trump e Bolsonaro, com declarações muitas vezes consideradas racistas, homofóbicas e machistas. (Many voters make the similarities between Jair Bolsonaro (PSL) and the President of the United States, Donald Trump, and the controversial speech of Trump and Bolsonaro, with statements which were often considered racist, homophobic and misogynistic.)

Here is another example in which the noun semelhança is used in combination with the verb fazer. The author of this article also refers to an impersonal majority as muitos leitores. The topics common to both politicians are "racism", "homophobia" and "sexism". The use of these lexical items forms a triplet, which sounds more persuasive, increases tension and maintains public interest in the election campaign, as in:

Mas, apesar das diferenças, ambos têm muitas semelhanças, no discurso polêmico e na defesa de ideias políticas de extrema-direita. (But, despite the differences, both have many similarities, in the controversial speeches and in the defence of extreme right political ideas.)

In the example above, we observe the noun semelhanças, which this time is used in combination with the verb ter. The author of the article draws attention to the fact that both politicians advocate far-right ideas "defesa de ideias políticas de extrema-direita".

In the course of the analysis, we found that image formation in Brazilian media discourse was realised on two linguistic levels: lexical and syntactical. At the lexical level most units belonged to the far-right rhetoric. At the syntactic level the use of the triplet was rather common. The authors note that both politicians had similar rhetorical portraits, and displayed much verbal aggression during the pre-election campaign, for example they expressed hatred concerning LGBT community, chauvinism and racism.

On the other hand, the use of linguistic means aimed at showing differences between the two politicians, predominantly at the lexical level, were observed in the analysed articles, for example: the use of items containing the Latin roots ‘Oppos’ and ‘Differen’. At the syntactic level, we have observed the tendency to use the adversative
conjunction ‘Mas’ at the beginning of the sentence, as in:

_Pode bastar para justificar a oposição a qualquer um desses políticos. Mas o escândalo despertado pela retórica virulenta dos nacional-populistas não deve ofuscar o enigma econômico que os cerca._ (It may be enough to justify opposition to any of these politicians. But the scandal aroused by the virulent rhetoric of national populists must not overshadow the economic issues that surround them.)

In the example above, the lexical unit _oposição_ is used in its direct meaning. At the same time, the adversative conjunction _mas_ at the beginning of the sentence serves as a means of building contrast at the syntactic level to express contrast between the two politicians. The author of the article shows that the true difference between Trump and Bolsonaro has to do with the economic agenda.

_Uma lenda urbana diz que o Trump original venceu graças às suas declarações machistas, homofóbicas e xenófobas. De fato, elas serviram para aquecer o núcleo minoritário de seus seguidores incondicionais. Mas o triunfo eleitoral deu-se apesar delas. O segredo da vitória trumpiana encontra-se na plataforma do nacionalismo econômico, desdobrada nas vertentes do protecionismo comercial (China) e da proteção do emprego americano (imigrantes hispânicos)._ (An urban legend says that the original Trump won thanks to his macho, homophobic and xenophobic statements. In fact, they served to warm up the minority nucleus of their non-followers. But the electoral triumph took place despite them. The secret of Trump's victory lies on the platform of economic nationalism, especially in the areas of commercial protectionism (China) and the protection of American employment (Hispanic immigrants).)

_<...> Trump – Presidente já deu declarações em favor da imposição de sobretaxas às importações, implementou sobretaxas e já ameaçou retirar país da OMC. Bolsonaro – Frase do programa de governo: o comércio internacional é uma das maneiras mais efetivas de se promover o crescimento econômico de longo prazo._ (Trump – President has already made statements in favour of imposing tariff surcharges on imports, implemented the surcharges and has already threatened to withdraw a country from the WTO. Bolsonaro – Quote from the government program: ‘International trade is one of the most effective ways of promoting long-term economic growth’.)
In the example above, we observe the use of the adversative conjunction *mas* at the beginning of the sentence, which helps intensify the opposition between the two politicians. The substantive part is also dominated by issues related to the economic agenda, especially concerning Bolsonaro’s lack of competence and knowledge in the economic sphere.

*Por fim, os especialistas apontam outras duas diferenças fundamentais entre Trump, o magnata, e Bolsonaro, o ex-capitão do Exército: recursos e estrutura partidária.* (Finally, analytics point out two other fundamental differences between Trump, the magnate, and Bolsonaro, the former army captain: resources and party structure.)

In this example the author uses the lexical item *diferenças* in its direct meaning to give a comparison between the two politicians.

*Trump e Bolsonaro têm origens diferentes, mas se assemelham em vários temas.* (Trump and Bolsonaro have different origins, but they are similar in several themes.)

In the example above, we see the adversative conjunction ‘*mas*’ as a syntactic means.

In the course of the analysis other syntactic means were found, among them the use of parallel structures.

*Ele [Trump] sabe como mobilizar setores da sociedade norte-americana, especialmente pessoas brancas da classe trabalhadora e da classe média que se sentem marginalizadas, ressentidas e frustradas. Trump realmente não tem princípios. Infelizmente Bolsonaro tem. Trump não é consistente politicamente. Bolsonaro é, pelo menos, em suas atitudes sobre negros, mulheres, pessoas LGBT, pessoas pobres, esquerdistas etc. Trump não respeita procedimentos democráticos. Bolsonaro quer eliminar completamente a democracia.* (He [Trump] knows how to mobilise sectors of American society, especially white working-class and middle-class people that found themselves marginalised, resentful and frustrated. Trump really has no principles. Unfortunately, Bolsonaro has them. Trump is not politically consistent. Bolsonaro is, at least, in his attitudes about blacks, women, LGBT people, poor people, leftists, etc. Trump does not respect democratic procedures. Bolsonaro wants to completely eliminate democracy.)

The author of this article uses parallel structures to compare the two politicians as well as to show all of Tramp’s advantages over Bolsonaro.
In the course of the analysis, we found that image formation was realised at two linguistic levels: lexical (69%) and syntactic (31%). At the lexical level most items reflected economic issues. At the syntactic level we observed the use of the triplet, parallel structures and means of building contrast. Lexical items are used in their direct meanings (Differen 44%; Semil 25%; Oppos 19%; Compar 12%) and at the syntactic level, contrastive constructions (32%), parallel constructions (21%), as well as triplets (47%) are used by authors. Most texts followed the pattern: Trump does good to the country’s economy, Bolsonaro does nothing.

At the macro level, the authors mainly regard as features common of both politicians their commitment to right-wing political ideas. It is known that Trump used aggressive rhetoric in his speeches during the US pre-election campaign in 2016. Obviously, his campaign was widely covered by Brazilian media so that Brazilians could form opinions about him. Thus, we can conclude that Brazilian media used Trump’s previously constructed negative image during Bolsonaro’s pre-election campaign.

The main differences between the two politicians related to the economic issues. The authors of the articles analyse the contents of the political and rather the economic agenda of the two leaders. The media noted some of Trump’s ‘positive’ qualities, namely his success in dealing with economic issues, in particular the protectionist policy and the rejection of everything that is ‘not profitable’ for the United States. Thus, we can conclude that the authors tried to break the link between Trump’s advantages proving that Bolsonaro was deprived of them.

This is clearly seen at the discursive level. Firstly, this is present at the macro- and super structural levels of organisation of texts, and secondly, it is reflected in the use of various topics while constructing the image of the Brazilian president, namely economic, political and media discourse.

Guided by the theoretical provisions on superstructures proposed by Van Dijk (1988) in relation to news discourse, we present a simplified organisational structure of the text of mass media articles during Bolsonaro’s pre-election campaign (Figure 1), which is used in most articles dealing with comparing the two leaders. However, we do not set ourselves the task of creating a universal scheme of Brazilian news discourse.
Figure 1. Superstructure of the empiric materials dealing with comparing the two politicians

About 37% of the text space is devoted to comparing the two politicians in order to find common features, and 63% is given to finding differences. At the beginning of the editorial article the authors speak briefly about the similarities between the two politicians, as was shown in the examples above, and then explain in detail that Trump has knowledge and skills in the field of economics, and Bolsonaro doesn’t.

**Cultural code and threat to the democracy and liberal values**

During Bolsonaro’s pre-election campaign, Brazilian media often expressed fears concerning the possibility of returning to the military dictatorship drawing the reader’s attention to the fact that Bolsonaro was ex-military. However, today’s situation in the country is a far cry from the one 50 years ago. In 1964, a revolution took place in Brazil, as a result of which the military came to power, intending to rid the country of corruption and restore democracy. However, they seized
power in the country, established an authoritarian regime and began to suppress dissent. In 1984, a large demonstration was held in São Paulo, the protestors sought the return of direct presidential elections. The manifestations were supported by Brazilians all over the country. That year, the military conducted political reforms and Paulo Maloof became president, the rule of the military came to an end.

The analysis proved that the process of image construction was conducted predominantly at the lexical level. The lexical items used in the editorial articles belong to the semantic field Military Takeover (67% of the sample) and Democracy (33% of the sample), as in:

Bolsonaro e outros ex-militares – incluindo seu candidato a vice-presidente – levantaram dúvidas sobre a aceitação de resultados eleitorais indesejados. Pela primeira vez em décadas, a ameaça de uma ditadura militar está emergindo. (Bolsonaro and other former militaries – including his candidate for vice president – have raised doubts about accepting unwanted election results. For the first time in decades, the threat of a military dictatorship is emerging.)

In the above example, the author uses the lexical items as ditadura military, ex-militares and resultados eleitorais indesejados. Similar lexical items such as chumbo da ditadura, risco de retorno were found in the following example:

Não deixa de ser irônico, pois estamos às vésperas da oitava eleição presidencial livre no período mais extenso de regime democrático no Brasil. De um lado, acadêmicos e intelectuais veem na candidatura Jair Bolsonaro o risco de retorno aos anos de chumbo da ditadura. (It is ironic that we are on the eve of the eighth free presidential election in the longest period of democratic rule in Brazil. On the one hand, academics and intellectuals see Jair Bolsonaro’s candidacy as risk of returning to the years of the dictatorship.)

Here the author directly points to the ‘risk of returning to the years of dictatorship’ and raises another issue of the ‘threat to democracy’. The author doesn’t speak about it directly but mentions that it is ‘the eighth free presidential election in the longest period of democratic rule in Brazil’. The same is observed in the following example:

As vésperas de uma eleição polarizada – mas absolutamente livre – Bolsonaro projeta-se explorando uma situação descrita como falência da democracia, resultado do esgarçamento das instituições políticas, capturadas pelo poder econômico, distanciadas da população,
afundadas na corrupção e na burocracia. (On the eve of a polarised – but absolutely free – election, Bolsonaro is projected by exploring a situation described as the failure of democracy, the result of the weakness of political institutions, captured by economic power, distanced from the population, sunk into corruption and bureaucracy.)

In the example above the author uses the lexical item democracia and makes reference to the situation back in 1964, which is described in detail. Most of the lexical items of the semantic field Military Takeover are formed from the Latin and Greek roots militia (42%), dictator (25%), minacia (17%), rizikon (8%) and reservo (8%). Most of the lexical items of the semantic field Democracy are formed from the Latin and Greek roots dēmokratia (60%) and libertas (40%). At the same time, the authors speak more about democracy rather than military issues. This means that Brazilians are still concerned about the possibility of reviving the times of military dictatorship.

Mass media appeal to the cultural code with the aim to revive the issue which is sensitive in their society in order to construct Bolsonaro’s negative image. Bolsonaro is viewed not only as a potential threat to democratic values but also as a military dictator who wants to seize power. They draw attention to the fact that his team are mostly former militaries and the bulk of the vocabulary used is formed from the Latin root militia. However, it is far from being true as Bolsonaro retired 30 years ago in the rank of captain of field artillery. For the past 30 years he has held different political posts. Thereby we may conclude that the media used the past negative experience as a means of constructing the president’s negative image.

**Conclusion**

In result of the analysis it was found that the image formation was conducted mainly on two levels lexical and syntactical. Lexical means were represented in several semantic fields: economy, military takeover, democracy as well as lexical items used to make a comparison. It makes 76% of all linguistic means. Syntactical means mostly were used contrastive constructions, parallel constructions and triplet so as to compare Bolsonaro with Trump. This means make 19% of all linguistic means.

Brazilian pre-election discourse is characterised by frequent reference to Trump’s rhetorical portrait, especially his far-right rhetoric, which led to a split in the society. In constructing candidate’s negative
image, the national media relied heavily on destroying similarities between Bolsonaro and Trump to suggest that the former didn’t have the positive features of the latter, for example understanding of how the economy works. Attention was drawn to Bolsonaro’s inability to effectively implement economic reforms, while Trump was portrayed as an effective reformer. The issues related to the ultra-right rhetoric, in particular impairment of the rights of minorities and women, have also been raised many times. Another topic that has often been touched upon in the media is the possible return to the times of military dictatorship, although, it is clear that this is impossible under the present circumstances. This could be linked with an attempt to form a certain allusion in the media environment which is rooted in the modern history of the country. Overall, Brazilian pre-election media discourse was dominated by the use of lexical items belonging to ultra-right discourse and military dictatorship. Lexical means played a crucial role in the construction of Bolsonaro’s negative image.
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