

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv  
Institute of Philology  
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

**POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN THE USA (BASED ON 2020 ELECTIONARY  
CAMPAIGN)**

**Master's thesis**

written by the student of the 2<sup>nd</sup> year  
of studies of the Master's program

“English Communication Studies and Translation  
and Two Western European Languages”

Field of science: 03 “Humanities”

Specialty: 035 “Philology”

*Nataliia Vitiuk*

**Supervised by:**

PhD, *Anna Karaban*

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології

та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 8 від 12.05.2020

Завідувач кафедри \_\_\_\_\_ д. філол. н., проф. Белова А.Д.

KYIV 2020

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 The discourse concept within Discourse Analysis.....	7
1.2 Linguistic features of political discourse.....	11
1.3 Genres of political discourse.....	16
1.4 Manipulation as a linguistic phenomenon.....	20
1.5 Manipulation in the US political discourse: retrospective view.....	24
<b>CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 1.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>2. LINGUISTIC MANIPULATION IN DONALD TRUMP’S DISCOURSE.....</b>	<b>31</b>
2.1 Linguistic means of manipulation in Donald Trump’s political speeches.....	31
2.2 Linguistic means of manipulation in Donald Trump’s political interviews.....	39
2.3 Linguistic means of manipulation in Donald Trump’s electioneering.....	44
<b>CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 2.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>3. LINGUISTIC MANIPULATION IN JOSEPH BIDEN’S DISCOURSE.....</b>	<b>51</b>
3.1 Linguistic means of manipulation in Joseph Biden’s political speeches.....	51
3.2 Linguistic means of manipulation in Joseph Biden’s political interviews.....	60
3.3 Linguistic means of manipulation in Joseph Biden’s electioneering.....	64
<b>CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 3.....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>RESUME.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>SUMMERY.....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS.....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS.....</b>	<b>91</b>

## INTRODUCTION

At the end of the twentieth century, the crucial role of language as a rapidly expanding medium of communication became apparent not only to linguists but also to professionals working in other fields. In the process of globalization of the communicative space in modern society the problems of studying verbal influence on the mass consciousness come to the fore. One of the areas in which manipulative influence is an integral part of its existence is politics.

The French philosopher Rene Descartes has defined people as purely linguistic animals. Aristotle was close to identifying people as political animals. A considerable number of linguists (Chilton in particular) do not doubt that both definitions are true, since one definition includes the other.

Politics is associated with power the essence of which lies in a great potential to make decisions, to control resources, to control other people's behaviour and values, etc.

Political discourse is the use of language to do the business of politics that includes persuasive rhetorics, the use of implied meaning, euphemisms, the exclusion of references to undesirable realities, the use of language to arouse political emotions.

The successful political career is impossible without well-structured and well-conceived political discourse. The most famous and influential politicians always were and still remain perfect orators and producers of eternal slogans, statements and appeals.

To thrive in the domain of politics one should foster their skills in crisis management, problem solving, raising money etc. More than a century ago outstanding German sociologist Max Weber assumed that the future of democratic politics lay with such professions as lawyers, journalists, party officials, teachers and public relations professionals. All are verbal professions that are based on persuasive use of words.

Accordingly, one more skill is important for a big-time political figure – the ability to communicate effectively. That is why political discourse became for them an essential

and inherent doctrine with its own rules and laws that should be taken into account and followed.

Political discourse allows to trace the mechanisms of influence on the mass consciousness, to identify strategies and tactics of speech manipulation, to explore the linguistic means of their realization. Political discourse is the object of study of various disciplines.

Thus, political science philosophy examines the relation between political discourse and concepts such as "power", "action", "authority" in relation to the linguistic features of the speaker and the interpretation of his language. Political science literary studies explore political discourse through the lens of literary studies, that is, determines the motivation of subjects, genre, motives, ideological basis of speech.

The basic concepts of political discourse were laid by representatives of Cambridge and Oxford schools in the 1950s. T. Van Dijk, Y. Habermas, R. Bart, N. Ferklo, P. Serio, as well as domestic authors: G. Pocheptsov, M.V. Ilin, O.J. Sheygal, O.N. Baranov were engaged in the study of political discourse.

In recent years, political discourse has become an active object of linguistic research. Due to the globalization of social change, the technologicalisation of political discourse, sociologists, linguists and other specialists conclude that "language is power". Thus, at the present stage of linguistics development, the interest of scientists is directed to the anthropocentric approach, which is why great importance is given to the linguistic personality in political discourse, in particular, to the study of idiosyncrasies of a politician. In particular, a considerable number of scholars are engaged in the study of political texts as part of political discourse, among which are: Serazim, K. Kusko, V. Petrenko, T. Yudin.

Exploring different approaches to the definition of discourse, it may be said that, as a multi-genre variety of public service broadcasting, political discourse is characterized by a number of specific means. And the essence is not only in the use of specific deterministic political activity of vocabulary, but also in the peculiar selection and organization of certain structures of expression in accordance with the

pragmatic guidelines, goals and conditions of communication formed in the process of professional activity of politicians.

The master thesis is focused on analyzing of political discourse in the USA, classification and analysis of linguistic manipulations in D. Trump's and J. Biden's speeches. These politicians' speeches were chosen because J. Biden and D. Trump are striking representatives of modern political discourse and they are currently very popular in the US.

Identifying of ways of lexical expressing a particular issue is not an easy task, as modern linguistics has the examples of several comprehensive studies of the linguistic manipulation tools which include both theoretical and practical aspects of studying.

*The relevance of the study* lies in the fact that it considers the questions of functions of the linguistic means of manipulation in political discourse in the framework of the actively developing theory of linguistics.

*The object of this research* is linguistic means of manipulation in modern English political discourse.

*The subject of this research* is the main functions of linguistic means of manipulation in the context of political discourse in English language.

*The aim of our research* is to identify and describe the most frequent features of linguistic means of manipulation in political discourse.

Based on the aim of our research, there are such *objectives* as:

- to show the place of theory and functions of political discourse;
- to describe the main genres of political discourse in the English language;
- to define existent definitions of manipulation as a linguistic phenomenon;
- to study linguistic manipulation in the US political discourse;
- to analyze linguistic means of manipulation in Donald Trump's and Joe Biden's political electioneering.

In this master thesis was used such *methods* of linguistic analysis as method of comparative analysis, method of continuous sampling and bibliographical method.

Our *research based on* the material selected from the latest political speeches, interviews and electioneering from magazines, articles, newspapers, video and television. We have presented and analysed approximately 80 examples of linguistic manipulations in the paper.

*Theoretical value* of this study is that it makes a contribution to the theory of linguistic in the English language at this stage of its development.

*Practical value.* Materials of thesis can be used for future more intensive researches, in courses of philology that study different communicative strategies and tactics or in subjects that close to linguistics.

*The research work consists of* introduction, three chapters, the conclusion and the bibliography.

In the Introduction, there are explanation of the theme choice, the topicality, established the main aim, and the practical tasks of the thesis have been provided.

Chapter One contains the theoretical basis, researches of well-known scientists and general notions of the work.

Chapter Two contains the analysis of the linguistic characteristics of manipulation in Donald Trump's political speeches. In this chapter the analysis of manipulation has been shown.

Chapter Three contains the analysis of the functional potential of linguistic manipulation in Joe Biden's political speeches. In this chapter the analysis of manipulation concept has been shown.

In conclusion the achieved results and the tasks of the master's work were generalized.

## 1. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE

### 1.1 The discourse concept within Discourse Analysis

Before discussing the discourse analysis, it is important to determine its object of study. The word “discourse” comes from the Latin word “discursus” that means “thinking, speech”. “Discursive” means “that is performed through logical conclusions” [Білодід 1970, p. 284]. As a linguistic term, this notion was first used in 1950-s after an American linguist Z. Harris who has published his famous article “Discourse Analysis” [Шейгал 1999, p. 42]. The notion of discourse establishes associations with all expressions of communication in a society, expression of rules and norms of communication, methods of the embodiment of a speaker’s pragmatic goal. Discourse is “a display of cultural communication; it embodies the pragmatic aims of the speakers and is formed under the influence of cognitive, linguistic, social and cultural factors” [Бобровская 2011, p. 1].

Teun Van Dijk in his work *What is Political Discourse Analysis* tries to characterize political discourse as one of types of this controversial concept, he says that “political discourse is identified by its *actors* or *authors*, viz., *politicians*. Indeed, the vast bulk of studies of political discourse is about the text and talk of professional politicians or political institutions, such as president and prime ministers and other members of government, parliament or political parties, both at the local, national and international levels. Politicians in this sense are the group of people who are being paid for their (political) activities, and who are being elected or appointed (or self-designated) as the central players in the polity. This way of defining political discourse is hardly different from the identification of medical, legal or educational discourse with the respective participants in the domains of medicine, law or education.” [VanDijk, 1997, p. 2-3] Therefore, we understand that the concept of discourse is widely used in a variety of fields, including politics, medicine, law, philosophy, psychology, and others. However, the general features and characteristics of this concept remain common to many of its variations, while the

intentions that motivate the discourse still depend on the communicative situation. It makes sense to find out the basic characteristics of discourse.

M. Stubbs distinguishes three main characteristics of the discourse:

- 1) in a formal sense – it is a language unit that is larger than a sentence;
- 2) in terms of content discourse is associated with the use of language in a social context;
- 3) in its organization discourse is interactive.

That is, we understand that any expression can be interpreted as a discourse only when it is immersed in a social context. Discourse is not an isolated textual or dialogical structure. As Van Dijk claimed, "discourse is an essential component of sociocultural engagement", bearing in mind that non-verbal means of text-based communication along with verbal ones play an important role in the success of the discourse intentions.

Discourse is a closed and internal communicative situation. Due to its pragmatic message, discourse reflects the realization of the linguistic functions of language described by Jakobson, among which is referential, poetic, emotive, conative, phatic and metalingual functions. Such disciplines as linguistics, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, the theory of communication, social psychology, and artificial intelligence deepen and expand the notion of discourse. Discourse can evolve and become more complex [Тацєнко 2017].

E. Skvortsova did a great job in the study of political discourse in linguistics, gathering in her article a concentration of the works of many linguists who also worked on defining the peculiar characteristics of political discourse. In particular, she refers to N. Arutyunova's work where the author in defining discourse, provides three perspectives for discussion. The first would be when the "discourse is viewed as a coherent text with a combination of extralinguistic aspects, including pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and others. Discourse can also be seen as text in a specific context. The latter would be when discourse is seen as a language that is regarded as a supposed social action, a component of human interaction and cognition. [Арутюнова 1999: 136]. According to Skvortsova, it is worth noting that

Arutyunova views discourse as a speech embedded in context” [Skvortsova 2017: 375]

Well-known Russian linguist-cognitologist Kubriakova also worked on defining discourse and its peculiarities. She noted that in terms of cognitive linguistics, "the difference between the two concepts (text and discourse) is quite natural because it correlates with the contrast between cognition and its result" [Kubriakova 1997: 191]. According to ES Kubriakova, “discourse can be regarded as a cognitive process related to language production, whereas text is the result of language” [Kubriakova 1997: 191]. Thus, returning to the definitions of the above and the characteristics of discourse, we see confirmation of the social component in this kind of linguistic unit and the importance of paralinguistic support of the language. That is why discourse and text differ in criteria such as functionality and structure, dynamics and static, process and result, relevance and virtuality.

There are other definitions of the concept of discourse. One of them says that discourse is “an arbitrary piece of text consisting of more than one sentence or an independent part of a sentence; which, as a rule, rotates by some basic concept, creates a general context, describing people, objects, circumstances, time, actions etc. [Demyanov 1980: 7] This definition hides the basic distinction of text and discourse, showing that one is a fundamental component of the other, without being the only element in the creation of this concept.

This means that discourse becomes different from the concept of text only in the case of a combination of verbal and non-verbal means of text communication. The presence of a basic concept and general context transforms the ordinary sequence of connected sentences into discourse. It is the extra-linguistic and prosodic communication features involved in the text production process that help to create this basic concept. These findings are supported by Van Dijk's example of political discourse: “This integration of political texts and contexts in political encounters may of course finally be characterized in more abstract terms as accomplishing specific political aims and goals, such as making or influencing political decisions, that is decisions that pertain to joint action, the distribution of

social resources, the establishment or change of official norms, regulations and laws, and so on.”

The interdisciplinary trend of discourse analysis makes it inevitable that the “term ‘discourse’ refers to diverse things via different viewpoints. Although the identical terminology ‘discourse’ is employed in many fields, its notion is, nonetheless, quite distinct. Sometimes discourse is treated simply as a word for language in use, at other times, discourse is theorized as a linguistics object or language above the sentence. To complicate the matter, an increasing number of scholars further elucidate the concept of ‘discourse’ through unique theoretical perspectives” [Martemianov 2006: 187].

For instance, Potter deciphers discourse “as texts and talk in social practices. That is, the focus is not on language as an abstract entity such as a lexicon and set of grammatical rules (in linguistics), a system of differences (in structuralism), a set of rules for transforming statements (in Foucauldian genealogies). Instead, it is the medium for interaction; analysis of discourse becomes, then, analysis of what people do” [Potter 1996: 146].

Hoey, views discourse in this way, especially written discourse, as “an interactive process between authors, readers, or audiences” [Hoey 2001: 2]. He clearly sets out his own approach, which focuses on the “way writers and readers interact, and relates it to other approaches. Each chapter introduces key concepts and analytical techniques, describes important parallel work, and suggests how to apply the ideas to stylistics and to the teaching and learning of reading and writing” [Hoey 2001: 2]. Strange to these two views of the authors, Gee (1999), classifies such a concept in terms of more intricate and deep theoretical grounds, considers discourse as “socially accepted associations between ways of using language, thinking, values, actions, and interaction in the right place and in the right place and at the right time with the right objects ” [Gee 1999: 17].

Generally speaking, discourse is an ambiguous concept and is considered and described by many scholars in different ways, depending on what the research focuses on.

## 1.2 Linguistic features of political discourse

In political speeches during election campaigns, ideas and ideologies need be conveyed through language so that they are agreed upon by the receivers as well as by others who may read or hear parts of the speech afterwards in the media. Words and expressions are used or omitted to affect meaning in different ways. Moreover, political speeches are composed by a team of professional speech writers, who are educated in the use of persuasive language. Adding rhetorical devices to a pre-composed speech may be of crucial importance to election results. A political speech is not necessarily a success because of correctness or truth, rather it may be a matter of presenting valid arguments. [Kulo, 2009 p.1]

Most studies of political discourse focus on the use of special words in the “political” language. Thus, according to what effect is to be achieved by the use of certain synonymous substitutions, stylistically colored words are selected, which carry not only objective information but also the evaluative judgment of the speaker, thereby forming the necessary perception of information by the audience. Thus, for example, politicians use the words *ruthless gangs* or *tremendous problems* to heighten the effect of the gravity of the situation, creating a sense of anxiety and fear in the audience. It is a well-known fact, that fear is one of the most effective methods of manipulating the audience. On the other hand, with the help of well-chosen lexical units with a positive connotation, politicians are able to describe in their political discourse the events, actions, facts or other people from the most favorable positions, thus giving the listeners a sense of confidence, protection and admiration.

Political discourse includes all speech acts of political discussions and public policy rules that have specific conventions. [Баранов 1990, p. 140]. In general, all the linguistic and extra-linguistic tools used in political discourse are used for the sole purpose of giving the recipients an impression of the need and appropriateness of policy decisions and actions. Strange as it may sound, thought creates a word which, if used correctly, can generate other “correct” and profitable thoughts. Politicians know this and use it to their advantage. An important complement and extension of my words is in Rathmayr 's statement “politicians use certain symbols

in their speech, which is successful depending on how these symbols relate to the public consciousness. A politician must be able to find the best way to reach his or her audience, taking into account their opinions, beliefs, etc.” [Rathmayr 1996: 211]. That is, wishing to convey their opinion, the politicians not only look for the best way how to do it, but also take into account what their listeners want to hear from them.

Thanks to technological advances, the modern world has provided people with diverse sources through which we can perceive political discourse and language. The main source of political language for recipients is mass media, including newspapers, radio, television and the Internet. There is also a source of political institutional discourse that includes postcards, debates, public speeches, published documents, and more. [Чудинов 2001: 43].

Political discourse is considered specific because it has a number of peculiar features or characteristics. Politicians use specific terms and concepts in their speech, which means that their vocabulary is professional, but at the same time common words and phrases, when used in a political context, may have a different meaning than usual. The structure of political discourse is also specific as it is comprised of particular speech strategies typical for political discourse. [Skvortsova 2017: 375].

A striking marker of political language is the particular use of intonation and pauses in speech. David Bell noticed that “the speech of a politician contains twice as many significant pauses than the speech of other people, and these pauses are usually longer, which makes it possible to compare this type of speech with theatrical performances” [Bell, 1997].

As stated in the introduction, discourse in general and political discourse in particular are “subject to multidisciplinary research and have a diverse approach” [Fontana 1993: 100]. In this paper, we assume that there are at least three perspectives that are worth discussing. First, political discourse can be viewed in terms of physiology as any other text, but in this case the academic would also take into account context and ideologies. Another important approach to political

discourse is sociopsychology, when researchers seek to evaluate the effectiveness of discourse and the degree to which it achieves its goals. And the last point of view is to analyze the personal justification or intentions and / or addressee in a particular context. The foregoing suggests that “the study of political discourse is indeed interconnected with a number of fields of inquiry and aimed at analyzing the forms, intentions and content of discourse used in a particular context” [Safire 1968: 375].

In addition, another feature of political discourse is “its oratorical nature, including recitation, propaganda, triumphant style, ideologies, abstract concepts, references to science and logic, criticism, bumper-sticker rhetoric, and assertions about the undeniable truth” [Beard 2000: 36]. All these features make the political speech sound theatrical and aggressive. The intention of the politicians in this case would be to abandon their opponents and impose their ideas and beliefs on the audience.

In her article Skvortsova comes to the following conclusion “Researchers make generalized criteria for political discourse, including a description of the actions or statements of fact included in the statements made in the questions asked; answers to specific questions, descriptions of issues that exist in society (they will also include the required positive or negative options); new ideas and beliefs; ascertaining the universal truth or truth of God, requests and claims against public authorities, and calls for certain actions or decisions to be taken. The above criteria contribute to the effectiveness of political discourse that meets specific requirements” [Skvortsova 2017: 376].

All recipients of political discourse are people with a best of their ability and externalities outlook. Their perception of any information is a subject to comprehension and is transmitted through the prisms of existing and previously acquired knowledge, their life experience, their own belief system and the ideas they profess. Much better is the listener's perception of information that has previously sounded in a particular context. A speaker who wants to succeed in their speech is forced to pay attention to these factors. Thus, in their speeches politicians often try to show their unity with the people, saying that they profess the same principles and

ideas. They appeal to objective reality with already known facts, augmenting their own visions and interpretations and, as if, directing people's thoughts in the right direction, forcing them to rely on the speaker's competence, and calling politically unpopular decisions a necessity and correct scenario that is needed by everyone in the current period. Imposing on people a new vision of reality, a politician always proclaims that the proposed vector of social development is offered not by his or her personally, but by the team of politicians or the party he or she represents. In this way, keeping yourself from the possible sole responsibility for certain negative scenarios. And, in order to increase public support, in announcing achievements and positive change, political party leaders often use the words "*we*," "*joint efforts*," "*our actions*," meaning that people are also implicated in positive changes in society. In this way, the politician manipulates public sentiment, creating the illusion of democracy, and making people feel responsible citizens who think of the common good.

Regarding the interpretation of political discourse as a whole, researchers note that research should not focus solely on linguistic means, since in this case the idea and true intent of political discourse would be omitted. Understanding and interpreting political discourse means that the study will refer to background information, speaker and recipient expectations, embedded motives, plots, and logic [Skvortsova 2017: 375].

Researchers often note that "the issue of understanding political discourse is one of its informational values in a particular context. Political discourse is closely intertwined with the ideology, mental outlook and philosophy of the recipient's life and feelings, so political discourse should be analyzed according to the above points. The rhetoric of political discourse correlates with overcoming its negative features, such as ideological pretensions and monopoly, aggressiveness, dictatorship, pragmatism and aptitude for conflict" [Deik 2008: 155].

All linguistic units used in discourse, as noted earlier, are not discourses as long as they remain text and are not used by paralinguistic means. Plain text without subjectivities is not a powerful method of influence. It is influence and reflection

that is the purpose of discourse, which distinguishes it from text. A large number of rhetorical tools are used to help the text adapt to the social context and "breathe life into it" in order to achieve this goal and to increase the interest and involvement of recipients in the speeches of politicians. Adaptation of the text in the mind of the recipient occurs during its reflection and understanding, taking into account all the factors and conditions under which the text of discourse was heard. The formation of attitudes is influenced by: the speaker's personality, including his past, present and plans for the future, his appearance if possible to observe the speaker visually, and his speech features, including the intonation, pauses and accents the politician makes in his speech. , the lexical units he uses to describe situations, people, or plans, and the coded ideas that these lexical units conceal. It is the decoding of these ideas and true motives that is the primary task of the critical-thinking recipient.

However, researchers often mention the maximum of the monologue as characteristic of political discourse, since sometimes the text does not reflect the speaker's reflection and does not require the recipient's reflection. Thus, political discourse involves all types of interaction between the individual and society, creating an outlook. Political discourse reveals a way of imposing cultural values and social order in different societies. Such type of discourse includes a different political debates in society, including discussions with politicians and officials, public rhetoric and others. [Skvortsova 2017: 376].

In conclusion, political discourse is an extraordinary phenomenon that people often encounter when switching on TVs, radios or simply on the Internet. The main problem is the need for a more detailed study and scientific justification for this phenomenon, since there is still no clear definition of this phenomenon and its classifications. Understanding and interpreting political discourse in different sciences is different. It is also necessary to develop qualitative research methods for political discourse, taking into account the diversity of methodological tools of interdisciplinary fields.

### 1.3 Genres of political discourse

The question of genres as a linguistic problem arose in M. Bakhtin's scientific works. He wrote “Language is realized in the form of individual concrete utterances (oral and written) by participants in the various areas of human activity. These utterances reflect the specific conditions and goals of each such area not only through their content (thematic) and linguistic style, that is, the selection of the lexical, phraseological, and grammatical resources of the language, but above all through their compositional structure. All three of these aspects—thematic content, style, and compositional structure—are inseparably linked to the *whole* of the utterance and are equally determined by the specific nature of the particular sphere of communication. Each separate utterance is individual, of course, but each sphere in which language is used develops its own *relatively stable* types of these utterances. These we may call *speech genres*.” [Bakhtin 1996, p.60]

P. Krolikowska in her doctoral thesis (2015) studied Bakhtin's works on speech genres. She noted that there are as many speech genres as there are areas of human activity and since new such areas come into being all the time, constantly new genres appear. Although the entire catalogue of generic structures is limitless, Bakhtin classifies them “according to the domain of human activity – in that way we have, use and are surrounded by literary genres, rhetorical genres and everyday speech genres”.

Nevertheless, the key point here is the division into “primary (simple) speech genres” and “secondary (complex) speech genres” that Bakhtin introduces in order to illustrate the interplay between these three types of generic structures. Bakhtin defines them in the following words: “Secondary (difficult) speech genres – novels, dramas, all kinds of scientific studies, major commentary genres, etc. arise in more complex and relatively highly developed and organized cultural communications (primarily written), that is artistic, scientific, sociopolitical, and so on. In the process of their formation, they learn and master various primary (simple) genres that have formed in non-medical speech communication. These primary genres change and

take on a special character when they come into complex. They lose their direct relation to the real reality and real expressions of others” [Królikowska 2015, p.9]

Thus, the classification of genres has a certain hierarchical structure that explains the role of constituents in the formation of the whole. Simple genres in the combinations form complex ones. Drawing on the analogy, it can be said that simple lexical units and unities, only by being united by a common context or idea, form a complex concept of discourse, which is divided into genres and forms.

Depending on formal, communicative, intentional and other factors, certain forms of political discourse are distinguished. Oral and written are distinguished by form; by the speaker's factor it is direct and indirect; by purpose – informative, stimulating, image, motivational, expressive; by the addressee factor – personally and massively addressed; by function – television, newspaper, radio, advertising, PR. [Кондратенко 2007, p. 150]

Politics, in essence, is a speech activity in which language is used to inform others about political problems and to convince them of the need to take part in actions related to these problems. [Gets 1987 p. 150]

Political linguistics distinguishes genres that are related to the political system (e.g., parliamentary debates, political manifestos and programs, reports of party leaders at conferences, political documents), genres related to the media (for example, political news, political interviews, talk shows, political advertising in the press), and genres related to the public sphere (e.g. meetings with citizens, political forums) [Dotsenko 2003 p. 294]. Such a variety of genres has been developed due to the continuous development of various spheres of human activity and technological progress. Genres related to mass media did not exist at a time when politics was already actively implemented in early human civilizations. However, at this time other types of political discourse genres began to emerge and improve. The genre classification of political discourse is an unstable notion. New forms of discourse and ways of their realization always arise. Therefore, the study of genre characteristics remain an open question.

It is believed that political discourse can be considered anything where politics is concerned. Van Dijk expressed the same opinion, calling political discourse "a class of genres defined by the characteristics of their social heritage, that is, politics" [Van Dijk 1998: 11]. The genre classification above helps you understand what is being defined. He also argues that political discourse can be considered genres that can influence political decision-making. [Van Dijk 2002: 19-20].

Regarding the typology of the genres proposed by Van Dijk, Krolikovska expresses her own considerations, noting that in van Dijk's approach with context as a crucial factor in identification of generic structures in politics, the overall typology of political genres that exists is very general – and, perhaps, even pushed to the background of his considerations. Various political genres are "presented as discourse structures used in different types of political actions, political processes and political systems, but there is no hierarchy that organizes them" [Królikowska 2015: 89].

Such a typology entails that, for example, parliamentary debates, political speeches or party programs can be treated as some of many 'main' types of genres in the domain of politics, and that any creative or in any other way modified manifestations of them can be classified under these main categories without any further, lower level division into subtypes. [Królikowska 2015, p. 91].

Based on the researches of the above linguists and articles from scientific journals, the following classification of genres which can be a conclusion to this part of work is proposed. It is presented in the table 1.1.

*Table 1.1.*

*Genres of political discourse*

**Genres of political discourse**

<b>According to institutional setting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● conversations about politics with family and friends (anecdotes, gossip);</li> <li>● postcards and graffiti;</li> <li>● telegrams and letters from citizens in which they express their support or protest;</li> <li>● political scandal;</li> <li>● press conference;</li> <li>● public political discussions;</li> <li>● public speeches and speeches by political leaders;</li> <li>● laws, orders and other policy documents;</li> <li>● international negotiations, official meetings of heads of state</li> </ul>	
<b>According to the subject-address parameter</b>	communication between group entities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● petition;</li> <li>● appeals;</li> <li>● postcard;</li> <li>● performances at rallies;</li> <li>● voting.</li> </ul>
	communication between agents of institutions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● official correspondence;</li> <li>● parliamentary discussion;</li> <li>● meetings of political figures;</li> <li>● reports at congresses.</li> </ul>

<b>According socio-cultural differential parameters</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● genres of discourse of power;</li> <li>● genres of opposition discourse</li> </ul>
<b>According the localization of events</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ritual (inaugural speech, traditional radio and television);</li> <li>● orientation genres (constitution, order, arrangement, report);</li> <li>● agonal genres (parliamentary debates, publicity, slogan)</li> </ul>

To sum up, political discourse is a multicomponent phenomenon that finds its realization in combining all component characteristics and aiming at achieving a common goal – to influence recipients' consciousness. Considering formal, communicative and other factors, politicians choose appropriate forms and genres of political discourse to achieve certain pragmatic goals.

#### **1.4. Manipulation as a linguistic phenomenon**

We have often noticed how, after watching or listening to political speeches, the general mood of the audience changed. A few minutes ago, the room was filled with different thoughts and views, people were concerned about their own problems, and now something made them think the same way and look in one direction, without any physical violence being applied to them. Some of the politicians' speeches end with violent applause and admiration of the public, and after the others the listeners feel a strong sense of patriotism or national unity. It is difficult for some people to explain why after a political leader's speech they feel frustrated and tears

appear in their eyes. However, many specialists in the fields of psychology, rhetoric, linguistics and others know the cause of this phenomenon. Behind all this lies manipulation.

Manipulation is a linguistic term with great creative potential that is first and foremost topical in the framework of the theory of linguistic manipulation. The wide and somewhat blurred semantic field of the term "manipulation" includes such key elements as "negative" intention of the speaker and covert (not evident for the listener) character of influence. Manipulative functions of discourse create covert, masked layer of linguistic data that is not easily separated from purely informational content. Depending on the character of utterance (its orientation towards past or future), more importance is attached to either confirmation with objective reality (if the topic of interaction touches upon something that has already happened) or to the pragmatic factor (frankness of the speaker whose speech is associated with the future). [Akopova 2013 p. 95]

Van Dijk was one of the researchers who studied the "manipulation" concept. He defined manipulation as one of the crucial notions of Critical Discourse Analysis that require further theoretical analysis. In his article he offers a triangulated approach to manipulation as a form of social power abuse, cognitive mind control and discursive interaction. Socially, manipulation is defined as illegitimate domination confirming social inequality. Cognitively, manipulation as mind control involves the interference with processes of understanding, the formation of biased mental models and social representations such as knowledge and ideologies. Discursively, manipulation generally involves the usual forms and formats of ideological discourse, such as emphasizing Our good things, and emphasizing Their bad things. At all these levels of analysis it is shown how manipulation is different from legitimate mind control, such as in persuasion and providing information, for instance by stipulating that manipulation is in the best interest of the dominated group and against the best interests of dominated groups. Finally, this theory is illustrated by a partial analysis of a speech by Tony Blair in the House of Commons

legitimizing the participation of the UK in the US-led war against Iraq in 2003. [Van Dijk 2006 p. 1].

Manipulation is realized when the listener cannot see the speaker's covered intentions behind what is actually being said. As one of the key parameters of manipulative utterance is specific intentionality, in order to discriminate manipulation, one has to analyze such parameters as aim of verbal communication, communicative intention, reason, and motive. Manipulation is pragmatic aspect that achieves its goals without evident detection of communicative intention: the speaker wittingly chooses such form of utterance that lacks direct signals of his intentional condition. By increasing the level of inadequate perception of information field, manipulation widens illusionary subjective reality. Manipulation is negative social psychological phenomenon exercising destructive effect upon an individual and the society as a whole. In order to illustrate the correlation of broad and narrow understandings of linguistic manipulation, it should be noted that the need for verbal communication between people arises in case if subsequently they must somehow interact with each other. [Akopova 2013 p. 95]

G. Orwell, who was the first in drawing attention to the manipulative feature of political discourse states that: "political speech and writing are largely the defense of indefensible" [Orwell 1969: 225]. Politicians try to avoid straightforward presentation of facts.

"J. Aitchison believes that when human beings try to understand the world around them, they try to build "mental models". Those mental models are the primes upon which human beings depend in making sense of the abstract things in this world like the concept of week consisting of seven days. Nothing in the outer world forces this view point. These are only subconsciously inherited models. The role of politicians comes when they try to deliberately insert mental models across human conceptualization of the life like the concept of democracy" [Ismail 2004: 3]. This process is called "representation" [Aitchison 1992: 91]. J. Wilson defines representation as "the issue of how language is employed in different ways to represent what we can know, believe, and perhaps think" [Wilson 2001: 401].

In her work, Dr. Akopova suggested a classification of language manipulation according to a number of certain characteristics. Depending on the sphere of mental activity, participation and dominance in the process of communication, language manipulation she proposes to divide into *rational* and *emotional*. She claims that in trying to influence the interlocutor's behavior, speakers can influence their rational sphere. To do this, they use compelling facts and arguments that affect people's minds. The purpose of emotional manipulation is to express the emotions of the speaker and to get another's emotional reaction from the listener, which will lead to changes in his behavior.

According to the nature of the interaction of the subject-object, manipulation may be *direct* (i.e. the subject is openly presenting his demands to the object of manipulation) and *indirect* (i.e. manipulation directed at the environment rather than at the object).

According to the language awareness, manipulation can be *deliberate* and *unintentional*. In case of intentional linguistic manipulation, the subject aims at a definite result on the part of the object of manipulation. Non-intentional linguistic manipulation is exercised involuntarily, as the subject does not aim at achieving results from the listener.

According to the type of linguistic action, manipulation can be: *social* (social non-informative speech actions with clichés in the form of greetings, oaths, prayers); *volitional* (speech actions following the will of the speaker in the form of orders, requests, refusals, recommendations, etc.); *information-evaluation* (speech acts that establish public moral, legal, interpersonal emotional relations in the form of reproach, praise, accusation, insults, threats).

According to the perlocutionary criterion (addressee's reaction) is the basis for discrimination of the following types of language manipulation: *evaluative* (change of subject-object relation, connotative value of object for object); *emotional* (formation of general emotional mood); *rational* (reconstruction of the categorical structure of individual conscience, introduction of new categories).

According to the interlocutor orientation, manipulation can be *oriented towards the individual and society*. [Akopova 2013: 100]

Each of the types of language manipulation considered can affect the interlocutor's thoughts and attitudes, as well as change his or her behavior.

To summarize, it can be concluded that language manipulation is a verbal and non-verbal influence on consciousness that is accomplished with a view to achieving a specific goal, which may include changes in the behavior, attitudes and values of those to whom the manipulation is directed.

### **1.5 Manipulation in the US political discourse: retrospective view**

In modern linguistics, there is no single approach to defining the strategies and tactics of language manipulation. Consider the main ones. Some scholars do not differentiate the terms "strategy" and "tactics" and use them as identical. We support this view, which is why the article focuses on the analysis of the manipulative strategy.

The concept of speech manipulation has not been sufficiently explored. There is currently no single classification of speech manipulation strategies in political discourse. It means that the analysis of speech manipulation strategies leads to the conclusion that public speeches by political figures are a form of political discourse through which manipulative influence on the consciousness of the audience is exercised. We consider the most exhaustive classification proposed by O. Marina (2014) and T. Rozhytska (2016) which was used to study manipulation strategies in American political discourse. The effectiveness of manipulative influence is justified by the use of certain manipulation strategies that we have considered:

1. *“Strategy for the use of identification formulas.* These are widely used language turns that can be used to induce the addressee to identify with the speaker, his or her position, his party, a sense of involvement, community, and more. A particularly productive way is to use personal and possessive pronouns. However, such a goal is ambivalent. It contributes to the formation of the collective identity of

the citizens of the state and leads to an increase in their sense of solidarity with the existing authorities. At the same time, it leads to the strengthening of the very idea of statehood. It is one of the means of ideological influence on the masses when the will of the (ruling) minority in a veiled form is imposed on the majority” [Маріна 2014 p. 118]: “*Tonight **this chamber** speaks with one voice to the people we represent: It is **you, our citizens**, who make the state of our union strong*” [Obama 2012].

As we can see, Obama is actively using this strategy in his speeches. This strategy involves widespread language turns, for that matter to encourage the addressee to identify with the speaker.

2. “A strategy for the submission of subjective thought in the form of objective fact or truth. The peculiarity of the presented strategy is the use of epistemic words” [Маріна 2014 p. 118]. These are words with the general meaning of "learn", "known", "as known", "as we all know", "no doubt" and so on. These words and phrases give expression to the character of unconditional truth that is beyond doubt: “***We know where to start. The best measure of opportunity is access to a good job...The good news is, we know how to do it...Of course, it’s not enough to train today’s workforce. We also have to prepare tomorrow’s workforce, by guaranteeing every child access to a world-class education... Of course, to reach millions more, Congress does need to get on board***” [Obama 2012].

3. “The authority reference strategy is very close to the strategies for the submission of subjective thought in the form of objective fact or truth, in which some authoritative, well-known or respected personality offers a vision of the problem” [Рожицька 2016: 78]. This creates a situation where the audience is relieved of any decision-making load, since the conclusions are already made by a more competent person, but at the same time, the politician removes all responsibility for the choice of the audience, because he only referred to someone's opinion: “*And I wouldn’t be the man I am today without the **woman** who agreed to marry me 20 years ago. Let me say this publicly. **Michelle**, I have never loved you more. I have never been*

*prouder to watch the rest of America fall in love with you too as our nation's first lady*" [Obama 2012].

4. *"The strategy of expressions of "praise" to the addressee"* [Рожицька 2016: 78]: *"I want to thank every American who participated in this election"* [Obama 2012]. Audience commitment by delivering a sublime, full of admiration and praise for the audience, especially in a crowded environment.

5. *"A strategy for emphasizing the importance and truth of ideas"* [Рожицька 2016 p. 79]. This strategy is implemented through the use of rhetorical questions, the irony directed against the opponent or opponent, the rhetorical figures. With the help of meaningless questions, the answer to which is quite obvious, the politician tries to emphasize the significance and truth of his ideas.

6. *Comprehensiveness Reduction and Contrast Appraisal Alternatives* [Маріна 2014 p. 119]. This type of strategy is designed for a mass addressee to manipulate. Each subsystem (policy, law, etc.) allows for sectoral analysis and thus simplifies "it's part of complexity". So, when using the given strategy, it is necessary to formulate two diametrically opposite ideas very precisely. Providing the full amount of information is not within the policy interests, and the formulation of two alternative ideas is not at odds with the wishes of a mass audience that is not ready to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the entire diversity of alternatives. This kind of strategy is extremely popular because it allows the politician to talk about the particular facts needed at a particular time in a particular place, without presenting the whole picture in general, which always makes it possible to make comparisons in their favor: *"But we have to act with more urgency because a **changing climate is already harming western communities struggling with drought** and coastal cities dealing with floods. That's why I directed my administration to work with states, utilities and others to set new standards on the amount of carbon pollution our power plants are allowed to dump into the air"* [Obama 2012].

7. *"Strategy for mobilization and demobilization of public opinion"* [Рожицька 2016 p. 79]. Under the first strategy, political events appear to be quite

dramatic, and the state of affairs is appalling, requiring immediate and decisive action. Under the second strategy, the state of affairs is not so dramatic, but the politician requires patience and peace from society. The first sub-strategy uses negative-evaluative words, expressions, metaphors, "looking for the guilty", "branding with shame". The second – uses euphemisms and avoids pointing to specific "culprits" or "responsible" for what is happening [Рожицька 2016 р. 79]: “*We want our children to live in an America that **isn’t burdened** by debt, **that isn’t weakened up by inequality**, **that isn’t threatened by the destructive power of a warming planet**” [Obama 2012].*

The analysis of speech manipulation strategies leads to the conclusion that public speeches of political figures are a form of political discourse that is used to manipulate the minds of the audience. The effectiveness of manipulative influence is justified by the use of certain manipulation strategies. All these strategies have been considered by Ukrainian and foreign scientists. They share common features and demonstrate the application of these strategies in B. Obama's speeches.

## CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 1

We can conclude that, as a linguistic term, the notion of discourse was first used in 1950-s after an American linguist Z. Harris who has published his famous article “Discourse Analysis”. The notion of discourse establishes associations with all expressions of communication in a society, expression of rules and norms of communication, methods of the embodiment of a speaker’s pragmatic goal. Discourse is a display of cultural communication; it embodies the pragmatic aims of the speakers and is formed under the influence of cognitive, linguistic, social and cultural factors.

We can assume that discourse is a broad concept that includes two unequal components, that is text and speech. At the same time, discourse is a cognitive process, and text is its result. Discourse becomes different from the concept of text only in the case of a combination of verbal and non-verbal means of text communication. The presence of a basic concept and general context transforms the ordinary sequence of connected sentences into discourse. It is the extra-linguistic and prosodic communication features involved in the text production process that help to create this basic concept.

Political linguistics distinguishes genres that are related to the political system, genres related to the media, and genres related to the public sphere.

Political speeches being a form of political discourse are composed by a team of professional speech writers, who are educated in the use of persuasive language. Adding rhetorical devices to a pre-composed speech may be of crucial importance to election results.

Manipulation is a linguistic term with great creative potential that is first and foremost topical in the framework of the theory of linguistic manipulation. The wide and somewhat blurred semantic field of the term “manipulation” includes such key elements as “negative” intention of the speaker and covert character of influence. Manipulative functions of discourse create covert, masked layer of linguistic data that is not easily separated from purely informational content. Depending on the

character of utterance (its orientation towards past or future), more importance is attached to either confirmation with objective reality or to the pragmatic factor.

There are two types of emotional manipulation: indirect and direct. By the nature of the interaction, the subject of the manipulation can be direct and indirect, too. According to the awareness of language actions, manipulation can be intentional and unintentional. By type of linguistic action, manipulation can be: social, volitional, information-evaluative, evaluative, rational. According to the interlocutor orientation, the manipulation can be oriented towards the individual and the society.

Political discourse involves all types of interaction between the individual and society, creating an outlook. Political discourse reveals a way of imposing cultural values and social order in different societies.

The importance of political discourse is determined by the fact that well-supported political communication ensures that consensus is reached in society. The politician must strive to make decisions that would benefit society as a whole. The main purpose of political discourse is to get recipients to believe in the need for politically correct actions or assessments. Therefore, it is not to describe, but to make sure that the recipient has some intentions, beliefs and need for some action. If we talk about the effectiveness of political discourse, researchers would analyze it according to the main purpose of political discourse.

Researchers often note that the issue of understanding political discourse is one of its informational values in a particular context. Political discourse is closely intertwined with the ideology, mental outlook and philosophy of the recipient's life and feelings, so political discourse should be analyzed according to the above points. The rhetoric of political discourse correlates with overcoming its negative features, such as ideological pretensions and monopoly, aggressiveness, dictatorship, pragmatism and aptitude for conflict.

To summarize, it can be concluded that language manipulation is a verbal and non-verbal influence on consciousness that is accomplished with a view to achieving a specific goal, which may include changes in the behavior, attitudes and values of those to whom the manipulation is directed.

The analysis of speech manipulation strategies leads to the conclusion that public speeches of political figures are a form of political discourse through which manipulative influence on the consciousness of the audience is exercised. The effectiveness of manipulative influence is justified by the use of certain manipulation strategies. All these strategies have been considered by Ukrainian and foreign scientists. They share common features and demonstrate the application of these strategies in the US political discourse.

## 2. LINGUISTIC MANIPULATION IN DONALD TRUMP'S DISCOURSE

Nowadays constantly growing political activity is fueling the intense development of political technologies that are impossible without the media. The media, which in a short time covers a large number of people, attracts public attention to political communication and political discourse.

Political discourse should include all the components of the speaker and listener's components that can influence the perception of speech, the political views of the author. And their job in creating text is to use all possible tools to manage the thoughts of the audience. In political discourse, there is a wide range of linguistic means capable of influencing the opinion of the masses in order to manipulate them.

The objective of this Chapter is to identify the main types of linguistic manipulation used by American president D. Trump during electoral campaigns. The material used for the analysis is taken from printed pre-election speeches of presidential candidate Donald Trump.

Exploring the features and characteristics of political discourse helps to identify the distinctive features and important components of a particular culture and to relate it to the political situation in real time in order to better understand the true intentions and goals hidden in the speeches of politicians. Another important feature of political discourse analysis is the identification of tools that demonstrate the most effective strategies and methods to engage the audience and inspire confidence in people.

### **2.1 Linguistic means of manipulation in Donald Trump's political speeches**

In the process of text creation, the authors of manipulation discourse often choose the most neutral word from the semantic field, though even a neutral word in a certain context may perform the role of impact, because in contrast to the word

with an expressive negative connotation it transfers a positive estimation of this issue in a hidden form, reflecting the position of the whole ideological system, and, vice versa, while describing events, criticized by this system, emotional words with negative connotation are chosen.

Many units of political language mean complexes of ideas far removed from direct human experience. Taking into account the Sternin's classification, the following groups of ideas (intentions) were identified during the study:

1) silencing the facts;

This group consists of 2 examples:

- *“Just as we believe in the First Amendment, we also believe in another Constitutional right that is under siege all across our country. So long as I am President I **will always protect** your Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms” (TSUS).*

Within critical discourse analysis, modality is understood as encompassing much more than simply the occurrence of overt modal auxiliaries such as *may, might, can, could, will, would, shall, should, must, and ought*. Rather, modality concerns the writer's (or speaker's) attitude toward and/or confidence in the proposition being presented.[Lillian D. 2008, p.2]

With a modal auxiliary *will*, D. Trump shows confidence in his position. He declares his desire not only to always care for the citizens of the United States of America, as it may seem at first glance, but also to always remain in the position of president.

In the following example, D. Trump is silencing specific actions that will be held to stop the spread of the infection:

- *“We will do **everything in our power** to keep the infection and those carrying the infection from entering our country” (DTC).*

2) soothing the audience;

This group consists of 3 examples:

- *“This **second chance at life is made possible** because we passed landmark Criminal Justice Reform into law. Everybody said that **Criminal Justice***

***Reform could not be done, but I got it done, and the people in this room got it done***” (TSUS).

In the foregoing words there is a sign of the authority of a politician, which thereby makes it clear to the people that they can count on him. And the use of the phrase “*chance at life is made possible*” is reassuring to the audience and at the same time soothing, showing that there is nothing to fear now, because a team of professionals led by the president are concerned about their lives and future.

- “**We** have launched ambitious new initiatives to substantially improve care for Americans with kidney disease, Alzheimer’s, and those struggling with mental health challenges. And because Congress was so good as to fund my request, **we** are pursuing new cures for childhood cancer, and **we will** eradicate the AIDS epidemic in America by the end of the decade” (TSUS).

This sentence contains a modal *will* the manipulative features of which are described in the previous examples above and repetition of the pronoun *we* which in the context of positive changes, enhances the impression of the President and his team being effective.

By repeating the phrase *we are so unified* D. Trump tries to soothe people by appealing to collective reflexology and by hinting that the united people are stronger and less prone to external influence. Through manipulation, he emphasizes the union of people and parties:

- “*Our country is doing so great. **We are so unified. We are so unified.** The Republican party has never ever been unified like it is now*” (DTC).

It is very important for a successful politician to be able to enter the trust of the audience and make her believe in her own words, because this is, in fact, based on all his future activities.

3) exhortations;

The right politician must not only speak well and correctly in order for people to understand him, but also in order to influence their consciousness in some way in the future. He must set a goal before the speech, namely, to achieve cooperation from the population. In the following example, exhortation is being implemented.

- “*But with your help, we have exposed the far left’s corruption and defeated their sinister schemes and **let’s see** what happens in the coming months. **Let’s watch. Let’s just watch. Very dishonest people**” (DTC).*

The repetition of the phrase *let’s just watch* has a double effect: on the one hand, the speaker asks not to interfere in the process, offering only to watch from the shadows, on the other hand, he encourages and asks people to follow up on the activities of a certain group of people who, in his opinion, are *very dishonest*. In this context, thy word *very* enhances negative perception and discredits the opponent by contrasting his dishonest activities with his own.

4) persuasion;

Persuasion is a way of verbal influence, which involves a system of arguments. Persuasion is a combination of information, explanation and evidence:

“*Our message is you will never escape American justice. **If you attack our citizens, you forfeit your life!**” (TSUS).*

In this example, I would like to focus on the rhetorical means that Donald Trump uses in his speech. The politician’s intonation is very important factor of his speech.

Intonation is a complex phenomenon. It includes four acoustic components: the tone of the voice, the intensity or strength of the sound, its duration and timbre.

Not only speakers, but everyone who seeks to convey their thoughts to the listener should be able to tone their speech, give it a melodic variety. The biggest drawback is monotony. Too high or too low tone also does not make speech better. Extremely high tone physically tires, causes fatigue, and low tone is often annoying, because it requires more tension from the listener. Pitch is determined by the state of the speaker, his attitude to speech and interlocutors. Emotional, enthusiastic and energetic speakers most often speak in a raised tone. Angry or arguing people do the same while shy and passive, on the contrary, speak in a low tone.[Введенская, Павлова 1998, p. 360-361]

Donald Trump is aware of the power of rhetorical means and successfully uses it in his speech. In the above example, the oscillations of the speaker's intonation are

noticeable. He speaks clearly and confidently, adjusting the pitch of speech and placing the necessary emphasis on important points. Drawing attention to the context, such intonation helps the speaker look convincing to the recipients.

5) self-justification;

This group consists of 2 examples:

*“The people are the heart of our country, their dreams are the soul of our country, and their love is what powers and sustains our country. We must always remember that our job is **to put America first!**”* (TSUS).

With these words, Trump justifies at times the tough decisions made towards other countries and their citizens. He stresses that his actions are justified by good intentions, the main one being the welfare of the citizens of the country President of which he is.

An extremely important role in the public speeches of political figures is the ability to defend their own opinions and to justify possible politically unpopular decisions. In our case, we can see enumeration of the positive changes and trends that justify the policy pursued by the politician:

- *“Jobs are booming, incomes are soaring, poverty is plummeting, crime is falling, confidence is surging, and our country is thriving and highly respected again! America’s enemies are on the run, America’s fortunes are on the rise, and America’s future is blazing bright”* (TSUS).

6) substantiation. This group consists of 2 examples:

- *“In just 3 short years, we **have shattered** the mentality of American decline, and we **have rejected** the downsizing of America’s destiny. We are moving forward at a pace that was unimaginable just a short time ago, and we are never going back!”* (TSUS).

- *“I give about 99% of the credit to Tim Scott’s mother. I do. I guarantee you, Tim, there was no games, right? There was no games in your household. It was let’s go to work, right? Great mother”* (DTC).

The politician-speaker, aiming at such an intention, first of all wants his words to be etched in the people’s memory and thus to show his power and authority.

The reference to numbers is used by the politician to back up his words with real facts, which helps him to sound more convincing. The use of the present perfect tense notes that the results of their policy are already noticeable. Donald Trump's intention could be traced by listening to the recording of his speech, where he markedly slowed down the pace of speech and significantly lowered his tone, focusing on important moments worth of people attention.

7) manifestations of duty;

This group consists of 2 examples:

- “*In reaffirming our heritage as a free Nation, we must remember that America has always been a frontier nation. Now we must embrace the next frontier, America’s manifest destiny in the stars*” (TSUS).
- “*If you want your children to inherit the blessings that generations of Americans have fought and died for, to secure, then we must devote everything we have towards a victory in November of 2020, November 3rd to be exact*” (DTC).

Fowler (1985) proposes 5 categories of modality which indicate speakers’ or writers’ attitudes to the proposition they utter. The attitudes fall into the areas of *validity* – the speaker expresses greater or lesser confidence in the truth of the proposition; *predictability* – the future events referred to are more or less likely to happen; *desirability* – practical, moral, or aesthetic judgments; *obligation* – speaker’s judgment that another person is obligated to perform some action; *permission* – speaker allows addressee to perform some action.

The first two categories, *validity* and *predictability*, correspond roughly to von Wright’s epistemic category and to Jespersen’s category “containing no element of will”, while the remaining three, *desirability*, *obligation*, and *permission* correspond roughly to von Wright’s deontic category and to Jespersen’s category of “containing an element of will”. [Lillian D. 2008, p.3]

The category of obligation that shows speaker’s judgment that another people are obligated to perform some actions is represented in the examples. By the words *must remember*, *must embrace the frontier*, *must devote* Trump means that people have to fulfill their civic duty. He states this, among other things, in an open context.

8) providing confidence;

- *“I am thrilled to report to you tonight that our economy is **the best** it has ever been. Our military is completely **rebuilt**, with its power being unmatched anywhere in the world — and it is not even close. Our borders are secure. Our families are flourishing. Our values are **renewed**. Our pride is **restored**. And for all these reasons, I say to the people of our great country, and to the Members of Congress before me: The State of our Union is **stronger** than ever before!”*(TSUS)

Degrees of comparison are used in the passage to evaluate the qualitative positive changes that America has undergone under Trump's presidency. The words with the prefix “re-” are used to create the illusion of renovation outdated concepts providing them with new content that is required in modern realities. All the changes that Trump lists are positive. The speaker does not mention the negative points in his political activity. People who do not follow the politics and economy of their country, but only listen to promising speeches, can really feel confident in the politicians who proclaim them.

Analyzing D. Trump's speech, we can also distinguish such groups of intentions as:

1) promises:

- *“But Obamacare is a very — it’s very bad. And if we win, **I will do healthcare**. If we get the House. If we get back the House — you can’t do it without the House”* (DTIWT).

This intention implies a change in attitude and opinion of the listeners, because usually after successful promises, the speaker becomes affectionate.

The words “*intend, improve, reach, certain*”, as well as a modal verb expressing intention, determination, and promise, will testify to the “spirit” of the promise:

- *“I feel that the justices that I am going to appoint — and I've named 20 of them — the justices that I'm going to appoint **will be** pro-life. They **will have** a conservative bent. They **will be protecting** the Second Amendment. They are great scholars in all cases, and they're people of tremendous respect. They **will interpret***

*the Constitution the way the founders wanted it interpreted. And I believe that's very, very important” (TSUS).*

*“I also promised our citizens that I would impose tariffs to confront China’s massive theft of American jobs. Our strategy worked. Days ago, we signed the groundbreaking new agreement with China that **will defend** our workers, protect our intellectual property, bring billions of dollars into our treasury, and open vast new markets for products made and grown right here in the United States of America” (TSUS).*

*“So to all Americans, in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, and from ocean to ocean, hear these words: **You will never be ignored again”** (TSUS).*

The example above promises a better future for Americans. In this way, forcing people to opt for the better promised future in which Trump is a guarantor.

2) criticism:

*“In 8 years under the **last administration**, over 300,000 working-age people dropped out of the workforce. In just 3 years **of my administration**, 3.5 million working-age people have joined the workforce.” (TSUS).*

In this example, D. Trump uses a hidden critique of previous power. He wants to emphasize that the policy of the previous government was not as effective as his.

Trump adheres to discrediting strategy. In this way he discredits his opponent:

*“We need a Supreme Court that in my opinion is going to uphold the Second Amendment, and all amendments, but the Second Amendment, which is under absolute siege. **I believe if my opponent should win this race, which I truly don't think will happen, we will have a Second Amendment which will be a very, very small replica of what it is right now**. But I feel that it's absolutely important that we uphold, because of the fact that it is under such trauma” (TSUS).*

The mechanism of verbal influence on a person is also based on the interaction of word and meaning. The professional politician in his communication strives for accuracy of definition, but sometimes he veils his goals with the means of ellipse,

nomination, metaphorization, special intonation, resorting to the distortion of information:

- *“Since my election, we have created 7 million new jobs — 5 million more than Government experts projected during the previous administration”* (TSUS).

Thus, analyzing the manipulation of Donald Trump's speeches and using Sternin's classification, eight groups of ideas (intentions) were identified, among them are: silencing facts, soothing the audience, exhortations, persuasion, self-justification, substantiation, manifestations of duty and providing confidence. There were also identified two groups of intentions – promises and criticism. In addition to linguistic manipulation tools, Donald Trump makes good use of rhetorical manipulation tools. Particular attention was paid to the fluctuation of the speaker's intonation in order to engage the audience, focus more on some important facts, and shape the attitude of the audience toward the ideas being proclaimed.

## **2.2 Linguistic means of manipulation in Donald Trump's political interviews**

Political interviewing is a genre that is best understood in terms of its formal and functional characteristics, such as institutional conversation, political discourse, media discourse and mediatorial discourse. With regard to the first of these components, the institutional setting in which political interviews are conducted clearly defines the roles, functions and main goals / motives of the participants. [Péter Furkó, p. 152].

The analysis makes it possible to identify the following groups of linguistic means of different levels:

- 1) hyperbole at the lexical level;
- 2) metaphor at the lexical level;
- 3) antithesis at the lexical;
- 4) anaphora at the syntactic level;

5) the superlative form of adverbs and adjectives at the syntactic level.

Hyperbole is one of the most commonly used lexical linguistic means of manipulation since ancient times and still people use it in their speeches, considering its ability to influence recipients' perception. Hyperbole successfully distinguishes the positive features of a described object or notion, making them brighter and more prominent, while even minimal negative traits, when hyperbole is used to describe them, completely lose their appeal and value to the audience. In the following example, D. Trump uses hyperbole and appeals to the patriotism of Americans, claiming that their country is the most unique in the world:

- “*We’re **the only country in the world** with the things that we have to do, and the Democrats could easily fix it, but they want open borders – which means crimes, it means drugs*” (DTIWT).

Hyperbole can be realized through comparison:

- “***Nobody’s** gone through and **nobody** has been treated as unfairly as Donald Trump*” (DTIWT).

- “*When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice. The Bible tells us, “How good and pleasant it is when God’s people live together in unity. We must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity. When America is united, America is totally **unstoppable**”* (DTIWT).

The President wants to stress that unity is the key to success. The country must be united and only in this case it will become a strong state. The people and the authorities must work towards common goals. Describing the future outcome of such joint work of citizens and government, the speaker does not use such common and neutral (to some extent) adjectives like rich, blossoming, powerful and so on, he uses the word “unstoppable” which can be considered as hyperbole that enhances expressiveness and testifies to the grandeur and scale of the president's plans for the country.

The president’s use of hyperbolization is aimed at providing an emotional impact on the audience, affects the patriotic feelings of Americans and makes them

feel proud of their own nation. In the following example, we can see the combination of hyperbola and antithesis:

- “*But what is a problem is that the **United States takes care of the world, and the world doesn’t take care of the world. The world doesn’t want to take care of itself***” (DTIWT).

In this way, the politician opposes America to the whole world, at the same time showing them equal magnitudes.

Hyperbole acts as a characteristic tool for interviewing calls. A technique based on excessive exaggeration uses D. Trump to emphasize the uniqueness of the American nation in the world:

- “*As the world bears witness tonight, America is a **land of heroes. This is the place where greatness is born, where destinies are forged, and where legends come to life.*** ” (TSUS).

A metaphor is a figure of speech that describes an object or action in a way that is not literally true but helps to explain an idea or make a comparison. Features of the metaphor make it possible to use it as a universal means of manipulation.

Trump actively uses metaphors and personifications in describing problems of the recent past:

- “*I’ll say, “Mr. Senators, let me tell you something. **South Carolina does want to win**”* (DTC).

The metaphor of construction and reconstruction is often found in his interview:

- “***We are stronger, we are better, but while we are building a great future, the radical left Democrats in Washington are trying to burn it all down***” (DTC).

Politicians often use metaphor in their speeches for the limits of the individual and the general. On the one hand, their vocabulary is political, legal, economic, rich in terminology, and on the other, they use expressive vocabulary and texts designed for a wide audience. Metaphors make political appearances more emotional and colorful:

- “Jobs are **booming**, incomes are **soaring**, factories are **returning**, poverty is **plummeting**, confidence is **surging**, and we have completely rebuilt the awesome power of the United States military. Our country is stronger than ever before” (DTC).

By the way, the indication that Donald Trump took an advantage of carefully constructed speeches aimed at manipulating the emotional sphere of the audience may be the fact that the passage above is repeated in various speeches (TSUS/DTC).

In this sentence we see the use of the famous American metaphorical phrase “American Dream”:

- “The next step forward in building an inclusive society is making sure that every young American gets a great education and the opportunity to achieve the **American Dream**. Yet, for too long, countless American children have been trapped in failing government schools” (TSUS).

Antithesis is usually based on, but not limited to, two words that are opposite, or differ in a large list of features. In the following example antithesis is semantic rather than lexical, so it may include words different parts of the language that represent opposite entities:

- “So really we’re down to two candidates, right? **Sleepy Joe Biden and crazy Bernie**” (DTC).

D. Trump’s use of the antithesis technique enhances the expressiveness of his speech, allows you to have an emotional impact on the audience to emphasize the need to solve problems in the country:

- “We are stronger, we are better, but while **we are building a great future**, the **radical left Democrats in Washington are trying to burn it all down**” (DTC).

Antithesis emphasises the contrast between two ideas. The structure of the phrases / clauses is usually similar in order to draw the reader's / listener's attention directly to the contrast:

“**Nobody** got it approved. **I** got it approved. They are starting ANWR shortly. **I** got ANWR approved” (DTIWT).

Anaphora like a repetition of syntactic constructions with the same initial element is also a commonly used tool. In the following examples, the manipulator uses an syntactic anaphoric design to emphasize the difference between what its competitor tells voters and what she or he thinks is or is about to do:

- *“**Ronald Reagan tried** to get it approved, everybody tried to get it approved. Nobody got it approved. I got it approved. They are starting ANWR shortly. I got ANWR approved. It’s as big as Saudi Arabia they say, in Alaska. I got it approved. Nobody else got it approved. **Ronald Reagan tried**, couldn’t do it. Bush tried. Everybody. Presidents, even Democratic presidents tried. They couldn’t get it approved. I got it approved”* (DTIWT).

The anaphoric reiteration of the phrase “we will” emphasizes the involvement of all American citizens in the process of future transformations. Trump does not separate himself from society, forming a sense of unity and significance of each.

It should be noted that the pronoun “we” is found in speech 256 times (DTC). A similar anaphoric repetition in combination with the use of parallel constructions occurs repeatedly:

- *“Together we will elect a Republican Congress to create a fair, safe, sane, and lawful system finally of immigration. **We will** continue to enact new trade deals that result in more products proudly stamped with beautiful phrase, “Made in the USA.” **We will** achieve new breakthroughs in science and medicine, finding new cures for childhood cancer, infectious diseases like we’re working on right now, and ending the AIDS epidemic”* (DTC).

There is anaphora in this sentences that helps to manipulate:

- *“It turned out to be a great political **movement** because of you. A great **movement**. A **movement** made up of hard working patriots who love their country, love their flag, love their children, and who believe that a nation must care for its own citizens first”* (PTO).

Using the highest degree of comparison is a means more individual than the means mentioned above. Adjectives and adverbs used by the speaker can be divided into two subgroups: positive and negative.

The following example illustrates a negative description of certain situations to counteract the positive properties of the manipulator:

- *“First, we have to figure out who would be the **weakest** candidate against President Trump. And then if it’s legal, I always say if it’s permissible by law, because they have so many little booby traps, but they only like getting the Republicans. Democrats skirt, right?” (DTC).*

The following example illustrates a positive description:

- *“You have the **best** year ever on record, right? Southeast, **best** year you’ve ever had, right? You have a great governor, you have two senators, great congressman, the greatest year you’ve ever had, but some people in South Carolina are getting a little tired, I’m surprised to hear this, of winning” (DTC).*

Political discourse is a multifaceted and multilayered phenomenon. The use of a variety of rhetorical means provides a broad basis for manipulation of recipients' consciousness (voters). The manipulation of meaning influences the process of thinking and, accordingly, the perception and structuring of reality. The analysis makes it possible to identify such rhetorical means of manipulation as hyperbole, metaphor, antithesis and anaphora.

### **2.3 Linguistic means of manipulation in Donald Trump’s electioneering**

When submitting information intended for manipulation, the means of its presenting may play an important role. Written texts sometimes are not so effective when it comes to successful mass manipulation in comparison with the other forms of information presenting. In terms of linguistics, linguistic material used in a speech and, for example, in an article of a popular newspaper (of one and the same politician) will be different, although the purpose will be the same. Only critically thinking people or linguists can read between the lines and understand the real purpose of usage of specific lexical units, grammatical constructs, or rhetorical means by a politician and only then make judgments or accept decisions on the basis of gained knowledge.

However, when dealing with oral presentations or speeches, the situation is completely different. Listening to the speaker, we concentrate on the common meaning of his or her words. As a rule, one cannot stop the speaker in order to take a pause to think about as well as to ask him or her to repeat what was said to make sure that everything was heard correctly. Thus, oral speech has a so-called "general effect" on recipients. If it is well structured, has a specific purpose, and the speaker makes effective use of non-verbal communication, this information can have a big impact on the listener. Most pre-election speeches are not in vain for public speaking or debate. In some countries, even political trips to different cities of the country before the elections are popular, with the aim of giving a credible and promising speech to the electorate.

These and other factors form the basis for the main classification types of language manipulation covered in linguistic literature and works in the field of psychology.

Speeches of Donald Trump within his presidential campaign are dominated by emotional manipulation:.

- “*You know why? They target our farmers because they know It’s one of our great strengths. It’s us, it’s not me, it’s us altogether. They know it’s one of our great strengths*” (PTO).

It is well known that there are two types of emotional manipulation: direct and indirect.

According to the character of *subject-object interaction*, manipulation can be *direct* when the subject is openly presenting his demands to the object of manipulation and *indirect* when the manipulation is directed at the environment rather than at the object. Direct method of linguistic manipulation includes such forms of the language system that are associated with certain meaning directly expressing corresponding illocution. [Akopova 2013: 98].

Indirect manipulation in D. Trump’s electioneering is expressed by constantly use of the personal pronoun “we”. Indirect manipulation significantly prevails in the material analyzed within the frames of this research. Here are

several examples where Trump uses the personal pronoun “we”, refers to the people as “the nation” and “Americans”:

- *We are stronger, we are better, but while we are building a great future, the radical left Democrats in Washington are trying to burn it all down.* (DTC)
- *We’re doing great. Our country is doing so great. We are so unified. We are so unified.* (DTC)
- *“We are one people. We are one family. And we are one glorious nation under god”* (PTO).
- *“Because we are Americans and our hearts bleed red, white, and blue”* (PTO).

Direct manipulation in other words, self-praise expressed by repetition of the personal pronoun “I”:

- *“I will soon have appointed my 145th judge. President Obama was very nice to us. He didn't fill the positions. I get there the first day. "How many judges do I have to appoint?", they said, "Sir, 139.", now it's 145 and we've just finished number 107, already approved sitting on the bench, how about that?”* (PTO).
- *Nobody got it approved. I got it approved. They are starting ANWR shortly. I got ANWR approved. It's as big as Saudi Arabia they say, in Alaska. I got it approved. Nobody else got it approved. Ronald Reagan tried, couldn't do it. Bush tried. Everybody. Presidents, even Democratic presidents tried. They couldn't get it approved. I got it approved”* (DTIWT).
- *“You remember during one of the debates, when Crooked Hillary said, "If I win, are you going to support me?", but I must be honest, I didn't give her a great answer. That was a very – I might have been my hardest question during the debates. Isn't it amazing that it worked the other way around, right? Is isn't it amazing?”* (PTO).

According to awareness of linguistic actions, manipulation can be intentional and non-intentional. In case of intentional linguistic manipulation,

the subject aims at a definite result on the part of the object of manipulation. Non-intentional linguistic manipulation is exercised involuntarily, as the subject does not aim at achieving results from the listener [Akopova 2013: 98].

Intentional manipulation we can see in the following example:

- “*They tried to take away your dignity and your destiny, but **we will never let them do that, will we?** Many times I said, “We would drain the swamp.”, and that's exactly what we're doing right now, we're draining the swamp” (PTO).*

Non-intentional manipulation is in the following example:

- “*I built up the military, imposed sanctions on Russia, and provided alternative energy sources for all over Europe that competed very, very strongly with Russia. **We are, by the way, the No.1 producer of energy in the world because of what we've done right now**” (PTO).*

Also, Donald Trump proceeds with one of his favorite tactics, which is promise:

- “*Here is my promise to the American voter: If I am elected President, **I will end the special interest monopoly in Washington, D.C**” (PTO).*
- “***I promise** you, Casey. She'll be tough, right? But a woman who's, a special woman and right – and her father, by the way, he's out there fighting for us all the time, Sarah Huckabee Sanders” (PTO).*

Also, the tactic of promise is actualized with the help of lexical formatives with the future form (I am going, they will):

- “*So if you either shut down this rigged system once and for all, then show up November 3rd, that's your day, big day, and vote, vote, vote, **we're going to have a big, big day**” (PTO).*
- “*This is everything they wanted, 132 miles already. **We'll have 500 miles built** by very early next year sometime. One of the reasons the numbers are so good. **We will do** everything in our power to keep the infection and those carrying the infection from entering our country.”(DTC)*

- “And Comcast, a company that spends millions and millions of dollars on their image... **I’ll do** everything possible to destroy their image because they are terrible. They are terrible. They’re a terrible group of people.”(DTC)

- “If our veterans can't get the care they need from the VA, **they will** have the right to go see a private doctor. **We’ll** pay for the doctor. And frankly, **we’ll** save a lot of money. **We’ll** help a lot of vets” (PTO).

- “And I'm telling you, I know him well, he's a great, great guy. **He is going** to be an incredible governor, I have no doubt — I have no doubt. I don't do these endorsements easily. I don't need to be here but I happen to love this state so it (inaudible)” (PTO).

To conclude, we may say if the political speech is well structured, has a specific purpose, and the speaker makes effective use of non-verbal communication, the information he or she affirms can have a big impact on the listener. The study shows that Donald Trump uses carefully prepared speeches to manipulate the emotional sphere of the audience. In his speeches he uses linguistic and rhetorical means of manipulation.

## CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 2

Exploring the features and characteristics of political discourse helps to identify the distinctive features and important components of a particular culture and to relate it to the political situation in real time in order to better understand the true intentions and goals hidden in the speeches of politicians. Another important feature of political discourse analysis is the identification of tools that demonstrate the most effective strategies and methods to engage the audience and inspire confidence in people.

It was found out that in the process of text creation, the authors of manipulation discourse often choose the most neutral word from the semantic field, though even a neutral word in a certain context may perform the role of impact, because in contrast to the word with an expressive negative connotation it transfers a positive estimation of this issue in a hidden form, reflecting the position of the whole ideological system, and, vice versa, while describing events, criticized by this system, emotional words with negative connotation are chosen.

In this chapter we found out that many units of political language mean complexes of ideas far removed from direct human experience. Taking into account the Sternin's classification, the following groups of ideas (intentions) were identified during the study: silencing the facts, soothing the audience, exhortations, persuasion, self-justification, substantiation, manifestations of duty and providing confidence. Analyzing D. Trump's speech, one can also distinguish such groups of intentions as promises and criticism.

In addition to linguistic manipulation tools, Donald Trump makes good use of rhetorical manipulation tools. Particular attention was paid to the fluctuation of the speaker's intonation. Intonation is a complex phenomenon that includes four acoustic components: the tone of the voice, the intensity or strength of the sound, its duration and timbre. Not only speakers, but everyone who seeks to convey their thoughts to the listener should be able to tone their speech, give it a melodic variety. In order to engage the audience, focus attention of the listeners on some important facts, and

shape the attitude of the audience toward the ideas being proclaimed, Donald Trump often changes it during the speech. He always speaks clearly and confidently, adjusting the pitch of speech and placing the necessary emphasis on important points.

Degrees of comparison that are often used in the discourse of the politician evaluate the qualitative positive changes that America has undergone under his presidency. Also, typical for Donald Trump speeches is that he does not mention the negative points in his political activity. People who do not follow the politics and economy of their country, but only listen to promising speeches, can really feel confident in the politicians who proclaim them.

Political discourse is a multifaceted and multilayered phenomenon. The use of a variety of linguistic and rhetorical means provides a broad basis for manipulation of recipients' consciousness. The manipulation of meaning influences the process of thinking and, accordingly, the perception and structuring of reality.

### **3. LINGUISTIC MANIPULATION IN JOSEPH BIDEN'S DISCOURSE**

New digital technologies have taken center stage in political processes – both as a source of information and a campaigning platform. In critical moments of public life, citizens increasingly consult social media for news about politics and public affairs. Such new and relatively unregulated platforms create new opportunities for nefarious actors to deliberately push false content and distort information flows for political gain.[Neudert, Marchal, 2019, p. 3]

The United States is actively preparing for the November 3, 2020 elections. According to opinion polls, after Senator Bernie Sanders withdrew his candidacy, social media nominated two main candidates for the presidency – incumbent President Donald Trump and former Vice President Joseph Biden. All politicians have a number of speeches and interviews to attract voter support. This enables the people to understand the ideology of the presidential candidate and learn more about the politician himself, including his previous activities and plans for the future. Our aim is to analyze their political discourses in terms of linguistic and rhetorical manipulations used in their political discourse.

The previous section was devoted to an analysis of Donald Trump's public speeches as the incumbent US president and 2020 presidential candidate. The objective of this Chapter is to identify the main types of linguistic manipulation used by Joseph Biden during electoral campaigns. The material used for the analysis is taken from printed pre-election speeches of presidential candidate.

#### **3.1. Linguistic means of manipulation in Joseph Biden's political speeches**

Manipulation is a negative socio-psychological phenomenon that has a detrimental effect on humans and society as a whole. It is a fairly universal phenomenon; it can be found in all socially significant spheres of human life. However, it should be noted that linguistic manipulation is seen as one of the

important features of everyday human communication. The object of political manipulation is the hidden expectations of people.

In this part of the master's thesis, Joe Biden's manipulations from a linguistic point of view were explored.

The rhetorical techniques used by the politician can be traditionally referred to as tropes and figures. Tropes, by creating connotations and spreading the meaning of words, can direct associations in the desired producer direction, which means that paths can be manipulated.

Irony, hyperbole, metaphor, antithesis, meiosis, anaphora, periphrasis, enhance the image by enhancing the denotative information.

Taking into account the Sternin's classification, we have analyzed groups of ideas (intentions) in Joseph Biden's political speeches:

- 1) silencing the facts;

This group consists of one example.

- “*We need you. We want you. There's a place in our campaign for each of you*” (JBSIP).

In this example, Joe Biden makes a statement without disclosing what it really means. Saying that everyone will find a place, he does not specify what places people can count on. Lexical repetitions enhance the effect of manipulation. In this way, the politician tries to address not all voters at once, but each one. In this way, the listeners really pay more attention to the words spoken by a speaker when he addresses them personally.

Using manipulation in their discourse, politicians do not tell lies, they only successfully present the truth profitably to themselves. Manipulation in political discourse is probably one of the most commonly encountered people. Only advertising can compete with it. Politicians play on human emotions and feelings, pulling the strings at the right time.

- 2) soothing the audience;

This group consists of 3 examples:

- *“And at this moment when there’s so much fear in the country and there’s so much fear across the world, we need American leadership. We need presidential leadership that’s honest, trusted, truthful, and steady, reassuring leadership. If I’m given the honor of becoming your president, I promise you **I’ll strive to give the nation that very leadership every day, every day I have a privilege to hold office.**”(JBSIP).*

In this passage, Biden plays on the human sense of fear. The coronavirus pandemic was a completely new concept that took people's lives. People are scared of a new dangerous disease and the politician knows about it. He uses hyperbole, talking about fear and then soothes the audience that he is ready to fight it. He shows that the people have someone to rely on in difficult times.

For a successful politician, it is important to be able to gain the trust of the audience and make them believe in politician’s words. In fact, all his future activities are based on it. Successful politician must not only gain the trust of his constituents, but also soothe them.

Biden reassures people that bad times will soon pass. Discrediting the opponent, using antithesis he opposes himself to Trump:

- *“We can’t let that happen, but winning means, but winning means uniting America, not sowing more division and anger. It means having a president who **not only knows how to fight, but knows how to heal**. It means, replacing a president who demeans and demonizes people with a president who believes in empathy, compassion, and respect for everyone” (JBSIP)*

It is important for a politician to feel trust and support of the audience. In order to achieve better results, Joe Biden often combines several means of linguistic manipulation.

J. Biden points to the inevitable fulfillment of the stated goal, and therefore, he seems to soothe the public:

- *“**To all those** who have been knocked down, **to all those** have been counted out, left behind, this is your campaign. Just over a week ago, many of the*

*pundits declared that this candidacy was dead. Now we're very much alive*" (JBSIP)

– This example shows combination of anaphora and metaphor.

3) exhortations;

This group consists of 3 examples:

- *"If I'm given the honor of becoming your president, **I promise you** I'll strive to give the nation that very leadership every day, every day I have a privilege to hold office."* (JBSIP).

The politician asks the audience to give him a chance to realize his political ambitions as President.

- *"**We have to** make sure everyone has access to maintain affordable health insurance coverage. **We should** be making it easier, not harder. Let me put it another way. It makes no sense. **It makes no sense** to be fighting in court right now to try to take away Obamacare from people who need it more than ever. **It makes no sense** not to open up a new enrollment period in the middle of this pandemic so that people who need insurance can get it now. As we look at the next steps that are needed, **we should** boost the subsidies for Obamacare, give them affordable coverage"* (JBVTH).

This example shows recipients that the speaker is well versed in social policy. While recommending certain changes, he addresses both the people who need these changes and those who are implementing them. In our opinion, the exhortation here is manifested in the fact that the speaker asks to give him a chance to implement these changes in the lives of Americans.

- *"**We should have** a rent freeze and a moratorium on evictions during this public health crisis because no one **should have** to worry about losing their home during a pandemic or where they live during a pandemic"* (JBVTH).

Modal verbs, such as *have to* and *should*, give the motive tint in the examples. They appeal to people's minds and encourage them to act. Repetitions of the phrase "*it makes no sense*" Biden points to the inaction of the previous government.

4) persuasion;

Technological progress has led to the improvement of mass media and the development of new ways of information exchanging. In turn, there was a need to develop new means of persuasion with psychological and emotional impact on recipients. This group consists of 3 examples:

- *We have to stand up to the gun manufacturers and to the NRA and **I will do it.*** (JBSIP)

The politician takes responsibility, convincing people that he will fight for their rights.

- *“I know that we’ll come through this challenge stronger than ever, just as we have every crisis we’ve ever faced in this nation. There’s nothing Americans can’t achieve when we do it together”* (JBVTH).

The main purpose of political communication is “to reach and retain power, and strategies and tactics of influence that are aimed at convincing the addressee of the correctness of his position as opposed to those of political opponents, are of particular importance” [Миронова 2000, p. 113].

The following example confirms that Biden uses a combination of several manipulative tactics. Firstly, it is a tactic of overloading consciousness with numbers and facts, secondly, the use of repetitions:

- *“The two things that we have to make sure **you** have a place to go to is when **you** go to your employment office, they’re able to pay **you** what **you** are entitled under the law and it’s an added **\$600** bonus from whatever the state had was going to pay before, essentially rendering **you** whole up to **\$75,000** and **I** know that’s not what you’re making right now. **I** assume that’s not what you’re making now, but up to that amount of money and the direct cash payment that we sent to you in the mail to your address that the Congress voted for through the IRS”* (JBVTH).

5) self-justification;

This group consists of 2 examples:

- *“We can’t just return to an unfair, unequal economy that’s stacked against American workers. We already know we’re going to need more resources, a lot more. More people are going to need help”* (JBVTH).

- *“I’ll try ... it’s complicated, but in one sense it shouldn’t be complicated”* (JBVTH).

Biden speaks of the impossibility or complexity of certain actions, giving arguments that confirm this.

6) substantiation;

This group consists of 3 examples:

- *“You or the outfit you work for did nothing through their fault to cause that insurance to not be able to be funded. That’s why we set up the COBRA plan years ago to begin with”* (JBVTH).

The politician explains why certain groups of the population may face difficult choices:

- *Black Americans are also less likely to have a job they can do just from home. Like many Latinos in America, they’re more likely to have to choose between their health, and their healthcare, and their paycheck.* (JBVTH)

J. Biden wants to be etched in the memory of the people, and thus to show his authority. In this passage, Joe Biden turns to rhetorical means of manipulation. He significantly slowed down the pace of speech and lowered the tone, focusing on the power:

- *“In the meantime though, what we have to do is significantly increase, significantly increase the number of tests that are available, the testing kits that are available and all the protective gear that’s available so doctors and nurses can deal with this pandemic in a way where we don’t lose them, that they’re able to take care of our health. That’s why, again, going back to this Defense Production Act”* (JBVTH).

7) manifestations of duty;

This group consists of 4 examples:

In the following examples, by using the repetition of the modal verbs the politician encourages people for actions:

- “My fellow Americans, we **have to** once again lead the world. Donald Trump’s America First policies made America alone. And the fight against climate change, we **have to** rally the rest of the world to act and act now” (JBSIP).

- “The other thing is we **have to** take care of seniors better. We **should** be increasing Social Security payments now. They’re struggling. They’re having real problems now. We **should** be increasing Social Security payments across the board, \$200 for everybody, besides reforming the system down the road to make it more applicable and more generous” (JBVTH).

- “We **have to** stand up to the gun manufacturers and to the NRA and I will do it. We **have to** rebuild the middle class, we **have to** rebuild the middle class and this time bring everybody along, everybody along” (JBSIP).

The politician calls not only for action, but also for counteraction:

- “I believe this nation can overcome four years of Donald Trump but given eight, four more years, he’ll forever and fundamentally changed the very character of this nation. **We can’t let that happen**, but winning means, but winning means uniting America, not sowing more division and anger.” (JBSIP).

In other words, there is a sign of the authority of a politician, which thereby makes it clear to the people that they can count on him.

8) providing confidence;

This group consists of 5 examples:

Biden makes people believe in his steadfast intentions and assurances that he will take care of the citizens in the future:

- “I believe we’re in an incredible moment in American history, a phenomenal opportunity to deliver a bold, progressive vision to the American people. **Guaranteeing** that every American has healthcare, affordable healthcare, total healthcare, not a privilege but a right.” (JBSIP)

- *“Make it clear to our allies that **we’ll honor our commitments**, that **our word can be trusted**. And make clear to our adversaries that **we will stand fast in restoring world order**. That’s the American responsibility.”* (JBSIP)

The speaker sounds convincing because he openly states that he knows how to act in a certain situation:

- *“Death rates, nearly six times higher. That’s unconscionable and never should happen. We need more data. We also need more data on how the Latino and other communities of color are impacted, other minority communities, so we know exactly what has to be done”.* (JBVTH)

In the following example, listeners can feel confident because there is a political force that will control the issue:

- *“**We have to make sure** everyone has access to maintain affordable health insurance coverage. **We should be making** it easier, not harder”* (JBVTH).

The tactic of promise is actualized with the help of lexical formatives with the future form (I will, we are going):

- *“As a consequence, when we get through this, **we’re going** to be able to do so much better than we’ve done in the past. Let me stop now and take any questions you all may have. **I’ll** leave it to you, Senator, how we go from here”* (JBVTH).

Frequent repetition of a phrase “*how valuable*” is making its context hyperbolized, forcing the listener to focus on what the speaker is saying:

- *“By the way, you know what we’re realizing with all this crisis? **How valuable, how valuable** unions are, **how valuable** it is that we have an IBW, that we have people who in fact are first responders. **How valuable** the people we didn’t look to before and didn’t say, “Thank you”* (JBVTH).

Analyzing J. Biden’s speech, we can also distinguish such groups of intentions as:

- 1) promises:

- “I have a lot more to say, but I’ve said too much. I get too passionate about it, but **I promise you**, Senator, we can get through this. As you’ve heard me say before, Wall Street didn’t build this country” (JBVTH).

- If I’m given the honor of becoming your president, **I promise you** I’ll strive to give the nation that very leadership every day, every day I have a privilege to hold office. (JBSIP).

The firm intentions of a politician can also be considered as a promise in this context:

- “The money and the plans that are in the Cares Act won’t be enough in the first time around. **We’re going to have to do more**. The unemployment insurance payments, they will have to keep people afloat” (JBVTH).

- “I’m anxious to hear your questions, but I tell you what, **I promise you**, we will get through this. You’ve heard me talk about the soul of America, Senator, and I talk about we need to restore it” (JBVTH).

## 2) criticism.

In these examples, J. Biden uses a hidden critique of previous power. He emphasizes on the “rebuiding of the economics”. He wants to emphasize that the policy of the government was not really effective.

- “These past few weeks have been devastating for our economy. We’re going to have to do an awful lot of work to **rebuild** after this is over. As I said over and over in the past weeks, I believe that a top priority for us is using the money, the \$2 trillion from the so called Cares Act that Congress passed, to keep as many workers on payroll as possible so they can hit the ground running, but so many people, including some of you, have already lost your jobs” (JBVTH).

- “We share a common goal and together we’ll defeat Donald Trump. We’ll defeat him together. We’re going to bring this nation together. We’re regenerating a democratic base, the Democratic Party, the African American community, high school educated folks, like the ones I grew up with in Claymont, not far from here in my old neighborhood, labor, suburban women, veterans, firefighters, union members and so many more” (JBSIP).

Joe Biden considers the incumbent President of America to be the main competitor in the 2020 elections. It is not weird that he often criticizes and discredits his administration in his public speeches:

- “*For a while, **Trump** was talking as if we had to choose between our public health and our economy, but they’re inextricably linked*” ” (JBVTH).
- “*So we can’t let the public sector workers risk losing pay. Instead, we have to encourage the privatization of the public sector as **President Trump** has done, that’s not what we should be doing. We need to boost support for state and local governments who are always and make sure that we’re going to have their backs and it means fighting, I would argue, for unions to make sure public sector employees have a voice in the workplace that they deserve*” (JBVTH).
- “*With **Donald Trump** as president, our core values are standing in the world, our very democracy, everything that has made America America is truly at stake*” (JBSIP).

Thus, Joe Biden's political speeches were analyzed by eight groups of intentions: silencing the facts, soothing the audience, exhortations, persuasion, self-justification, substantiation, manifestations of duty and providing confidence. It is important for a politician to feel trust and support of the audience. In order to achieve better results, Joe Biden often combines several means of linguistic manipulation. Analyzing J. Biden’s speeches, we can also distinguish such groups of intentions as: promises and criticism. Compared to Donald Trump's speeches, Joe Biden is more likely to make promises in his political discourse. Also, a politician often criticizes and discredits his main competitor in elections.

### **3.2 Linguistic means of manipulation in Joseph Biden’s political interviews**

Interviews may be either structured or unstructured. In the case of the former, the interviewer has well defined questions presented in a set sequence. Such questionnaires can only be used when a certain amount is already known about the topic/situation being studied. The unstructured interview, where the researcher has

only a list of topics which can be added to or changed in the course of the interview, is employed when little is known about the subject of study.

The depth interview is a one-to-one encounter, concluded at length, that enables the researcher to tackle sensitive and/or potentially embarrassing topics with the individual. Depth interviews are also useful when the decisions or behaviour under study are complex. [Crawford, 1997, ch.9]

An analysis of Joseph Biden's political discourse has revealed that the vast majority of the interviews he gives are mostly structured and in-depth. The interviewer is well acquainted with the previous activities of the politician, his political views and previous statements, so during the interview, the questions asked to the respondent are clear and with references to specific data.

The analysis makes it possible to identify the following rhetorical means of manipulation of different levels: hyperbole at the lexical level, metaphor at the lexical level, antithesis at the lexical, epithets at the lexical level, anaphora at the syntactic level, and others.

Hyperbole is one of the most commonly used rhetorical figure in J. Biden's interviews:

- “*We have to restore the integrity of this country internationally. We have to get off of **this God-awful effort** on this president's part to divide the country*” (JBOFN).

- “*They are all the reasons why I'm running, among others. But look, the next president of the United States also is gonna have to stand on the stage on day one and **lead the world***” (JBOFN).

- “*All those other polls you all cite also show **I'm the most person, I'm the- the person most likely to be Trump**. I'm the person that, in fact, in those polls in addition to that, **I'm the only one**, in terms of the Russians and all this stuff you've all been reporting*” (JBOFN).

We have said, that metaphor is a figure of speech that describes an object or action in a way that is not literally true but helps to explain an idea or make a

comparison. This allows the speakers to use it as a universal means of manipulation.

J. Biden uses metaphors in describing problems of the recent past:

- *“I’m prepared to do that. To the best of my knowledge, there’s been no complaints made against me in terms of my Senate career, in terms of my office. Look, this is **an open book**. There’s nothing for me to hide. Nothing at all”* (JBATRA).

On the one hand, Joe Biden's vocabulary is political and rich in terminology, and on the other, he uses expressive vocabulary and texts designed for a wide audience. Idioms he uses in his discourse make his speech more emotional and colorful:

- *“The White House is **shedding light**. The President is angry because the intelligence community, in fact, informed Bernie Sanders and I guess others and members of the Intelligence Committee that, in fact, the Russians want to see Trump reelected. And they like Bernie”* (JBOFN).

In this sentence we see the use of personification in J. Biden’s interview:

- *“Well, they weren’t supposed to be revealed. I gave them to the university, and **the university said** it’s going to take them time to go through all the boxes”* (JBATRA).

In Biden’s interviews, antithesis is manifested in phrases that are usually similar in order to draw the reader's attention directly to the contrast:

- *“**I assume** that's part of the reason why those numbers are down. But **I don't know**”* (JBOFN).

In political interviews, Biden often uses antithesis to contrast his "right" actions with "wrong" actions of an opponent in order to influence the opinion of the audience.

One of J. Biden's most widely used stylistic figure is epithet:

- *“And we have to have an immigration policy that, in fact, is **rational** and **reasonable** and represents who we are. They are all the reasons why I'm running, among others”* (JBOFN).

The use of epithets in this passage makes the speech more emotional:

- “That if you got any **negative** information about someone else from **another** from a **foreign** source, you would not use it. And if you got any information that they were trying to interfere, you'd report it” (JBOFN).

The politician often resorts to repetitions in his speeches. Thus, the repeated material stands out in the flow of speech as one that deserves additional attention and comprehension:

- “Because the facts are, look. **She** – I’m not suggesting **she** had no right to come forward, and I never – I’m not saying – any woman, they **should** come forward and they **should** be heard, and then **it should be investigated. It should be investigated.** And if there’s anything that makes it – that is consistent with what’s being said, and she makes the case or the case is made, then it should be believed. But ultimately, **the truth matters. The truth matters. Period**” (JBATRA).

- “The responsibility I have is to protect America's national self-interest and not put our women and men in harm's way to try to solve every single problem in the world by use of force. That's my responsibility **as President.** And that's what I'll do **as President**” (JBOFN).

In the following passage we see an example of the use of gradation by the speaker. This stylistic figure is used to attract the attention of a wide audience, including these strata of society, and to show their importance in the formation of a great state.

- “I'm not watching this at all. I go out I'm running for the same exact reason when I started: to restore some dignity to the office, to make sure that **African-Americans and minorities** get treated well, and this time when we rebuild **the middle class** get brought along, and to **unify the country** and the **party**. Nothing's changed why I'm running. And I'm going to continue to do that.” (JBOFN)

Hyperbole is used to exaggerate and generalize numerical quantities. In this context, its use is due to the desire to discredit the opponent:

- “What is happening is you have Steyer spending **hundreds of millions, tens of thousands of dollars, millions of dollars,** out campaigning there. And so I think a lot is happening in terms of the amount of money being spent by the

*billionaires to try to cut into the African-American vote. I think that has a lot to do with it.” (JBOFN).*

Adjectives and adverbs used by politicians by their connotation can be divided into two subgroups: positive and negative. Among the analyzed descriptions, the most often was the use of positive descriptions concerning the politician and his activities:

- *“I’m prepared to do that. To **the best** of my knowledge, there’s been no complaints made against me in terms of my Senate career, in terms of my office” (JBATRA).*

- *“Look, you guys can do all the pontificating about what it means. I’m not going to that’s not my job. My job is to go in and make the **best** case I can. And I think we’re gonna do well, and I think we’re going to go on to Super Tuesday and do very well” (JBOFN).*

The analysis of Joseph Biden's political interviews showed that the politician actively uses a variety of linguistic, rhetorical, and stylistic figures in his speeches. This helps the politician to diversify his vocabulary and to make the language more expressive and impressive. It is established that the use of such means of manipulation can affect the consciousness of recipients and change their views and interests.

### **3.3 Linguistic means of manipulation in Joseph Biden’s electioneering**

Joe Biden’s electioneering is characterized by a large number of public speeches. All of them are always accompanied by the creation of a special visual and psycho-emotional atmosphere (people in branded T-shirts and caps are involved, many posters and flags with the name of the politician around attract the viewer’s attention). The speaker always looks confident and demonstrates his strength and professionalism. Pre-election speeches of all politicians, without exception, are aimed at convincing voters to elect them President of the country. To achieve this

goal, politicians are ready to spend a lot of money, but to succeed it demands not only money but also their charisma, communication skills and perseverance.

So, it was clarified that among the tropes, metaphor, hyperbole, comparison, and epithet are most often used in Joe Biden's political discourse. Stylistic tropes create considerable manipulative influence through their own novelty, unexpectedness, the expression of the author of his creative personality. Let us continue to identify the rhetorical and stylistic devices used in his speeches.

1) Idioms:

- *“Here’s what he said in one stanza, he said, “History teaches us not to hope on **this side of the grave**, but then once in a lifetime, that longed for tidal wave of justice rises up and hope in history rhymes.”(JBSIP)*

- *“This campaign is just getting started. And I promise you this, no one, no one is going to work longer, no one is going to campaign harder **to win your hearts, your trust, and your support than the son of Catherine Eugenia Finnegan from Scranton, Pennsylvania, and Joseph R. Biden from Delaware**” (JBOLCP).*

The use of such idiomatical statements during public speaking creates a friendly atmosphere, helping the audience to comprehend serious topics, to explain global processes in a simple language that appeals not only to the logic, but also to the emotions and feelings of the recipients. This approach is quite effective in politics.

2) metonymy:

- *“**America** didn't live up to the promise for most of the people at the time, for people of color, for women” (JBOLCP).*

In this sentence, the politician also uses the name of the country, referring to politicians. By manipulating people's minds, Biden stresses that America's current authorities have failed to keep their promises.

3) allusion:

- *“You all think I'm kidding. That's how I'm identified. Everyone knows Jill is a Philadelphia girl. She loves this city. I do, too. But to paraphrase the poet,*

*James Joyce, I have to say this, folks, because I'm near my state, **when I die, "Delaware" will be written on my heart***" (JBOLCP).

Allusion in modern English is a model for the generation of new meanings and performs a meaningful function. In J. Biden's speech we see an allusion to James Joyce who said at ones "When I die, Dublin will be written on my heart".

If the tropes are small and are only lexical techniques of manipulative performances, then stylistic figures include many lexical and morphological-syntactic techniques of manipulative speech.

The stylistic figures such as polysyndeton, rhetorical question, lexical repetition, anadiplosis, syntactic parallelism, modal structures, chiasmus, ellipse and other are observed in the Biden's electioneering.

1) Polysyndeton:

- *"This campaign is just getting started. **And** I promise you this, no one, no one is going to work longer, no one is going to campaign harder to win your hearts, your trust, **and** your support than the son of Catherine Eugenia Finnegan from Scranton, Pennsylvania, **and** Joseph R. Biden from Delaware"* (JBOLCP).

2) rhetorical questions:

- *"You've watched the president now for three years. Look at what he's doing. Instilling fear. I mean, not joking, instilling fear, sowing division, stoking racial division, undercutting every institution that was designed to check the abuse of power by the president or anyone else. **All this for what reason?** All of this in order to solidify his base and expand his power"* (JBOLCP).

Rhetorical questions do not require an answer, although addressed to the interlocutor, they do affect the addressee in some way. Thus, uttering a rhetorical question, the speaker prompts the listener to find the answer himself and at the same time convinces him that this is the only correct answer.

3) grammatical intensifiers:

- *"Folks, I know some of the **really** smart folks say Democrats don't want to hear about unity. They say Democrats are so angry, that the angrier a candidate*

*can be, the better chance he or she has to win the Democratic nomination. Well, I don't believe it. I **really** don't*" (JBOLCP).

Analyzing the last example, it becomes clear that in English the phrase "really" acts as an intensifier.

4) repetitions.

Likewise, repetition can be used to give a logical emphasis to the utterance and/or to show the speaker's emotional state.

- “And we have to be able to **beat Donald Trump**. Nothing, none of these other ideas will come to life if we can't **beat Donald Trump**. He's making the case that he's the best to do that. We're going to find out. That's what this campaign is about” (JBOLCP).

In the following example, saying the word "our" the politician tries to share with people the responsibility for unpleasant actions. He uses the repetition of the word "so" to show his condemnation of such actions, thereby creating the illusion of a righteous person.

- “**Our** politics has become **so** mean, so petty, so negative, **so** partisan, **so** angry, and **so** unproductive. **So** unproductive. Instead of debating our opponents, we demonize them” (JBOLCP).

In our study, we used A. Akopova's classification to differentiate political manipulation in D. Trump's election campaign. We used the same classification to analyze J. Biden's election campaign, too.

We should say that J. Biden's electioneering speeches are dominated by emotional manipulation. For example,

- “*You hear what he just did on the sanctuary cities? But here's what he's done. He's taken the military arm, the heavily-armed folks who are the teams you see getting out of the back of vehicles with the vests on and the guns and the rest. He's sending them into sanctuary cities. **It's all about trying to scare you***” (FVPJBVRN).

J. Biden's election campaign is no exception from all others campaign; all manipulations he uses intentionally or unintentionally we can divide into direct and indirect.

1) According to the character of *subject-object interaction*, indirect manipulation in J. Biden's electioneering campaign is expressed by uses of the personal pronoun "we".

- *"We've always said xenophobes like that and racists like this. We have a right to protect our border. We have a right to determine who comes through that border, but to do what we're doing"* (FVPJBVRN) – syntactical repetition.

- *"I'd go into small towns and cities in El Salvador, I wouldn't give them money, make sure the State Department would not give the money to the leaders who were corrupt. We'd say, "Well, we'll do the lighting for you in the city. We'll erect essentially Boys and Girls Clubs. We'll increase the number of hospitals, will pay for nurses, et cetera." The reason why people leave. Guess what? Immigration slowed down significantly until Trump came along and said, "I'm not going to fund that anymore "* (FVPJBVRN) – syntactical repetition.

Direct manipulation expressed by repetition of the personal pronoun "I" in J. Biden's campaign:

- *"One of the things I'm going to do when I put together an entire plan and I'm going to do it literally the first ... and they're going to announce it in detail, if and when elected, and begin to implement it between now and the time that I get sworn in"* (FVPJBVRN) – syntactical repetition.

2) according to *awareness of linguistic actions* in case of intentional linguistic manipulation, the subject aims at a definite result on the part of the object of manipulation. Such kind of manipulation we can see in J. Biden's electioneering campaign:

- *"How many times did you hear in the 2018 election that their coming? You see a picture of this caravan coming up. You're about to be invaded. They're*

*going to take over, they're going to, you're going to come in and they're going to do this, that, and the other thing*" (FVPJBVRN).

This example is full of different linguistic means. We can see anaphora, syntactical repetitions and enumeration.

- “By the way, **I** was speaking with some of the firefighters, it doesn't matter whether **you** take your leaves, **you**'re still going to have fires. You know what **I** mean?” (FVPJBVRN) – the example of antithesis (I :: you)

Non-intentional linguistic manipulation is exercised involuntary, as the subject does not aim at achieving results from the listener. Non-intentional manipulation we can see in the following example:

- “On the following note: Folks, when **I** got elected to the United States Senate, **I** was 29-years old. Thank you, man. I was 29-years old. **I** wasn't old enough to be sworn in as a **U.S. Senator**. For real. **I** had to wait 17 days to be constitutionally-eligible to be sworn in. **I**'m the first **United States Senator I** ever knew, Lieutenant Governor, the first one **I** ever knew. You think **I**'m joking. **I**'m not. **I** mean, **I** didn't know anybody by their first name before that” (FVPJBVRN) – anaphora.

3) according to the *type of linguistic action* social manipulation is presented in the following example:

- “**Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. I** appreciate it very, very much. **I** need your help” (FVPJBVRN).

The volitional manipulation was not so popular in Biden's electioneering campaign.

Evaluation manipulation was mainly aimed at the opponent in the form of criticism of D. Trump:

- “Look, we should look at this like we have in the past. We always have had **xenophobic people** in this country like **Trump**. It last anywhere from 2 years to 10 to 12 years, but then we overcome it quickly. We overcome it and we open it up” (FVPJBVRN).

1) *according to orientation towards the interlocutor a case of person-oriented linguistic manipulation is directed towards the listener by the speaker who constructs the image of his interlocutor in order to achieve the desired effect* [Akopova 2013: 98]:

- *“Okay. If you ask me easy questions, I’ll give you quick answers. No, but by the way, if they’re essays, then I’m going to give you shorter answers to get it about, we got about, they tell me the commitment with the school here, we have about another 10 to 15 minutes. But let me begin. Sir, go ahead”* (FVPJBVRN).

In society-oriented manipulation, “the speaker doesn’t construct the image of a separate listener, but creates generalized image of a group as a whole” [Akopova 2013: 98]:

- *“By the way, we didn’t talk about it and I won’t go into unless you want me to later, but here’s the deal. Think about this. You know why are social security system is still solvent? Because of immigration. They didn’t cost us anything. They’re paying for it. You got it mom. That’s the reason why it’s moving”* (FVPJBVRN).

J. Biden as D. Trump also uses promises in his speeches. For example,

- *“Well, **we’ll do** the lighting for you in the city. **We’ll erect** essentially Boys and Girls Clubs. **We’ll increase** the number of hospitals, will pay for nurses, et cetera”* (FVPJBVRN).

As we can see, the tactic of promise is actualized with the help of lexical formatives with the future form (I am going):

- *“So **I’m going** to surge to the border. **I’m going** to double the number of immigration officers going, immigration judges, as well as those folks who are focusing on making the initial judgment of whether or not someone seeking asylum has a legitimate basis”* (FVPJBVRN).

To conclude, the research shows that Joe Biden took an advantage of carefully constructed speeches aimed at manipulating the emotional sphere of the audience. We have analyzed different types of linguistic manipulation in his electioneering

campaign. On the basis of collected media texts of J. Biden's political discourse and on the basis of their research, we have proposed examples of linguistic methods and techniques of manipulation.

### CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 3

In this chapter it was investigated that new digital technologies have taken center stage in political processes – both as a source of information and a campaigning platform. In critical moments of public life, citizens increasingly consult social media for news about politics and public affairs. Such new and relatively unregulated platforms create new opportunities for nefarious actors to deliberately push false content and distort information flows for political gain.

After reviewing the information in mass media, we found out that according to opinion polls, after Senator Bernie Sanders withdrew his candidacy, social media nominated two main candidates for the presidency – incumbent President Donald Trump and former Vice President Joseph Biden.

We have come to conclusion that, using manipulation in their discourse, politicians do not tell lies, they only successfully present the truth profitably to themselves. Manipulation in political discourse is probably one of the most commonly encountered people. Only advertising can compete with it. Politicians play on human emotions and feelings, pulling the strings at the right time.

In this chapter we analyzed the main types of linguistic manipulation used by Joseph Biden during electoral campaigns. It is important for a politician to feel trust and support of the audience. It was identified that in order to achieve better results, Joe Biden often combines several means of linguistic manipulation.

Joe Biden's electioneering is characterized by a large number of public speeches. All of them are always accompanied by the creation of a special visual and psycho-emotional atmosphere.

Taking into account the Sternin's classification, we have analyzed such groups of ideas (intentions) in Joseph Biden's political speeches as: silencing the facts (1 example); soothing the audience (3 examples); exhortations (3 examples); persuasion (3 examples); self-justification (2 examples); substantiation (3 examples); manifestations of duty (4 examples); providing confidence (5 examples).

Our analysis has shown that the largest group of intentions is the group with providing confidence (5 examples). Also such groups of intentions as promises and criticism were distinguished in Joseph Biden's speeches. Among the tropes, metaphor, hyperbole and epithet are most often used in his political discourse.

We used A. Akopova's classification to differentiate political manipulation in J. Biden's political discourse. It should be said that J. Biden's electioneering speeches are dominated by emotional manipulation. During the analysis the usage of indirect, direct, intentional, non-intentional, social, evaluative, person-oriented and society-oriented manipulation by the politician was noticed.

## GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

A large number of researchers have been studying political discourse over the last ten-twenty years as it is seen as a type of discourse that has a greater impact on society.

Political discourse involves all types of interaction between the individual and society, creating an outlook. Political discourse reveals a way of imposing cultural values and social order in different societies. This type of discourse includes a variety of political debates in society, including discussions with politicians and officials and public rhetoric.

There are two types of emotional manipulation: direct and indirect. By the nature of the interaction, the subject of the manipulation can be direct and indirect, too. According to the awareness of language actions, manipulation can be intentional and unintentional. By type of linguistic action, manipulation can be: social, volitional, information-evaluative, evaluative, rational. According to the interlocutor orientation, the manipulation can be oriented towards the individual and the society.

Exploring political discourse helps to identify important valuable components of a particular culture and to relate it to the current political picture to better understand the true goals pursued by the politician. Another important feature of political discourse analysis is the identification of tools that demonstrate the most effective strategies and methods to engage the audience and inspire confidence in people.

Many units of political language mean complexes of ideas far removed from direct human experience. Taking into account the Sternin's classification, the following groups of ideas (intentions) were identified during the study: silencing the facts, soothing the audience, exhortations, persuasion, self-justification, substantiation, manifestations of duty, providing confidence. Analyzing D. Trump's speech, one can also distinguish such groups of intentions as promises and criticism.

Political discourse is a multifaceted and multilayered phenomenon. The use of a variety of linguistic means provides a broad basis for manipulation of recipients'

consciousness (voters). The manipulation of meaning influences the process of thinking and, accordingly, the perception and structuring of reality. The analysis makes it possible to identify the following groups of techniques based on linguistic means of different levels: hyperbole, metaphor, antithesis, anaphora, the superlative form of adverbs and adjectives.

The rhetorical techniques used by Joe Biden can be traditionally referred to as tropes and figures. The concept of "tropes" is a system of unmatched meaningful elements, hierarchically organized, motivated, involved in contextual relations of semantic transference. Tropes, by creating connotations and spreading the meaning of words, can direct associations in the desired producer direction, which means that paths can be manipulated. Irony, hyperbole, metaphor, antithesis, meiosis, anaphora, periphrasis, enhance the image by enhancing the denotative information.

Biden's political discourse is characterized by words and phrases with positive or negative connotations, expressive vocabulary with ideological implications. That is why the texts of political discourse, and in particular Joe Biden's speeches, use speech-stylistic means that enhance expressive and axiological functions.

Among the tropes, metaphor, metonymy, comparison, allusion, epithet are most often used in political matches. Stylistic trails create considerable manipulative influence through their own novelty, unexpectedness, the expression of the author of his creative personality.

Thus, manipulations, as an expression of the perlocutive effect of the initiating cue, in the study are subjected to a complex analysis: to determine their tactical and strategic potential for the interlocutor and to establish the functional orientation of the manipulation. It has been confirmed that manipulative speech influence is realized in the specific choice of verbal means, including those that convey the estimated color.

In conclusion, at all linguistic levels, the means of expressing manipulative potential are characterized by the following features: the use of imagery, the involvement of emotional component, the introduction of implicit information, the use of a complex of evaluative means of all linguistic levels, the regulation of the

volume of expression, the choice of habitual and understandable, choice language units and more.

## RESUME

Протягом останніх двадцяти років велика кількість дослідників заявляють, що політичний дискурс здобуває дедалі більший вплив на суспільство. Політичний дискурс передбачає всі типи взаємодії між індивідом та соціумом, формуючи світогляд та нав'язуючи культурні цінності і соціальний порядок в суспільстві. Цей тип дискурсу включає різноманітні політичні дебати, дискусії політиків та чиновників і громадську риторику.

В даній роботі розглядаються предмети та типи емоційних маніпуляцій, а також проводиться дослідження політичного дискурсу, що допомагає виявити важливі цінні компоненти певної культури та співвіднести її з поточною політичною картиною задля кращого розуміння справжніх цілей, які переслідує політик. Важливою особливістю аналізу політичного дискурсу стало виявлення інструментів, які демонструють найефективніші стратегії та методи залучення аудиторії і вселяють довіру людям.

Враховуючи класифікацію Стерніна, в ході дослідження виявляються основні групи намірів маніпуляції, а завдяки аналізу промови Д. Трампа вони доповнюються такими групами ідей, як обіцянки та критика.

Політичний дискурс – явище багатогранне. Використання різноманітних мовних засобів дає стійку основу для маніпулювання свідомістю реципієнтів (виборців). Маніпулювання сенсом впливає на процес мислення і, відповідно, на сприйняття та структурування дійсності. Аналіз маніпулятивного дискурсу дає змогу виділити окремі групи прийомів, що базуються на мовних засобах різного рівня.

В даній роботі з'ясовується і підтверджується, що маніпулятивний мовленнєвий вплив реалізується в конкретному виборі словесних засобів, у тому числі тих, що передають оцінене забарвлення.

## SUMMARY

At the end of the twentieth century, the crucial role of language as a rapidly expanding medium of communication became apparent not only to linguists but also to professionals working in other fields. In the process of globalization of the communicative space in modern society the problems of studying verbal influence on the mass consciousness come to the fore. One of the areas in which manipulative influence is an integral part of its existence is politics.

The French philosopher Rene Descartes has defined people as purely linguistic animals. Aristotle was close to identifying people as political animals. A considerable number of linguists (Chilton in particular) do not doubt that both definitions are true, since one definition includes the other.

Political discourse is the use of language to do the business of politics that includes persuasive rhetorics, the use of implied meaning, euphemisms, the exclusion of references to undesirable realities, the use of language to arouse political emotions. This notion was first used in 1950-s after an American linguist Z. Harris who has published his famous article "Discourse Analysis". The notion of discourse establishes associations with all expressions of communication in a society, expression of rules and norms of communication, methods of the embodiment of a speaker's pragmatic goal. Discourse is a display of cultural communication; it embodies the pragmatic aims of the speakers and is formed under the influence of cognitive, linguistic, social and cultural factors. There are two unequal components of any discourse, that is text and speech. Discourse becomes different from the concept of text only in the case of a combination of verbal and non-verbal means of text communication. The presence of a basic concept and general context transforms the ordinary sequence of connected sentences into discourse. It is the extra-linguistic and prosodic communication features involved in the text production process that help to create this basic concept.

Political linguistics distinguishes genres of political discourse that are related to the political system, to the media, and to the public sphere. According to institutional setting there are such genres of political discourse: conversations about

politics with family and friends (anecdotes, gossips), postcards and graffiti, telegrams and letters from citizens in which they express their support or protest, political scandal, press conference, public political discussions etc. According to the subject-address parameter genres divide into communication between group entities (petition, appeals, postcard, performances at rallies) and communication between agents of institutions (official correspondence, parliamentary discussion, meetings of political figures, reports at congresses). According socio-cultural differential parameters the divide into genres of discourse of power and genres of opposition discourse. According the localization of events, they can be ritual (inaugural speech, traditional radio and television), orientation (constitution, order, arrangement, report) and agonal genres (parliamentary debates, publicity, slogan). Political speeches being a genre of political discourse are composed by a team of professional speech writers, who are educated in the use of persuasive language.

Manipulation is a linguistic term with great creative potential that is first and foremost topical in the framework of the theory of linguistic manipulation. The wide and somewhat blurred semantic field of the term “manipulation” includes such key elements as “negative” intention of the speaker and covert character of influence. Manipulative functions of discourse create covert, masked layer of linguistic data that is not easily separated from purely informational content. Depending on the character of utterance (its orientation towards past or future), more importance is attached to either confirmation with objective reality or to the pragmatic factor.

Depending on the sphere of mental activity, participation and dominance in the process of communication, language manipulation divides into *rational* and *emotional*. In trying to influence the interlocutor's behavior, speakers can influence their rational sphere. To do this, they use compelling facts and arguments that affect people's minds. The purpose of emotional manipulation is to express the emotions of the speaker and to get another's emotional reaction from the listener, which will lead to changes in his or her behavior. There are two types of emotional manipulation: *indirect* and *direct*. By the nature of the interaction, the subject of the manipulation can be *direct* and *indirect*, too. According to the awareness of language

actions, manipulation can be *deliberate* and *unintentional*. By type of linguistic action, manipulation can be: *social, volitional, information-evaluative, evaluative and rational*. According to the interlocutor orientation, the manipulation can be oriented towards the individual and the society.

The importance of political discourse is determined by the fact that well-supported political communication ensures that consensus is reached in society. The politician must strive to make decisions that would benefit society as a whole. The main purpose of political discourse is to get recipients to believe in the need for politically correct actions or assessments. Therefore, it is not to describe, but to make sure that the recipient has some intentions, beliefs and need for some action.

If we talk about the effectiveness of political discourse, researchers would analyze it according to the main purpose of political discourse. The effectiveness of manipulative influence is justified by the use of certain manipulation strategies. All these strategies have been considered by Ukrainian and foreign scientists. They share common features and demonstrate the application of these strategies in the US political discourse.

New digital technologies have taken center stage in political processes – both as a source of information and a campaigning platform. In critical moments of public life, citizens increasingly consult social media for news about politics and public affairs. Such new and relatively unregulated platforms create new opportunities for nefarious actors to deliberately push false content and distort information flows for political gain.

After reviewing the information in mass media, it was found out that according to opinion polls, after Senator Bernie Sanders withdrew his candidacy, social media nominated two main candidates for the Presidency in the United States of America – incumbent President Donald Trump and former Vice President Joseph Biden. Therefore, these politicians were chosen for linguistic research.

Taking into account the Sternin's classification, the following groups of ideas (intentions) were identified during the study of political discourse of both politicians: silencing the facts, soothing the audience, exhortations, persuasion, self-

justification, substantiation, manifestations of duty and providing confidence. Also, both of them use such groups of intentions as promises and criticism in their public speeches. Particular attention was paid to Donald Trump's use of rhetorical manipulation tools especially the speaker's intonation. Intonation is a complex phenomenon that includes four acoustic components: the tone of the voice, the intensity or strength of the sound, its duration and timbre. Not only speakers, but everyone who seeks to convey their thoughts to the listener should be able to tone their speech, give it a melodic variety. In order to engage the audience, focus attention of the listeners on some important facts, and shape the attitude of the audience toward the ideas being proclaimed, Donald Trump often changes it during the speech. He always speaks clearly and confidently, adjusting the pitch of speech and placing the necessary emphasis on important points.

Degrees of comparison that are often used in the discourse of the politician evaluate the qualitative positive changes that America has undergone under his presidency. Also, typical for Donald Trump speeches is that he does not mention the negative points in his political activity. People who do not follow the politics and economy of their country, but only listen to promising speeches, can really feel confident in the politicians who proclaim them.

Joe Biden's electioneering is characterized by a large number of public speeches. All of them are always accompanied by the creation of a special visual and psycho-emotional atmosphere (people in branded T-shirts and caps are involved, many posters and flags with the name of the politician around attract the viewer's attention).

The analysis has shown that the largest group of intentions used by Joseph Biden in his public speeches is the group with providing confidence. Also such groups of intentions as promises and criticism were distinguished in his speeches. Among the tropes, metaphor, hyperbole and epithet are most often used in his political discourse.

It should be said that J. Biden's electioneering speeches are dominated by emotional manipulation. During the analysis the usage of indirect, direct, intentional,

non-intentional, social, evaluative, person-oriented and society-oriented manipulation by the politician was noticed.

To sum up, it should be said that the successful political career is impossible without well-structured and well-conceived political discourse. The most famous and influential politicians always were and still remain perfect orators and producers of eternal slogans, statements and appeals. Political discourse allows to trace the mechanisms of influence on the mass consciousness, to identify strategies and tactics of speech manipulation, to explore the linguistic means of their realization.

## LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

1. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999. – 896 с.
2. Баранов А.Н., Паршин П.Б. К построению словаря терминов когнитивной науки / А.Н. Баранов. Когнитивные исследования за рубежом: Методы искусственного интеллекта. – М., 1990. – 139-149 с.
3. Бахтин М.М. Проблема речевых жанров // Бахтин М.М. Собрание сочинений. — М. : Русские словари, 1996. — Т. 5. — С. 159–206.
4. Білодід І. К. Словник української мови / І. К. Білодід. – Київ : Наукова думка, 1970. – С. 284.
5. Бобровская Г. В. Газетный дискурс в проблемном поле коммуникативно-прагматической лингвистики [Электронный ресурс] / Г. В. Бобровская // Грани познания. – 2011. – Режим доступа : <http://grani.vspu.ru/files/publics/1325146149.pdf>.
6. Варламова Е. В. Отличительные особенности политического дискурса / Гуманитарные исследования. – М., 2011. – № 2 (38). – 45-50 с.
7. Воїнов В.В. Соціально-оціночні номінації у контексті культури США. – К.: Либідь, 1994. – 144 с. – С. 8-14.
8. Демьянов В.З. Англо-русские термины по прикладной лингвистике и автоматической переработке текста. Методы английского текста. / В.З. Демьянов. Вып. 2: Тетради новых терминов. – М: ВПТС, 1982. – 90 с.
9. Колегаєва І. М. Хронотоп газетного дискурсу [Електронний ресурс] / І. М. Колегаєва. – Режим доступу : <http://liber.onu.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/123456789/4585/1/107-113.pdf>.
10. Кубрякова Е.С. Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения / Е.С. Кубрякова. – М.: Ин-т языкознания РАН, 1997. – 237 с.
11. Маріна О.В. Моленнева маніпуляція в американському політичному дискурсі. URL: <http://oaji.net/articles/2014/918-1416390541.pdf>

12. Миронова П. О. Коммуникативная стратегия редуционизма в политическом дискурсе. Язык. Человек. Картина мира. 2000. С. 165-170.
13. Рожицька Т. Особливості використання маніпулятивних стратегій у політичному дискурсі. URL: <https://eprints.oa.edu.ua/4851/>
14. Серажим К. Дискурс як соціолінгвальне явище: методологія, архітектоніка, варіативність. [На матеріалах сучасної газетної публіцистики]: Монографія / За ред. В.Різуна. / Київ. нац. ун-т ім. Тараса Шевченка. – К., 2002. – 392 с.
15. Таценко Н. В. Реалізація емпатії в сучасному англomовному дискурсі: когнітивно-синергетичний аспект / Н. В. Таценко. – Суми : Сумський державний університет, 2017.
16. Шейгал Е. И. Пространство политического дискурса // Полит. дискурс в России. – 1999. – № 3. – С. 42.
17. Чудинов А.П. Россия в метафорическом зеркале: когнитивное исследование метафоры (1991-2000): [монография] / А.П. Чудинов. – Екатеринбург: Урал. гос.пед. инст., 2001. – 238 с.
18. Aitchison, J. Linguistics / J. Aitchison. – London: NTS Publishing Group, 1992. – 240 p.
19. Akopova A. Linguistic manipulation: definition and types / A. Akopova. – Rostov-on-Don: (IJCRSEE) International Journal of Cognitive Research in science, engineering and education Vol. 1, No.2, 2013. – P. 96–114.
20. Bakhtin, M.. The problem of speech genres / In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds). Speech genres and other late essays.– Austin: University of Austin Press, 1986. – P. 60 –102.
21. Bell, A. and Garrett P. Approaches to Media Discourse / A. Bell. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. – 289 p.
22. Beard, A. The Language of Politics / A. Beard. – London: Routledge, 2000. – P. 21-76.
23. Bell, D. M. Innuendo. Journal of Pragmatics / D.M. Bell. – 1997. – Vol. 27, № 1. – P. 35–59.

24. Bloor, T., Bloor M. *The Functional Analysis of English* / T. Bloor. – London, NewYork: Arnold Butt, 1995. – 278 p.
25. Ball, W.J. *Colloquial Idiom*. London / W.J. Ball. – Toronto: Longmans, 1958. – 258 p.
26. Briscoe, D. *How He Did It: The Inside Story of Campaign 2008* / D. Briscoe, E. Clift, K. Connolly, P. Goldman, D. Stone, N. Summers. – Newsweek, 2008. – P. 38–121.
27. Cap, P, Okulska, U. *Analyzing genres in political communication* / P. Cap, U. Okulska. – Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2013. – 426 p.
28. Chefneux, Gabriela. *Evaluation in the newspaper article entitled Rebels in Libya Gain Power and Defectors* // *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov*. Vol. 4 (53). No.2. 2011. Series IV. – P.123-130.
29. Clatworthy, M.A., Jones M.J. *Differential patterns of textual characteristics and company performance in the chairman's statement* // *Auditing and Accountability Journal*. 2006. Vol. 19. No. 4. – P. 493-511.
30. Cook G. *Discourse* / G. Cook. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989. – 180 p.
31. Crawford I.M *Marketing Research and Information Systems*. (Marketing and Agribusiness Texts - 4) / I.M. Crawford – Rome, Italy, 1997. – 121p.
32. Deik, T.A., Kinch, V. *The Strategies of Understanding of Connected Text* // *New in Foreign Linguistics: 23rd ed*. Moscow, 2008. – P. 153–211.
33. Deleuze, G., Foucault, M. / Translated from French by Semina E.V. *Prolusion of Ilin I.P.* – Moscow: Humanitarian Literature Publ., 2006. – 172 p.
34. Demiankov, V.Z. *Effectiveness of Argumentation As Linguistic Manipulation* // *Problems of the Effectiveness of Speech Communication*. Collection of scientific and analytical reviews. – Moscow: INIONANUSSR, 1989. – P. 13–40.
35. Dikon, T.U. *Modern Development of Language and Brain* // *Problems of General Linguistics*. 1st ed.: Language Sign. Consciousness. Learning.

Chrestomathy under the editorship of Mikhalev A.B. Publ. PGLU: Pyatigorsk, 2002. – P. 224–231.

36. Dotsenko, E.L. Psychology of Manipulation: Phenomena, Mechanisms and Protection. Moscow: CheRo, 2003. – 344 p.

37. Encyclopedia Britannica. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Joe-Biden>.

38. Ermolaev, B.A. Goal Formation in Communication // Optimization of Linguistic Manipulation. Moscow: Nauka, 2007. – 455 p.

39. Fairclough, N. Genres in Political Discourse / N. Fairclough // Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics. – Oxford : Elsevier Science Ltd., 2009. – P. 293-298.

40. Fetzer A., Lauerbach G.E. Political discourse in the media: Crosscultural perspectives // Political discourse in the media: Cross-cultural perspectives / Edited by A. Fetzer, G.E. Lauerbach. – Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007. – P. 3-31.

41. Fontana D. The Secret Language of Symbols: A Visual Key to Symbols and Their Meaning. – San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1993. – 192 p.

42. Foucault, M. The Archaeology of Knowledge. – London: Routledge, 1972. — 108 p.

43. Freedman, A., Medway P. Genre and the New Rhetoric / A. Freedman. – London: Taylor and Francis, 1995. – 254 p.

44. Furkó Péter & Ágnes Abuczki A contrastive study of English and Hungarian discourse markers in mediatised interviews and natural conversations. URL: [http://sugl.eu/wp-content/uploads/25\\_2/05\\_furkop\\_abuczki.pdf](http://sugl.eu/wp-content/uploads/25_2/05_furkop_abuczki.pdf)

45. Gee J. P. An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method / J.P. Gee. – London: Routledge, 1999. – 248 p.

46. Galperin, P.I. Introduction to Psychology/ P.I. Galperin. –Moscow, 2007. – 455 p.

47. Goikhman, O.I., Nadeina, T.M. Fundamentals of Linguistic Communication. Moscow: Ihfra-M, 2005. – 269 p.

48. Goldin, V.E., Dubrovskaja, O.N. Genre Organization in the Aspect of Social Interactions // Speech Genres: Collection of scientific articles. 3rd ed., Saratov: Publ. GosUNTC "College", 2007. – 318 p.
49. Gorelov, I.N., Sedov, K.F. Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics: Study Guide. I.N. Gorelov. – Moscow: Labirint, 2005. – 224 p.
50. Greenwood, J. The truth history of a little ragamuffin / J. Greenwood. – N.Y.: Harper & Bros, 1954. – 349 p.
51. Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – 367p.
52. Henderson, B.L.K. A Dictionary of English Idioms / B.L.K. Henderson. – London: J. Blackwood, 1954. – 759 p.
53. Hoey, M. Textual interaction: An introduction to written discourse analysis / M. Hoey. – New York: Routledge, 2001. – 125 p.
54. Ismail K. Manipulation of Meaning in Political Discourse / K. Ismil. 2004. URL: [https://www.academia.edu/22359569/Manipulation\\_of\\_Meaning\\_in\\_Political\\_Discourse](https://www.academia.edu/22359569/Manipulation_of_Meaning_in_Political_Discourse)
55. Królikowska P. Dyskurs konfliktu jako gatunek polityczny / P. Królikowska. – Łódź: Interfaculty Interdisciplinary Doctoral Studies in the Humanities Faculty of Philology Institute of English Studies Department of Pragmatics, 2015. – 293 p.
56. Kulo L. Linguistic features in political speeches / L. Kulo. – Lulea, 2009. – 37 p.
57. Lee, K.-K. Korea, Northeast Asian Economic Hub Country. Institute of International Relations and Area Studies, Ritsumeikan University / K.-K. Lee // International Affairs Journal. – 2004. – №2. – P. 1–25.
58. Lyell Th. R. G. Slang, Phrase and idiom in Colloquial English and their use / Th. R. G. Lyell. – Tokyo, the Hokuseido press, 1931. – 818 p.

59. Liptak K. Obama's Exit Interview: I Could Have Won Again" CNN Politics [электронный ресурс] / К. Липтак// Режим доступа: <http://edition.cnn.com/2016/12/26/politics/axe-files-president-obama/>
60. Little M. Discourse Communities and the Discourse of Experience [electronic resource] / Miles Jordens Little, Emma – Jane Sayers. – Australia: Centre for Values, Ethics and the Law in Medicine, University of Sydney, 2003. – Mode of access: <http://hea.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/7/1/73>.
61. Malmkjaer K. The linguistics encyclopedia / К. Malmkjaer. – N.Y.: Routledge, 1996. – 304 p.
62. Martemianov, I.S. Speech Implicatures and Their Transformational Development // Implicitness in Language and Speech / Executive editor Borisova, E.G., Martemianov, I.S. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture, 2006. – P. 187–192.
63. Mayr, A. Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse / Mayr A. – London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2008. – 204 p.
64. McCarthy, M. Vocabulary / M. McCarthy // Language Teaching: A Scheme for Teacher Education. – 1990. – P. 5-174.
65. Megenntesov, S.A. Lingunistic Aspecnts of Psychnic Influnence and Methonds of Manipulation / S.A. Megentesov. –Krasnodar, 2008. – 111 p.
66. Myers, G. The discourse of blogs and wikis / G. Myers. – London: Continuum, 2010. – 180 p.
67. Neudert L.M, Marchal N. Polarisation and use of technology in political campaigns and communication / L.M. Neudert, N. Marchal – Brussels, 2019, – 55 p.
68. Obama, B. Transcript of President Obama’s Election Night Speech / B.Obama. URL: <http://www.nytimes.com/>
69. Orwell, G. Politics and the English language / W. F. Bolton and D. Crystal, The English Language Vol. 2: Essays by Linguists and Men of Letters, 1858–1964. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – P. 217-230.

70. Potter, J. *Discourse and social psychology* / J. Potter. London: Sage, 1996. – P. 146.
71. Rathmayr, R. *Neue Elemente im russischen politischen Diskurs seit Gorbatschtow. Totalitare Sprache – langue de bois-language of dictatorship.* – Wien: Passagen, 1995. – P. 195–214.
72. Richards A. *Phylosophy of rithorics // Theory of metaphor* / edited by Arutiunova N.and Zhurinskaya M. A. M., 1990. P. 44–67.
73. Safire W. *The New Language of Politics* / W. Safire. – N.Y., 1968. – 524 p.
74. Schiffrin D. *Approaches to Discourse.* Oxford / D.Schiffrin. Cambridge, Mass. : Basil Blackwell, 1994. 195 p.
75. Skvortsova E.Y. *Political discourse in linguistics: peculiar characteristics.* Молодой учёный. Международный научный журнал. № 9 (143). 2017. – P. 374-376.
76. Smith C. A. *Candidate strategies in the 2004 presidential campaign: instrumental choices faced by the incumbent and his challengers* / C. A. Smith // *The 2004 presidential campaign: a communication perspective.* – Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2005. – P. 131 – 151.
77. Talbot M. *Media Discourse: Representation and Interaction (Media Topics)* / M. Talbot. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007. – p. 198.
78. Trent Judith S. *Political Campaign Communication Principles and Practices* / Judith S. Trent, Robert V. Friendenberg. – Praeger, 1991.
79. van Dijk, T. A. *Discourse and manipulation* / T.A. van Dijk. *Discourse and Sociaty.* – London: SAGE Publications, 2006. Vol. 17 (2). – P. 359–383.
80. van Dijk, T. A. *Discourse and racism* / D. Goldberg & J. Solomos (Eds). *The Blackwell companion to racial and ethnic studies.* – Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. – P. 145–159.
81. Van Dijk T.A. *News as Discourse* / T.A. van Dijk. –London: Routledge; 2013.

82. Van Dijk T.A. Political discourse and Ideology / T.A. van Dijk. Lorda and M. Ribas (eds.), *Analisi del discurs politic*. 2002. URL: <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Political%20Discourse%20and%20Ideology.pdf>
83. VanDijk, T. A. What is Political Discourse Analysis / T.A. van Dijk. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. 1997. No 11. – P. 11-52.
84. Vizetelly, F. H. *A Desk Book of Idiomatic Phrases* / F.H. Vizetelly, L.J.De Bekker.– N.Y.: Funk & Wagnalls Co, 1923. – 487 p.
85. Warner R.G. *Discourse connectives in English*. – London, 1985. – 193 p.
86. *Webster's third new international dictionary of the English language, unabridged: a Merriam-Webster / editor in chief, Ph.B.Gove and the Merriam-Webster editorial staff*. – Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster, 1993. – 2670 c.
87. Wilson, J. *Political Discourse* / Schiffrin, D., D. Tannen, and H. E. Hamilton. – Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2001. – P. 398 – 415.
88. Wodak R. *The Discourse of Politics in Action. Politics as Usual* / R. Wodak. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, p. 345
89. Zimniaia I.A. *Speech Mechanism In the Scheme of Speech Production // Psychological and Psycholinguistic Problems of Language Proficiency and Acquisition*. Moscow, 2006. 360 p.

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

90. (DTC) – Donald Trump Charleston, South Carolina Rally. URL: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?469663-1/president-trump-campaign-event-north-charleston-south-carolina>.
91. (DTIWT) – Donald Trump's Interview With TIME on 2020. URL: <https://time.com/5611476/donald-trump-transcript-time-interview/>
92. (FVPJBACP) – Former Vice President Joe Biden addresses the coronavirus pandemic. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2QOidd8FGUM>
93. (FVPJBVRN) – Former Vice President Joe Biden campaigns in Reno, Nevada. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7JofbImwJwU>
94. (JBATRA) – Joe Biden Addresses Tara Reade Allegations on ‘Morning Joe’. URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/01/us/politics/joe-biden-tara-reade-msnbc.html>
95. (JBOLCP) – Joe Biden Officially Launches Campaign for President. URL: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FaN-Pf\\_LW1Q](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FaN-Pf_LW1Q)
96. (JBOFN) – Joe Biden on “Face the Nation”. URL: <https://www.cbsnews.com/video/biden-says-u-s-intel-agencies-should-brief-campaigns-about-russian-interference/>
97. (JBSIP) – Joe Biden Speech in Philadelphia. URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/video/us/elections/100000007024136/joe-biden-march-10-live.html>
98. (JBVTH) – Joe Biden Virtual Town Hall. URL: <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/joe-biden-virtual-town-hall-transcript-april-8>
99. (PTO) – President Trump in Orlando. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nij3bsI7MAc>.
100. (TSUS) – Trump’s State of the Union speech. URL: <https://www.vox.com/2020/2/4/21123394/state-of-the-union-full-transcript-trump>.