

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Institute of Philology
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

ELECTIONEERING IN THE USA

Master's thesis
written by the 2nd year student
of master's programme
"Modern English Communication
and Translation and Two
Western European Languages"
Field of Science – 03 "Humanities"
Specialty – 035 "Philology"
Oksana Lytvynets

Supervised by:
Danylo Lytovchenko, PhD.

«Допущено до захисту»
Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології
та міжкультурної комунікації
Протокол № 11 від 24.05.2021
Завідувач кафедри _____ проф. Белова А.Д.

KYIV – 2021

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
1. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE	6
1.1. Political discourse as an object of linguistic analysis	8
1.2. Pre-election rhetoric within political discourse	15
Conclusion to chapter 1	23
2. PRE-ELECTION RHETORIC OF US 2020 ELECTIONEERING	26
2.1. Communication strategies	26
2.2. Stylistic features of the pre-election rhetoric	34
2.3. Manipulation in pre-election rhetoric	39
Conclusion to chapter 2	45
3. RHETORIC OF CANDIDATES FOR US 2020 PRESIDENCY	47
3.1. Donald Trump’s rhetoric.....	47
3.2. Joe Biden’s rhetoric.....	57
Conclusion to chapter 3	67
CONCLUSIONS	69
SUMMARY	72
LIST OF REFERENCES	75
APPENDICES	85

INTRODUCTION

The master's thesis is devoted to the research of electioneering in the USA.

Despite the fact that in recent years a lot of research has been devoted to discourse, the study of certain types of discourse remains relevant. In the course of discursive practice, the expression of the speaker's thoughts is explicated and a new, desired reality is constructed. This understanding determines the ability of discourse to influence human consciousness.

Among the discourses, the intensity of the impact of which is the highest, the pre-election discourse stands out as a means of realizing the power functions of the language. In this case, the impact is carried out in a latent form, against the will of the object of influence. One of the ways to influence the addressee in the pre-election discourse is speech manipulation. Consideration of speech manipulation as one of the most effective types of influence in American pre-election discourse is associated with the fact that the struggle of political parties and candidates turns into a struggle of a symbolic nature, which is carried out by means of language.

The **topicality** of the study is due to the increased attention of modern linguists to the study of electioneering in the USA. It should be noted that in the presence of linguistic works devoted to speech manipulation in the English-language pre-election discourse, in most works on phraseological units, the authors limit themselves only to the statement of the problem.

Along with the study of the dynamics of the diverse semantic connections of the above linguistic units, it becomes necessary to consider the role of comic statements in the studied type of discourse and the means of their implementation. Another evidence of the relevance of the stated topic is the fact that the contrast, which received the status of a means of speech influence in literary discourse, did not receive due attention in the pre-election discourse.

The **aim** of the research is to identify and characterize electioneering in the USA.

To achieve the goal of the study it is necessary to solve the following **objectives**:

- 1) to find out the theoretical bases of research of political discourse;
- 2) to consider political discourse as an object of linguistic analysis;
- 3) to analyze pre-election rhetoric within political discourse;
- 4) to disclose the pre-election rhetoric of US 2020 electioneering;
- 5) to analyze communication strategies, stylistic features of pre-election rhetoric and manipulation in pre-election rhetoric;
- 6) to analyze the rhetoric of candidates for the US 2020 presidency, precisely Donald Trump's rhetoric and Joe Biden's rhetoric.

The **object** of the research is electioneering in the USA.

The **subject** of the research is the specifics of pre-election rhetoric of US 2020 electioneering.

The **material** of the research are text fragments selected from English-language pre-election advertising texts and slogans, social networks, presidential debates in the pre-election campaigns of American politicians.

The **research methods** are determined by the purpose, objectives and analyzed material: *a comparative method*, which consists in the correlation of linguistic means of manipulation, that is strategies and tactics on different classification features such as lexical-semantic, syntactic, stylistic and communicative-pragmatic on the examples of political advertising texts, debates and social networks; *contextual-interpretive*, which consists in clarifying the specifics of the meaning of a particular language unit; *descriptive*, which was used to justify the use of a certain type of communicative or manipulative strategy or tactics; *the method of continuous sampling*, by means of which the number of language means of actualization of communicative and manipulative strategies and tactics was selected and counted.

The **scientific novelty** of the research is that it comprehensively examines the linguistic methods of communication and manipulation in the American pre-

election discourse. A study of specific features of the texts of the political pre-election discourse is conducted.

The **practical value** of the research is that the results can be used in the development of theoretical and practical courses in general linguistics. The results of this study can be useful in writing term papers, dissertations, and master's theses, as well as in the further development of the problem of translation of texts of pre-election discourse.

The aim and objectives of the research determined the **structure** of the paper, consisting of an introduction, three chapters, conclusions to each chapter, general conclusions, a list of sources used, a list of data sources, appendices, and summary.

1. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Political discourse is a complex and multifaceted concept. It determines both language practice and social reality. Realizing the symbolic function of language, political discourse is studied by psychologists and linguists, philosophers and culturologists, historians and semioticians [72, p. 78]. However, political science lacks scientific research on this topic that is how political discourse can be analyzed by political scientists remains undiscovered in domestic science.

Political discourse is studied from the point of view of various sciences. This is caused by the linguistic revolution that took place in the second half of the XXth century. Then there was a range of new areas and methods of research of language communication, which influenced the study of language communication, which took place within anthropology, culturology, aesthetics, semiotics and hermeneutics, cybernetics, neuropsychology, various areas of psychology and philosophy, sociology and more. It should be noted that each of these areas has developed its own methods of analysis as well as its own conceptual apparatus [82, p. 99]. In other words, political discourse has become the object of interdisciplinary research, the methodology of which intersects and complements each other.

Undoubtedly, the main method of studying political science was discourse analysis. It was officially developed in the middle of the XXth century, and it marked a way to explore speech practice, a system of signs and symbols endowed with a specific meaning that can influence the consciousness and behavior of societies that exist within temporal and spatial boundaries. Teun van Dijk noted that discourse analysis itself is not a method, but rather an area of scientific practice, an interdisciplinary project common in all humanities and social sciences [11, p. 127]. So, this interdisciplinary nature of political discourse is the basis for its study within political science, which will expand its understanding and supplement with its help the understanding of political reality in the modern world.

In addition to scientifically determined aspects of relevance, it is important to study political discourse for purely applied reasons. In particular, this should be done in order to identify specific signs of development of a particular community, because it is in political language that the least specificity and change of a particular political reality is reflected [90, p. 178]. Thus, today in the discourse of most democracies there are undemocratic elements that seek to close the community in order to resist the trends of world development. They become particularly pronounced under the influence of conflicts and migration processes, while political tolerance does not receive the necessary support.

It is also important to understand the undemocratic features of the discourse of countries experiencing so-called “transitional stages” from totalitarianism to democracy [6, p. 89], because by identifying areas where the political discourse of these communities is distorted, tending to dictatorship, they can be eliminated using political discourse construction mechanisms. This can be done by politicians, scientists, journalists or public activists.

It is reported that in modern science there is a large number of investigations that artificially use *discourse analysis* as a method and category of ‘discourse’ in general, without being of any scientific value given that they can not be verified or applied in other circumstances. Thus, the study of political discourse should provide a thorough understanding of it, which will allow to ignore pseudo-research. That is, to study political discourse, resorting to the methodology of discourse analysis, it is relevant for several reasons:

- 1) lack of political scientific research on this object;
- 2) blurring of the categorical apparatus of the available;
- 3) the need to choose the optimal methodology for the analysis of political discourse, which requires the study of a large number of already developed approaches and definitions, ie combining the achievements of different sciences, including political linguistics, semiotics, semantics and theory of politics and power;
- 4) the need to understand the trends of society [2, p. 11].

The methodological basis of the work is the conclusions and approaches developed in the framework of discourse analysis at different stages of development of political science. In particular, it is about the classical developers of the concept of political discourse, whose works marked the beginning of its scientific study – M. Foucault [54], R. Barthes [5], J. Baudrillard [8], J. Habermas [55], U. Eco [15], N. Chomsky [56], G. Lasswell [32], and M. Bakhtin [7] (although he lacks the concept of political discourse, his views are used to analyze the political text).

Important are the works of modern foreign authors who analyze the specifics of the functioning of political discourse in different regimes and how this specificity determines political reality. They are T. van. Dijk [11], L. Phillips [53], R. Andersen [2], Z. Kloch [84]. Among Russian authors, the development of political discourse analysis is studied by E. Sheigal [61], E. Budaev [9], A. Chudinov [58], D. Demyankov [14]. In Ukrainian science, political discourse is studied by N. Nagorna [39], I. Klymenko [27], N. Akinchyts [1], K. Serazhym [47] and others.

1.1. Political discourse as an object of linguistic analysis

Within the first stage of the development of political linguistics, there is a kind of ‘groping’ of the object of study of discursive investigation. During this period, the word “discourse” occurs (for example, the work by Descartes originally called “Discours de la methode”). But it refers only to mental practice with signs of consistency, logic, unfolding in the concepts and judgments (there was a monologue form of treatises and essays) [28]. E. Kozhemyakin notes that in non-classical and post-non-classical paradigms the scope of this concept changes, dividing into two: for the exact natural sciences discourse becomes scientific conclusions, for the humanities it is a system of rhetorical and aesthetic figures [28].

The beginning of a *new stage* in the development of the science of political language can be attributed to the scientific work of Ferdinand de Saussure. He introduced the new science of semiology, which distinguished between language and speech. Language, in his opinion, has become the embodiment of traditions, rules and customs of communication, culture of the people, and speech appeared to be the product of the communication process. Interacting, these two linguistic elements provided the work of the whole mechanism: language – denotes, speech – conveys meaning [48, p. 45]. The scientist was convinced that language should be the object of study of science, because speech is often random, it absorbs human errors and depends on its features [53, p. 27]. According to F. de Saussure, it is language as a stable, constant, unchanging structure which speech hides that should be the object of study of linguistics.

In the mid-XIXth Ch. Pierce introduces the term “semiotics”, denoting the science of ways of transmitting information and patterns of its perception [42, p. 171]. As for our part, his event played a decisive role in changing the understanding of the very essence of language and led to the emergence of structural linguistics. In American semiotics, which developed under the significant influence of the works by Ch. Pierce and C. Morris, the author of the concept “pragmatics”, the main object of study were various non-verbal symbolic systems, such as gestures or animal language [91, p. 234]. In Europe, the opposite is true. From the very beginning, the linguistic Saussure tradition dominated. In fact, semiotics was developed here mainly by linguists and literary critics: R. Jakobson [66], V. Propp [45], B. Eichenbaum [64], I. Serman [64] and others.

With the beginning of the XXth century language began to gain the status of the main object of study in the humanities. As a result of the first (20s of the XX century) and the second (40-50 years of the XX century) wave of linguistic turn, the following scientific approaches arise and develop: hermeneutics, constructivism, structuralism, poststructuralism, as well as political linguistics as the science of political language. Each of them has included in its methodological and terminological arsenal the concept of discourse [29, p. 23].

It should be noted that political language was actively studied not only in Europe but also in the United States. Harold Lasswell analyzed propaganda during the Second World War. He was one of the first to study the actual political language and political metaphor [86, p. 4]. In the “Study of Quantitative Semantics” G. Laswell analyzes political language, proposes a specific method of its study and considers the relationship between language style and political regime. He and W. Lippmann raise the issue of the formation of public opinion and its impact on political life [88].

It should be added that important for the development of political linguistics was the development of semantics, which evolved within the framework of logic as situational and game-theoretical. The first was developed by J. Barwise. His main idea was that the meaning of linguistic expressions depends entirely on the context (including the situation in which they are actualized) [69, p. 123]. It is especially noteworthy that game-theoretical semantics was developed by Jaakko Hintikka. For him, language games are activities that usually surround the word and that give the word meaning [30, c. 53].

However, logical semantics describes the interpretation not of language as a system, but directly the use of language, ie it interprets language activity. Semantics of philosophy and logic penetrated into linguistics in the form of the theory of reference, pragmatics and the theory of linguistic acts. Thus, at the *second stage* of development of the science of political use of language is the study of communication processes and phenomena, when scientists recognize language as the main subject of study.

With the increase in the number of scientific disciplines, the strengthening of the role of semiotics and the emergence of the concept of discourse, which was defined as a necessary condition for communication and coexistence, many scholars are moving to *interdisciplinary discourse analysis* as a methodology for studying political reality. The very concept of discourse analysis in 1952 was defined, introduced into scientific circulation and explained by Z. Harris, who

published the article “Discourse Analysis”, in which he called discourse analysis a method of studying the movement of information in discourse [78, p. 123].

After that, various sciences began to study the relationship between ‘discourse’ and argumentation, to create the basic terminology of political linguistics and political discourse analysis. The most famous representatives of this stage of development of science are M. Foucault, J. Dubois, R. Barth, P. Bourdieu, J. Habermas, A. Gramsci and M. Bakhtin [29, p. 23]. They focused on the study of texts as a single semantic whole, filled with denotative and connotative meanings, the study of metaphor in the structure of the text, the role of the author of the political text, as well as the relationship between power and discourse.

Examining traditional societies, K. Levi-Strauss concludes that language and culture do not exist without each other [33, p. 220]. They together create a type of certain linguistic behavior, which is defined by “political discourse” as a new separate category of functional style of language. It should be stressed that this category occupies an intermediate link between language and speech in the Saussurean sense, and appears not only as a speech activity, but also a political behavior that has a collective-activity basis.

Michel Foucault made a significant contribution to the development of the concept of political discourse, describing the concept of the power of discourse. He claimed that power was previously understood as “control of the body” [54, p. 77]. However, the modern world ‘evolved’ under the influence of globalization, the development of international politics, as a result of the assertion of the rights and freedoms of citizens at the legislative level, abandoned the ‘inhumane’ ways of exercising power. Instead, “control of the soul” was established [54], which consists in correcting the behavior of the subject in a way invisible to him, namely through the power of discourse.

We have to stress one basic point that this power of discourse does not allow physical suffering, but captivates the mind and soul, anticipating in advance what a person should know and think about. Developing this concept, T. van Dijk defines the power of discourse as indirect, such that is realized through the ‘consciousness’

of people, for example, by controlling the flow of information, one can persuade people to certain actions. In his view, most forms of social power are a kind of the so-called “mental control” exercised through beliefs or other forms of discursive communication [11, p. 48].

Roland Barthes also analyzes language and reality, behavior and consciousness [5, p. 380]. He studied semiotics, texts and myth. The thinker developed the idea of the symbolism of discourse, analyzed the place of the author in the text and the difference between text, discourse and the whole work. The scientist develops M. Foucault’s idea that the truth can be grasped only if we look beyond all discourses. M. Foucault’s views are closely connected with the ideas of intertextuality and discourse as a context of expression, the presence of many discourses and the impossibility of the existence of one. The philosopher describes the dangers of the need to explore obvious discourses. He was one of the first to emphasize the difference between linguistics and discourse analysis [54, p. 73].

Unlike previous stages of development of science, from the middle of the XXth century the concept “political discourse” is beginning to be actively used. In 1967, under the editorship of Richard Rorty, a collection of articles entitled “Linguistic Turn” was published, which deals with the common features of all studies of knowledge and language actions, combined with the label “discourse analysis” or “discourse theory”. The scientist states the global immersion of all science in linguistics, emphasizing the spread of the methods of F. de Saussure, N. Chomsky and R. Jakobson in scientific research [94, p. 123].

Interesting are the investigations of George Lakoff, who, working in the field of psycholinguistics, tries to explain the paradoxes of political reality by the specifics of the functioning of the brain itself. His thesis that “it is impossible to understand the policy of the XXI century with the mind of the XVIII century” [85, p. 21] substantiated the need to change the approach to understanding political reality, ask other questions and move from a conservative to a progressive worldview.

We can accept the view generally held that at the end of the XXth century science rethinks the role of the symbolic in real life of the average citizen. R. Debre writes that Lacan's psychoanalysis, structural anthropology, neo-Marxism, semiology and linguistics set themselves the task of revealing the mechanisms of combining the breadth of views and laziness of mind [13, p. 55]. The current stage of development of discursive researches is based on the generalization of previous methods and the development of new approaches to the study of political language, political reality, sources of information and new linguistic phenomena.

As a result of these explorations, the understanding of political myth and political metaphor has changed. It is already radically different from the meaning that was attached to these concepts 100 years ago [73, p. 12]. Numerous schools of discourse analysis, which began to emerge in the late XXth century, tried to reveal the essence of the symbolic existence of the political. Neo-Marxists also became an important source of scientific development. In particular, E. Laclau and S. Muff, criticizing the general postulates of Marxism about the base (economy) and superstructure (schools, army, church that is all that is associated with the production of meaning in society), argued that such a division is unjustified, because the Marxist superstructure itself (rather than the base) makes it possible to create or at least imagine a new reality [31]. Scientists have demonstrated that the category of "discourse" belongs to the direction of modern thought, initiated by the three main intellectual currents of the XXth century: analytical philosophy, phenomenology and structuralism. According to them, the century began with three concepts that promoted the illusion of immediacy: the referent, the phenomenon and the sign.

Over time, the illusion of immediacy disappeared and the need arose to replace it with some form of discursive mediation. Thus, according to E. Laclau and S. Muff, it happened in analytical philosophy with the works of late Wittgenstein, in phenomenology – with existential analysis of Heidegger and in structuralism with poststructuralist critique of the sign [31]. Therefore, it was E. Laclau and

S. Muff who explained, substantiated and developed the concept of political discourse as a reality in which a certain community lives; as a set of symbols whose meanings are understood only in a particular community and as a product of power and politics that create and change the symbolic meaning of discourse.

There is a rich tradition of German study of political discourse, which began with J. Habermas and K. Apel and continues to this day. It should also be emphasized that J. Habermas tried to explain the nature of human, analyzing his communication practices in various fields. His views became the basis for the emergence of discursive ethics, which puts forward to the discourse the requirement of rationality, on the basis of which its universality arises and criticizes the subjectivity of discourse [55, p. 89].

The point has to be stressed that today the study of political discourse is mainly concentrated in the United States (J. Lakoff, W. Benois, R. Andersen, S. Muff and E. Lacro), in Central and Western Europe (D. Banks, R. Wodak, M. Schroeter, G. Girth, T. van Dijk, N. Fairclough) and other megaregions [9].

Among Ukrainian scholars, the problem of political discourse is studied by G. Pocheptsov [44], A. Sotnikov [49] and others. So, G. Pocheptsov explores political discourse in terms of semiotics as the science of ways of transmitting information. In his scientific work "Semiotics" [44, p. 68] he focuses on sign and symbolic reality, analyzes the verbal actions (anecdotes, speeches, expressions) of political actors, as well as the sphere of aesthetics (monuments, literature) as a political discourse of the era.

These facts give rise to important conclusions. The analysis of political discourse today is developing in different directions, solves various scientific problems, in particular, it describes certain elements of political language. It studies certain levels of analysis: phonetics, vocabulary, syntax, text and discourse; develops normative (critical) and descriptive approaches; studies certain political genres, styles and texts; explores idiostyle as general patterns of political language. We may add that it is also engaged in discursive study of communicative roles, strategies and tactics, as well as carries out comparative researches, reveals the

general and special signs of political discourses of the different countries and epochs. Besides it is engaged in research focused on related fields of science and uses methods of psycholinguistics, cognitivist methods, methods of linguocultural studies.

1.2. Pre-election rhetoric within political discourse

Despite the abundance of recently published works devoted to various aspects of political communication, electoral technologies, and election campaigns, a detailed study of the *pre-election* discourse as a genre that includes institutional, ritual and rhetorical characteristics has not been carried out.

Fragmentally, to one degree or another, most aspects of the chosen research topic are covered both in domestic and foreign science in a number of specialized books on election campaign technologies, political imageology, political marketing and numerous publications devoted to the analysis of current election campaigns (R. Agranoff [68], B. Campbell [72], M. Hershey [80], K. Jamieson [82], J. Kessel [83], W. McWilliams [90], G. Pomper [93]). However the positions of the authors of these works differ in many ways. Thus, nowadays the answer to the question about the essential characteristics of the pre-election discourse has not been found yet.

Thus, the genre features of the pre-election discourse are practically not reflected in the domestic linguistic literature. There are no studies of the structural and stylistic features of the texts of pre-election speeches. However, the specifics of television advertising and the features of advertising messages recommended for use during the election campaign in textbooks and studies on technology and organization of political campaigns are covered in relatively detail [92, p. 274].

Therefore, the relevance of this research is due to the insufficient study of a significant phenomenon of modern political life that is the *pre-election speech*, in which the signs of rhetorical communication are clearly manifested, as well as the

lack of work on the study of the structural-compositional and linguistic rhetoric features of the texts of pre-election speeches.

It is possible to speak of pre-election discourse as a complex communicative formation that refers to different types of discourse (institutional – to political and non-institutional – to ritual and rhetorical), as a result of which it is a “hybrid” genre and is distinguished by a special set of diverse characteristics.

Institutional signs of pre-election discourse include target attitudes, status-role characteristics of participants in communication, temporal characteristics, communication strategies and tactics and thematic determinants.

The ritual features of the pre-election discourse are determined by specific local, temporal, subject-symbolic and linguistic parameters that form the linguo-semiotic space of the pre-election event [77].

The rhetorical features of the pre-election discourse (appeal to pathos, logos, ethos) are associated with the manipulative, argumentative, ethical and emotive features of the pre-election speech as a political text created to influence the electorate.

Linguistically, the text of the pre-election speech is distinguished by a special set of different-level stylistic means and techniques: phonetic, lexical, syntactic, which create rhetorical structures and contribute to the formation of the candidate’s speech image and the provision of a communicative impact on voters [77, p. 422].

As a result of the study, it was found that signs of rhetorical communication are more pronounced in the pre-election discourse. The analyzed aspects of rhetorical influence correlate with manipulative and argumentative strategies and tactics, as well as the ethical aspect of the pre-election discourse.

Manipulation is viewed as an emotional influence or impact, carried out through the linguistic reflection of the state of affairs [93, p. 131]. The linguistic expression of manipulation manifests itself at the level of a targeted selection of evaluative and emotionally colored lexical means, since by choosing a certain

lexicon, a person can be angered, intimidated, inspired, in other words, to influence his emotional side and thus determine his behavior.

It should be noted that, depending on the tasks facing the candidates, the manipulative influence in their speeches is expressed in two strategies: the strategy of discrediting the opponent and the strategy of self-promotion [95]. Firstly, politicians need to create advertising, show themselves in a positive light, and form their own positive image, which is facilitated by a self-promotion strategy. Secondly, candidates need to create a negative image of the opponent or “prove” the inconsistency of the political ideas expressed by the opponent that is present their opponent in a bad light, which is achieved through a strategy of discrediting the opponent.

The strategy of discrediting the opponent in pre-election speeches is manifested in the tactics of criticizing and compromising the opponent’s actions, accusing the opponent, “hanging labels”, indirect hinting at “negative” actions of the opponent, “foreseeing” the future of voters, providing “independent” choices, “lying” to the opponent, sabotage against the opponent, disregard for the opponent, indirect ‘assessment’ of the opponent’s actions and defense. The strategy of self-promotion is implemented in the following tactics: seeking support from voters, promises, opposing oneself to an opponent, indirect calling for a vote, ascribing political experience to oneself [94, p. 123].

Under argumentation, the work considers a means of influencing mainly the rational consciousness of a person and uses the concepts of ‘rational argumentation’ and ‘emotional argumentation’. Rational argumentation is understood as a speech act consisting of a thesis and a number of arguments [91, p. 125]. In rational argumentation, the presence of factual (statistical and illustrative) material is mandatory.

On the other hand, emotional argumentation means *rhetorical* argumentation, since the process of proof and persuasion does not occur at the expense of statistical or factual data, that is, considering the impact on the rational side of the audience, and through *rhetorical means* that give the arguments an

emotional tone of persuasive speech. Thereby they contribute to the appeal to the emotions of the audience and the impact on the emotional and psychological side of the audience [86, p. 123]. Emotional argumentation is also characterized by an argumentative model that is a thesis and a number of arguments based on emotional conjectures and assumptions of candidates in the absence of factual material.

There are two argumentative strategies that are most often encountered in the pre-election speeches of candidates for the presidency: the strategy of rational argumentation and the strategy of emotional argumentation. The strategy of rational argumentation is expressed in tactics: persuasion, appeal, verification, giving an example and promise. The strategy of emotional reasoning is expressed through tactics: appeal, hidden threat and accusation [88, p. 89].

In the course of studying the scientific literature, it was found that in pre-election speeches, according to the method of arrangement of the thesis and arguments, radial and mixed structures prevail [83, p. 99]. The reference to ethos in the work is considered as an appeal to the moral and ethical foundations and principles of the nation and is revealed in topoi, reflecting universal, national and group values. At the linguistic level, toposes are implemented through thematically relevant lexicon.

We have reason to state that the campaign speeches of the candidates are mainly based on a system of multilevel toposes: universal, state and group. The analyzed scientific literature has shown that the most frequent topoi in election speeches, which are implemented within the framework of the ethical aspect, are topoi created on the basis of national values: the American nation, American society, the American military past, the American military power, the American government, the President of the United States, American exclusivity [78, p. 34]. These toposes represent the value judgments shared by the candidate and his audience. Besides, they dominate the campaign speeches of American presidential candidates, as they affect the interests of the entire nation and its citizens.

The universal toposes, which occupy an insignificant part in the campaign speeches of the Republican candidate, include: the topos of responsibility, spirituality, freedom and democracy, religion, and world problems. Along with universal and state toposes, election campaigns are based on group topoi, which include: the topos of middle-generation Americans, older Americans, American veterans, and American teachers [73, p. 90].

The campaign speeches of the Democratic candidate are predominantly based on toposes based on national values. This group includes the toposes of the American nation's self-awareness, American society, national identity, US superiority, American achievements, American exceptionalism, and the President of the United States.

The group of toposes, created on the basis of universal values, includes: the topos of religion, world problems, economic prosperity and well-being, freedom and democracy, equal opportunities. To group toposes one can refer: the topos of middle-aged Americans, the unity of the American family, a worthy profession of a teacher and American farmers [72, p. 232].

The analysis of pre-election speeches, carried out by linguistic scientists, made it possible to establish that the pre-election speech is distinguished by a peculiar composition, which includes the following parts: the opening, introduction, the main part of the speech, consisting of thematic blocks, and the conclusion [72, p. 233]. Each of the compositional parts of the pre-election speech performs certain functions, correlated with the basic functions of the pre-election discourse: influencing, inspirational, agitation and propaganda and informational [72].

So, the main functions of the opening are to establish contact with listeners and create an idea of the topic and direction of speech. The functions of the introduction are to consolidate contact with the audience, their attention and interest, to communicate the main topic of the speech and provide certain information on the topic of the speech. The main part of the pre-election speech performs the following functions: retaining the attention of voters, forming the

tasks of the candidate, as well as providing further information on the topic of the speech. The functional specificity of the conclusion is manifested in: summing up what has been said, consolidating and strengthening the impression produced by the speech, setting a number of tasks before the voters; calling on voters to take immediate action that is voting for a particular candidate [12, p. 12].

It has been established that according to the method of the thematic deployment of speech, most of the campaign speeches of the Republican candidates have a mixed type of presentation, while less have sequential and parallel type [1]. The campaign speeches of the Democratic candidates are usually characterized by a radial type of presentation. The most common type of termination of pre-election speeches can be an appeal to their voters or a repetition of the main provisions or conclusions of a speech, a generalization of what was said in a speech and the setting of tasks.

Conducted by O.V. Gaikova's linguostylistic analysis of pre-election speeches shows that the pre-election speech of candidates for the presidency of the United States is predominantly focused on the emotional impact of speaker's speech through a deliberate selection of stylistic means and techniques of phonetic, lexical and syntactic levels [12]. However, the set of stylistic devices for each of them is not the same. So, in the pre-election speeches of the US presidential candidates from the Republican Party, the most frequent methods of the phonetic level are alliteration, of the lexical level are metaphor and epithet, of the syntactic level are antithesis, anaphora, parallelism, enumeration, polysyndeton, contrast and opposition. Less used lexico-stylistic devices include simile, among syntactic-stylistic devices are gradation, epiphora, circular repetition, distant repetition of words and rhetorical question [12].

In the pre-election speeches of US presidential candidates from the Democratic Party, the predominant stylistic devices of the phonetic level are alliteration, of the lexical level are metaphor, epithet and allusion, of the syntactic level are anaphora, epiphora, ring repetition, antithesis, contrast and opposition, parallel constructions, enumeration, polysyndeton, gradation, rhetorical question.

Fewer are such stylistic devices of the lexical level as simile and hyperbole, of the syntactic level is distant repetition of words [12].

It is needless to comment on the pre-election discourse that is distinguished as one of the genres of political communication based on the presence of a goal and a communicative situation. A *communicative situation* is understood as an election campaign taking place on the eve of the presidential elections in any democratic country. While the main goals of the genre of pre-election discourse are motivation to action, the speaker's desire to convince the audience of the need for the audience to take a conscious action, as well as arousing the listeners' emotions and assessing the significance of the event [9]. As one of the additional criteria for identifying the studied genre, *the address genre* is considered, which is a prototype genre for an election speech.

It is natural to regard that the pre-election discourse is one of the complex communicative formations with high social and political significance. Studying the pre-election discourse as a genre, which is characterized by signs of institutional communication, its constitutive features are distinguished by V.I. Karasik:

- 1) participants as candidates for the post of the head of state of the United States and their voters;
- 2) chronotope as the time of the beginning of preparations for the election campaign and the election campaign itself;
- 3) values concentrated in the key concepts of the American society such as "power", "politician", "election campaign";
- 4) strategies such as manipulative and argumentative and a number of their tactics;
- 5) subject matter, that is a wide range of issues of greatest interest to certain groups of American voters [20, p. 187].

The special specificity of the pre-election discourse lies in the following functions: influencing, inspirational, agitational and propagandistic, informational [27, p. 5]. So, the *influencing function* helps to exert emotional pressure on voters, appeal to their feelings, affecting their value system, and persuade them to vote for

a particular candidate. The specificity of the *inspirational function* is manifested in the inspiration of the nation (voters) and the glorification of traditional American values. The agitational and propagandistic function promotes the dissemination and introduction of the ideas and ideology of a particular candidate's party into the minds of potential voters. The *information function* primarily helps to provide information about the 'advertised' candidate and create a stable image-knowledge of the elected politician among voters.

Taking into account the opinion of V.I. Karasik that ritualization is inherent to varying degrees in different types of discourse, allocated on a sociolinguistic basis, it is proved that the signs of ritual communication are manifested to one degree or another in the genre of pre-election discourse [24, p. 39]. So, for example, in the United States, the speeches of presidential candidates in electoral audiences, on television and radio are traditional as they have long developed into a kind of ritual. It has been established that the ritual specificity of the pre-election discourse is revealed in the following characteristics [83, p. 78]: ritual, scenario, role structure, temporality, and symbolism.

The election of the President of the United States is a specific political plot that has a well-established, easily recognizable scenario and is a long-established ritual. In other words, such a ritual has a certain script, that is electoral discourse can be characterized as a theatrical action with its own "actors" and "spectators", whose roles are played by presidential candidates and their voters. Besides, pre-election discourse can be viewed as a sporting struggle and even as the so-called 'political trade' with its constant buyers and sellers [6, p. 221].

Since the scenario of the pre-election discourse presupposes the presence of two sides of communication, they are politicians running for the presidency of the United States, and the population called the electorate. Since election campaigns are held in the United States every four years, preparations for the next presidential elections begin a year before the end of the term of office of the incumbent. Finally, to provide symbolic support for the pre-election discourse, a kind of 'semiotiser' of the ritual communicative space is used, that is signs and artifacts,

which are “the sum of impressions combined in the mind and capable of exerting a certain kind of influence on the listener” [27, p. 77]. These include semiotisers of a national-historical character, a moral-value character and a personal character.

Political texts are primarily aimed at impact and appeal to the emotions of the audience, and therefore the pre-election speech as a political text is viewed from the standpoint of a *rhetorical paradigm*, since it has a number of characteristic features inherent in rhetoric as a science of impact. It is about the so-called aspects of rhetorical influence [39, p. 89]: pathos, logos, and ethos, correlated with the manipulative and argumentative strategies and tactics highlighted in the pre-election discourse, as well as the ethical aspect of the pre-election discourse.

In general, a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic literature made it possible to establish that the so-called “hybridity” of the studied genre of pre-election discourse manifests itself in the intersection of institutional, ritual and rhetorical communication. The constitutive features of pre-election discourse are chronotope, role structure, ritualism, symbolism, scenario, strategies and tactics of influencing the emotional, rational and moral and ethical spheres of the electorate.

Further research prospects are associated with a detailed linguistic description of the pre-election rhetoric in the English-language political discourse, namely, its communicative strategies, manipulative and stylistic functions.

Conclusion to chapter 1

The very understanding of discourse that existed before the XXth century differs from its modern definition. Then it meant only mental practice with signs of consistency, logic, unfolding in concepts and judgments (monologue form of treatises and essays). While in nonclassical and postclassical paradigms the volume of this concept changes, dividing into two: for the exact natural sciences scientific conclusions become ‘discourse’ and for the humanities it is a system of rhetorical and aesthetic figures.

It seems essential to emphasize that at the end of the XXth century political linguistics and political discourse analysis have become new sciences that have begun to directly analyze how to use language resources in the struggle for political power to perpetuate social order, as well as in the process of political competition and construction of community identity.

In the presented study, the genre of pre-election discourse is considered from the standpoint of the theory of political discourse and mass media discourse, sociolinguistic analysis of discourse, cultural linguistics, genre studies, argumentation theory and rhetoric. The pre-election discourse is viewed as a complex communicative formation in which the signs of institutional, ritual and rhetorical communication intersect. A pre-election speech is understood as a text created during the election campaign with the aim of influencing voters. The study confirmed that the pre-election discourse as a complex communicative event belongs to the following types of discourse: institutional (political) and non-institutional (ritual and rhetorical), intersecting with them for a number of reasons.

Often, the appeal to pathos as an appeal to the feelings and emotions of voters is realized through strategies and tactics of manipulative influence: strategies of discredit the opponent and strategies of self-promotion. The appeal to the logos as an appeal to the rational sphere of the electorate is argumentation and is realized through the strategies and tactics of argumentative influence that is the strategy of rational argumentation and emotional argumentation. The address to ethos as an appeal to the moral and ethical principles and foundations of the nation is realized through toposes, or 'common places', reflecting universal, national and group values.

The study proved that the pre-election speech is distinguished by a peculiar composition, which includes the following parts: the opening, introduction, the main part of the speech, consisting of thematic blocks, and the conclusion. Each of the compositional parts of the pre-election speech performs certain functions correlated with the functions of the pre-election discourse: influencing, inspirational, agitational and propagandistic, informational. It is interesting that the

predominant setting on the emotional impact of speaker's speech is carried out through a deliberate selection of techniques and means of phonetic, lexical and syntactic levels. However, the set of stylistic devices for each of the presidential candidates is not the same.

2. PRE-ELECTION RHETORIC OF US 2020 ELECTIONEERING

2.1. Communication strategies

Before moving directly to the communicative strategies of the pre-election discourse of the US presidential campaign in 2020, let us turn to the very concept of “self-presentation” in linguistics.

For our purposes, we consider sufficient the definition of **strategy** as a general direction of speech that is a common line of speech behavior. Under the **communicative tactics** we can understand the way to implement the chosen strategy with the help of some private techniques or language moves [38, p. 7].

In O.N. Parshina’s monograph [40, p. 34] a rather interesting classification of strategies and tactics which are used in political discourse is noted. The scientist distinguishes between **communicative strategies** of self-presentation, discrediting, attack, manipulation, self-defense, informative-interpretative, argumentative, agitational. It is obvious that advertising or self-advertising refers to language genres for which the most important property is persuasiveness (from the Latin ‘persuadeo’ “to persuade, convince”). This feature of advertising determines the communicative strategies, tactics and techniques used in the pre-election discourse [38].

What is significant is that the communicative strategy of self-presentation is one of the fundamental social needs of the individual ‘to have his own face’. Among its tactics there are tactics of objective information, subjective information, social interaction, consolidation, planning, and transfer tactics. A.P. Romanchenko emphasizes that the strategy of self-presentation reflects the author’s “Self” through individual views, worldview of the people in general and scientists in particular [46, p. 197].

There is no doubt that self-presentation is a creative method of expressing a person’s goals and objectives in different ways. In other words, it is a personal self-assessment of one’s own character, social positions and personal worldview.

In other words, **self-presentation** is a self-promotion of oneself, one's unique capabilities and cultural level [16]. In short, it is a desire to be useful to society or the assertion of one's right to be among the leaders.

Noteworthy, the strategy of self-presentation is implemented in various forms and scales. Photos, videos, archival and new text information are used to create it. Such a form of self-expression can influence the opinion of society, groups of people and identify the audience to which the semantic load of self-presentation is directed [16]. There are many places where self-presentation is used, including elections. Given that self-presentation is self-promotion, it can have both positive and negative features, such as lobbying for selfish goals as president.

Thus, self-presentations are widely used in pre-election campaigns. The creative way of promotion as a kind of self-assessment and promotion of one's work is used when discussing a candidate for the post of the head of government. We believe that self-promotion helps to understand the usefulness of a person's character, his experience for a part of society [16].

As for the pragmatism of political slogans, which are often used to present a presidential candidate, A.P. Minyar-Beloruicheva believes that slogans do not differ in typological homogeneity. Based on the reference contained in them, they are classified into four main groups: imperative slogans, descriptive slogans, superlative slogans and provocative slogans [34, p. 27], which, characterized by discreteness, are divided into several subgroups. Thus, *imperative slogans* include:

- slogan-order: *A Fresh Start for America* [96]; *Win the Era* [96];
- slogan-appeal: *Make America Great Again* [96]; *Promises Made, Promises Kept* [96]; *Come Together* [96];
- slogan-performative: *A New Choice for Democrats* [96]; *Fighting for Our Future* [96];
- slogan-toast: *One Nation. One Destiny* [96].

Descriptive slogans in pre-election discourse often include:

- slogan-program: *Focus on the Future* [96]; *For the People* [96];

- slogan-characteristics: *Brave Wins* [96];
- slogan-recognition: *Our Best Days Still Lie Ahead!* [96].

The group of **provocative slogans** in pre-election discourse includes:

- slogan-provocation: *Lead with Love* [96]; *Stand up with Tulsi* [96];
- ‘warning’ slogan: *We Rise* [96];
- slogan-threat: *A Fair Shot for Everyone* [96].

Comparative slogans are typical for pre-election political slogans:

No More Wars [96]; *America Deserves Better* [96]; *Actions Speak Louder than Words* [96].

Communicative characteristics inherent in the pre-election discourse, have a significant impact on the choice of political figures of the language means in the text of self-promotion [43, p. 167]. Thus, in the process of analysis of the language presentation of advertising messages within pre-election political discourse, a number of communicative and pragmatic features were identified that influence the author’s choice of language means when writing pre-election texts. These characteristics of self-promotion, used in the pre-election political discourse, include [43, p. 167]: brevity of messages, their relative expressiveness, informativeness, persuasiveness and intertextuality.

Let us consider the **communicative** characteristics of intercourse and language features of self-presentation of Donald Trump and Joe Biden during the 2020 pre-election campaign.

It should be noted that the **brevity** is caused by the functional limitation of the length of messages, taking into account spaces and punctuation, which indicates the conciseness of the pre-election text. The texts should contain all the information that the author intends to convey: names, quotations, private messages, for example: *Folks, thanks to you we raised \$1.2M from nearly 30,000 donors yesterday. And I was even happier to hear that 1/3rd of those donors were new. I can’t begin to tell you what your support means. South Carolina is just a few days away* [100].

Accordingly, a small amount of the text, a clear structure have a positive effect on its visual perception by the readers. Having only a small number of characters, the author tries to convey in the most concise and accessible form information that can be manifested in the use of simple sentences at the syntactic level: *Well, first of all, I guess I'm debating you, not him, but that's okay. I'm not surprised. Let me just tell you something. There's nothing symbolic. I'm cutting drug prices. I'm going with Favored Nations, which no President has the courage to do because you're going against big pharma. Drug prices will be coming down 80 or 90%. You could have done it during your 47 year period in government, but you didn't do it. Nobody's done it. So we're cutting healthcare* [97]. These examples illustrate the use of simple sentences that contribute to a clear perception of the idea conveyed by supporters and / or opponents of the politician.

We now turn our attention to the definition of the concept of relative texts' *expressiveness* "...in linguistics it is the characterization of language units and speech acts as a means of expressing the subjective evaluative attitude of the speaker to the content or addressee of speech. Expressiveness is enhanced by paralinguistic means of communication" [65, p. 168].

We would like to say that in the pre-election advertising text, the markers of expressiveness at the graphic level are the emphasis of words and sentences in capital letters and the multiple writing of punctuation marks: *"Pres Trump is correct to ask for recusal & question justices' bias. Political opposition is inappropriate coming from a sitting SCOTUS Justice, even couched in a dissent"* [99]. The capitalization of words is used in the fragment. This example illustrates an important graphic stylistic means, the purpose of which is to focus voters' attention on the most important, from the author's point of view, lexical units. In addition, the use of graphic means is an important element of intonation marking of the statement or part of it. Given the written form of communication, it has a considerable meaning.

At the lexical level, markers of expressiveness include, for example, the use of exclamations (*Well, Ha, Ugh, Wow*) in the text of the pre-election political

sphere: *Yes. Well, that's what he's going to try to do, but there's thousands of scientists out there, like here at this great hospital that don't work for him. Their job doesn't depend on him. They're the people... And by the way* – [97]. It is shown that the marked words serve only as a means of conveying the feelings of the speaker, his emotional attitude to speech. Otherwise stated, they give the message, given the general logic and sequence of expressions, a certain expressiveness.

At the morphological level the use of adjectives with positive and negative evaluation serves as a marker of expressiveness. They are an important stylistic means that increases the expressiveness of phrase and gives it an emotional coloring, for example: *Nevada, y'all did it for me! Thank you to all of our incredible supporters, volunteers, and organizers around the state. We couldn't have done this without you. Next stop: South Carolina!* [100] *Let me guess what you will say. Bla bla bla fake news, bla bla bla ratings, bla bla bla* [99].

At the syntactic level, an example of expressive markers is the use of nominative sentences. The latter give the phrase a special expressiveness, which helps to establish contact between the addresser and the addressee: *Virus incubation event. Have fun!* [99]

Therefore, examples of expressive markers that enhance the content of the statement and help to provide logic to the content of different expressive shades, are presented at all levels of language. However, research has shown that politicians use these means with varying degrees of intensity. This determines the so-called 'relativity' of such a characteristic for the pre-election advertising text used in politics. In other words, the use of means that increase the expressiveness of speech is found mainly in the information texts of those politicians whose speech is dominated by the phatic function.

Incidentally, *informativeness* is an important textual category, as the purpose of any text is the transfer of information [10, p. 231]. Whereas in pre-election texts the informative function belongs to one of the main functions of communication. "The informativeness of the text is the degree of its semantic

novelty for the voter, which consists in the theme and the author's concept, the system of author's assessments of the subject of thought" [4, p. 60]: *The platform of the Democratic Party is what I, in fact, approved of, what I approved of. Now, here's the deal. The deal is that it's going to wipe out pre-existing conditions. And, by the way, **the 20, the 200 mil- the 200,000 people that have died** on his watch, how many of those have survived? Well, there's **seven million people that contracted COVID**. What does it mean for them going forward if you strike down the Affordable Care Act?* [97]

It should be emphasized that the way of presenting information in the genre under study, which relates mainly to the plans of a politician, his political platform, his views on his opponents, the situation in the country, can be called economical, in which information is often presented in the form of theses. This feature is related to the functional length limit of the ad pre-election text. However, informativeness can be increased by enlarging the amount of information through videos, audio materials, ie additional information is introduced, "...which specifies, explains, expands knowledge about the subject of the message" [10, p. 239].

Thus, an important way to increase informativeness in pre-election political texts can be called hypertextuality: ***150 million people have been killed since 2007 when Bernie** voted to exempt the gun manufacturers from liability, more than all the wars, including Vietnam from that point on* [100].

In the presented fragment it is about a huge number of people mentioned by Joe Biden, who died from various weapons. To markers of informativeness, in this case, it is also possible to add the proper names such as *Bernie* and the indication of the number (150 million).

Graphic capitalization of such words as, for example, *ALSO, MONTHS*, which help to focus the attention of voters can be called additional markers of informativeness in the text of pre-election advertising: *Get ready for DumbleDork – and wear face masks..he just came back from India, meeting with tons of people..some who might have the Corona virus **ALSO**, vaccines are **MONTHS** away* [99].

However, *persuasiveness* means influencing the recipient in order to mobilize him to perform certain actions. “Citizens are encouraged to transfer power to a particular party or policy, to provide this party with other support, to act in accordance with the decisions taken by the party” [60, p. 84]. Persuasiveness, aimed at appealing to voters to come to the polls, vote for a particular political party and politician, to participate in rallies, is realized through various linguistic means. The most frequent form of appeal in the studied genre can be called the use of verbs in the imperative form: *Better stay at Home and resign. Save America* [99].

In addition, for the appeal to the addressee there are cases of using explicit performatives [41, p. 209]: *We all have a responsibility to declare with conviction that hatred and bigotry and white supremacy have no place in America. We must give hate no safe harbor* [100]. In this message, the performative explication is realized by using the verb *declare*.

The most effective way to appeal to the addressee related to the recommendation of performing an action is the use of constructions with modal verbs: *The right to vote is the most fundamental American right there is. We should be making voting easier – not harder* [100].

In this example, the use of the modal verb form indicates the wishes of the politician, his intentions. In addition, it has an imperative character and increased ideological significance in the political sphere of communication.

At the same time, *intertextuality* is the use of someone else’s text in the author’s text [10, p. 141]. Intertextuality is an important textual category that reflects the correlation of one text with others, ie the interaction of texts in the process of their functioning [51, p. 100].

The analysis showed that the following types of intertextuality can be presented in the pre-election text:

– a quote of the author himself from his past speeches, which is typical, for example, for Joe Biden: *Housing should be a right – not a privilege. But far too many Americans lack access to affordable, quality, and safe housing* [100]. “The

Biden Plan for Investing in Our Communities through Housing – Joe Biden for President Joe Biden is running for President to rebuild the middle class and ensure that this time everyone comes along. He believes the middle class isn't a number, but a value set which includes the ability" ... joe Biden.com [100].

– quoting the statements of famous writers, philosophers (in the following example, Joe Biden refers to Donald Trump as the author of the selected quotations): *We fall into the same pattern every time: a senseless act of violence occurs, politicians offer “**thoughts and prayers,**” and calls for reform fade away until the next tragedy inevitably occurs. I’m sick and tired of saying “**enough is enough.**” We can’t go on like this any longer [100].*

– use of links due to the technical communication channel (if the self-promotion, for example, is placed on Twitter): *I know that with folks like Bernice and the Reckoning Crew, we will win the battle for the soul of our nation. I’m so grateful to have them on our team. Join them and get involved in your community: <http://JoeBiden.com/Volunteer> [100].*

– precedent statements [59, p. 114], which are quotes, aphorisms, proverbs, as well as individual words and expressions, “... by which the communicative practice of a famous person is recognized” [59, p. 115]: *I think Barack Obama was **one hell of a President.** I was proud to stand alongside him every step of the way – and **fought like hell** to make sure he was re-elected [100].* This text is a quote from the user, the part of which is an easily recognizable phrase, which increases the emotionality of expression, bringing elements of the language game in the message.

As we can see, intertextual inclusions, due to the contact of “friend”-or-“foe”, create conditions for essential (both semantic and structural) transformations of the text. ‘The text in the text’ is not just an element of the author’s erudition or a purely external decoration. The text in the text is able to emphasize or show the dominant meanings of the main text, to discover another meaning generated by the superposition of meanings, as well as to create different levels of perception of the text as a whole [10, p. 154].

Thus, it can be concluded that the specific features of pre-election self-presentation or self-promotion undoubtedly create certain difficulties in the study of language in general and the language means used in pre-election texts, in particular, on the Internet. In contrast to traditional political communication, where the use of language is subject to clear rules and restrictions, where a special language etiquette is present, in pre-election Internet communication, the linguistic personality of a politician often comes to the fore, which can not but influence the choice of language means.

Along with traditional language means, the texts of pre-election advertising also mention the use of means typical of Internet communication, such as the social network Twitter of Joe Biden and Donald Trump in general. These include: the use of graphic spelling of words, multiple writing of punctuation marks, non-compliance with punctuation.

In addition, language analysis is complicated by the possibility of using audio and video fragments in verbal text. The speaker's choice of language means, style of presentation used in the political pre-election campaign is determined by a number of factors, namely: the goals of communication, the language personality of the politician, as well as the communicative features characteristic of the discourse.

2.2. Stylistic features of the pre-election rhetoric

The use of rhetorical figures in the texts of political discourse, including pre-election one, is of particular research interest for at least two reasons. Firstly, this sphere of communication has a number of features that distinguish it from other spheres of communication. Secondly, this sphere is dynamic, and therefore any reference to the texts of political discourse means a new, deeper understanding of the essence of political communication.

As a result of the analysis, rhetorical figures typical of this kind of speech were identified. It is also sufficient to note that for political discourse as a whole,

the most frequent are such of them as gradation, parceling, different types of repetitions, antithesis (and other types of contrast), pleonasm and some others. For instance: *It's long past time we take action **to end the scourge of gun violence in America. As president, I'll ban assault weapons and high-capacity magazines, implement universal background checks, and enact other common-sense reforms to end our gun violence epidemic*** [100].

In the fragment we can observe the repetition of metaphorical expressions. In the second case, metaphoricity acquires signs of hyperbole due to the lexeme *epidemic*.

The analyzed texts are characterized by the following stylistic and rhetorical features: compositional standardization, the use of stylistically elevated lexicon, a combination of retrospection and actualization, the use of rhetorical figures, for example: *I want to extend my **prayers and condolences** to the Chaldean Assyrian Community this 10th anniversary of **Our Lady of Deliverance church massacre in Baghdad. The right to worship** is fundamental, and as Americans we should be proud that people from around the world find a home here* [100].

In the fragment, the bookish vocabulary that characterizes Joe Biden's speech serves to express his reconciliation with ordinary people and the demonstration of his religious feelings.

The peculiarities of such pre-election political texts include the widespread use of various rhetorical figures. Here are some examples.

Gradation (from Latin 'gradatio' "gradual increase" < gradus "level, degree") is a stylistic figure consisting of a number of verbal components (at least three): words, phrases, parts of sentences, sentences, imaginative and expressive means of language, arranged in their order increasing or (less often) decreasing semantic and / or emotional significance [19, p. 139]. For instance: *The words of a president matter. And time and time again, Donald Trump has callously used his **to incite violence, stoke the flames of hatred and division, and drive us further apart. It's time for it to end*** [100]. In the above examples, there is an emotional

assessment in the gradation series. However, in the analyzed texts, there are also gradations of the rational-logical type: *violence – flames of hatred – separation*.

Parcellation (from the French ‘*parcelle*’ means “particle”) is a stylistic device, which consists in dividing a sentence as a single syntactic structure into several intonational and semantic units or phrases [19, p. 454-455]. For instance: *Every single American deserves access to regular, reliable, and free COVID-19 testing. **Period*** [100]. Let us note that parcelling, as a rule, in this case is accompanied by appropriate intonation and pause.

Stylistic contrast (from the French ‘*contrast*’ means “the opposite”) is the principle of the linear-syntagmatic organization of a speech, which consists in a sharp opposition of various elements of the text” [19, p. 690]. For instance: *The Trump Administration knew how deadly this virus was back in February. **But they didn’t tell you or your family.** Instead, they gave a heads up to their friends on Wall Street so investors could make a profit before the recession hit. They hid the truth. It’s unforgivable* [100].

Syntactic parallelism is a constructive principle of syntactic structures, in particular, stylistic figures. It is a particular principle of symmetry and repetition and consists in the identical (fully or partially) structure of syntactic constructions [19, p. 623]. For instance: *President Trump **doesn’t care about** you. He **doesn’t even care about** his own supporters* [100].

The use of stylistic means to achieve certain goals in the process of speaking is an integral part of successful speech. Speakers in all public spheres use this technique. This is due to the fact that the stylistic features of the language can enhance the speaker’s influence on the audience. This aspect is especially relevant for political speeches, the purpose of which is not only to influence the audience, but also to partly manipulate their thoughts and actions [35, p. 89].

In pre-election rhetoric, the attitude towards the emotional impact of presidential candidate’s speech is expressed in the deliberate choice of multi-level means, their stylistic and semantic combination, first of all, appealing to the emotional structures of the human psyche, as well as influencing the unconscious

components of speech perception: *More than 9 million cases of COVID-19 have been now confirmed in the United States – and more than 228,000 Americans have lost their lives. It is as severe an indictment of a president’s record as one can possibly imagine, and it is utterly disqualifying* [100]. In the fragment we can observe a hyperbolic simile, enhanced by the adverb-intensifier *utterly*.

In our opinion, this explains the high level of saturation of the pre-election speech with linguistic expressive and emotional means, as well as the techniques of syntactic, lexical and phonetic levels. Experts note that the emotional form of expression changes the pattern of speech perception, influencing the mechanisms of attention, memory, thinking and facilitating the process of information introduction into the consciousness of the addressee [62, p. 122-138].

An analysis of the pre-election debates of Joe Biden and Donald Trump suggests that techniques of syntactic, lexical and phonetic levels, as well as stylistic means, are used to enhance the psychological and emotional impact of speech.

Stylistic techniques of the phonetic level that were encountered in speech, both by Donald Trump and Joe Biden, include the technique of alliteration and assonance, for example: *My faith has been a source of immeasurable solace in times of grief and a daily inspiration to fight against the abuse of power in all its forms. As president, it will continue to serve as my anchor, as it has my entire life* [100]. In the fragment, the alliteration of the consonant *-s* and the assonance, ie the repetition of the vowel *-a*, serve the purposes of self-expressiveness of the political text, as well as unite individual words or their groups.

The group of stylistic and lexical devices most often used by Donald Trump includes metaphor and stylistically coloured words, while Joe Biden has statistics and repetitions, epithets and simile: *More than 230,000 Americans have died from COVID-19 – and Donald Trump has given up on trying to get the virus under control. He may have quit on you, but I promise I never will* [100]; *Health care is deeply personal to me – like it is for so many Americans. And I promise you that as president, I will protect your family’s health care as if it were my own* [100].

The most popular stylistic means of speech influence at the syntactic level among candidates were a rhetorical question, emotional opposition and antithesis, repetitions, anaphora, and others. Let us illustrate the use of the mentioned stylistic figures with the following examples: *There are just two days until Election Day, and our campaign is working around the clock to get folks to vote. **Can you chip in to help us reach every last voter before polls close on Tuesday?*** [100]; *I promise you this: **I'll end Donald Trump's chaos and end this crisis*** [100].

The most common lexical level techniques are idioms, epithets and metaphors, for example: *From his **heinous acts** of separating families at our border to his neglect of the people of Puerto Rico after Hurricane Maria, President Trump **has attacked the dignity of Latino families time and time again.*** *It will end when I'm president* [100]; *Tonight, marks our last end-of-month fundraising deadline – and it's our most important one yet. With three days until Election Day, we can't afford to **fall short*** [100].

The results of the study lead to the following conclusions.

Thus, functional peculiarities of pre-election political discourse contribute to the use of all possible means of speech influence, including rhetorical figures. The most frequent rhetorical figures in the pre-election political sphere of communication include gradation, parceling, repetitions, pleonasm, various types of contrast. The functions of rhetorical figures have their own specifics in political communication, conditioned by the characterological and functional features of pre-election political discourse.

Obviously, in our opinion, there is a relationship between the rhetorical figures used and the communicative strategies and tactics chosen by the political speaker. In this case, the solemn speech of a US presidential candidate dictates the use of such rhetorical figures that are aimed at emotional impact on the audience, inspiration, and rallying of the mass community of people.

2.3. Manipulation in pre-election rhetoric

It should be stressed that the main intention of a political entity in the pre-election process is his election to the expected high post, and the secondary one is to increase recognition. In this case, the applicant chooses one of the general strategies ie a **strategy of positive self-presentation**. This strategy corresponds to the secondary and, indirectly, the main goal of the politician. It consists in the “positive perception of the candidate as a candidate for a high post in the consistent implementation of this positive image in the minds of voters” [67, p. 85].

We have analyzed the texts of political pre-election debates broadcast on various TV channels during the pre-election campaign, including the 2020 presidential campaign in the United States (videos), with the main goal of describing the communication strategies and tactics that were most actively used. As the selected material shows, **manipulative strategies** of self-presentation and presentation, discrediting, argumentation, and agitation are most often used in the American pre-election discourse.

Here are some examples of manipulation in the pre-election discourse of presidential candidates Joe Biden and Donald Trump in 2020. Thus, the strategy of self-presentation (involves “emotional dedication of the speaker, indirect demonstration of mental qualities of his personality to form an impression of him and his goals” [40, p. 43]) is implemented through tactics such as solidarity (with the recipient), identification (with someone or something), the creation of “one’s own circle”, distancing (from political competitors and those associated with them), neutralization of negative perceptions of themselves, hypertrophy of the “I-theme”, shock, mockery, and others [40].

It seems essential to emphasize that by presenting himself to the voters, the candidate of the pre-election campaign strives to look “us” for a certain circle of voters. The addressee of the information tries to convince them that he will take care of his own people. This is the essence of the tactics of creating of “one’s own

circle”, for example: *Not Me. Us* [96]; *Deval for All* [96]; *Our Future is Now* [96]; *We’re All In This Together* [96].

This tactic mainly belongs to the category of manipulative. This is due to the fact that usually pretending to be a “friend” for a politician is a way of mimicry. However, there is no objective reason to consider this tactic inappropriate.

In the political pre-election discourse, one of the active tactics is the tactic of comparison in the right aspect with other parties and movements participating in the elections, the so-called *tactic of favorable comparison*. We can add that explicit comparison with concrete parties meets seldom enough [87, p. 89].

Most often *tactics of distancing* and *contrasting “friend” and “foe”* are used. They are realized at the textual and lexical levels: in the composition of the text, in opposing and comparative constructions of the sentence using the deictics of the first / second person and third person *we, you, our, us, they, their, someone, them*, as well as in syntactic parallelism and antitheses [76, p. 124]. Moreover, the component with the deictics of the first or second person is usually combined with positive evaluation words. In addition, the meanings associated with political competitors are often negatively evaluated. Let us compare: *We are the only party responsible for ...* [99]; *They need great shocks, we need Great America* [100]; *They decide where and with whom we must live* [96]; *We don’t need such power* [99];

It is also important to show that the implicit comparison with political competitors in a favorable light is manifested in the texts, the generation of which is based on *the tactics of exclusivity* and *hypertrophy of the “I-theme”* [76, p. 99]. The linguistic means of implementing this tactic belong mainly to the lexical level. Most often, limiting particles *just, only* and nouns and adjectives with positive evaluative semantics are used, cf.: *Only one party does not vote on orders from above* [98]; *The Democratic Party has a clear program for the revival of the countryside, it knows how to stabilize prices ... There are real professionals on the electoral list* [97].

It is specially noted that comparisons are universal concepts. They reflect cognitive processes both in the field of scientific cognition and in artistic creativity and everyday thinking. Therefore, communicative tactics based on comparison can be identified in many other strategies. This applies in particular to *agitation* and *argumentation strategies*. The latter is the only strategy of political discourse that has almost zero conflictogenity. According to the researchers, the strategy of argumentation is characterized by tactics of contrastive (comparative) analysis, justification of assessment and indication of the future [40, p. 100].

The tactics of contrastive analysis are based on the method of comparing what was in the country before with what is now. Naturally, the “party in power” speaks of the improvement in the lives of Americans, while other parties speak of the deterioration: ***I used to work three jobs ... And the salary could not be paid for months ... Now everything is different*** [97]; ***When Obama came to power, there were only 345 billionaires, today there are already 788*** [97].

Let us move on to consider *conflict-generating strategies* and tactics of pre-election political discourse. According to scientists, the so-called ‘agonal’ function is one of the characteristic of the pre-election discourse [37, p. 97]. The most striking “agonality” of self-presentation is manifested in the *strategy of discrediting* (the communicative essence of this strategy can be seen from the name itself) [37, p. 98].

It should be emphasized that the set of tactics used in pre-election political communication to implement the strategy of discrediting is relatively small. Most often, these are tactics of accusation and illustration of the negative. Occasionally there are also tactics of indirect insults, labeling, minimizing the achievement of comparisons, and others.

The accusation can be directed at a specific politician or party or be of a generalized nature (the entire government, the ruling party). It should be added that *the tactics of accusation* are closely related to the *tactics of illustrating the negative* [79]. Both tactics are implemented through the active use of colloquial vocabulary such as, for example, *went around the world, seized, got* and phrases with negative

evaluative epithets such as *destructive reforms, corrupt bureaucrats*, cf.: *This is our moment to root out systemic racism and build a nation true to our founding ideals. A nation where all men and women are not only created equal – but treated equally* [100].

In fact, the *tactics of indirect insult, or labeling*, is quite common. Its essence is that the negative expressions used to discredit political competitors do not belong to specific parties or individuals. Although the context often makes it possible to understand who a politician calls, swindlers, scoundrels [79]: *Donald Trump’s COVID-19 response has been the greatest failure of presidential leadership in our nation’s history* [100]; *Donald Trump claimed he would be “the greatest jobs president God ever created”. Instead, he’s on track to become the worst jobs president in 100 years* [100].

The *strategy of discrediting* probably includes language techniques or figures, called irony and sarcasm: *Donald Trump sees the world from Park Avenue. I see it from where I came from: Scranton, Pennsylvania. It’s why I’ll fight every day as president to make this country work for middle class and low-income Americans – not just the wealthy and well-connected* [100].

In political pre-election discourse, the **strategy of manipulation** is used no less actively than in commercial advertising. As mentioned earlier, manipulative tactics cannot include all the means used to implement a persuasive function. In our study, these include techniques that in various researches are called tactics of intimidation or hyperbolization, falsification of facts, substitution of concepts, implicit information and appeal to the senses [81, p. 318].

Let us consider the essence of *tactics of intimidation* or hyperbolization, which is that candidates inspire voters to think about the possibility of negative consequences of the victory of another party or politician. Here is a very typical example in this regard: *Together, we can make Donald Trump a one-term president* [100]; *Donald Trump is trying to eliminate the entire Affordable Care Act in the middle of a pandemic. If he gets his way, more than 100 million Americans with pre-existing conditions could see their costs skyrocket or be*

denied coverage altogether. We can't let him win [100]. Attention is drawn to the rhetorical means that are used in the fragment. They enhance the perlocution of the text, ie phraseological units and paraphrases.

In political pre-election discourse, *the tactics of falsifying facts* are rare. First, it is not effective and, moreover, can cause conflict and undesirable actions for politicians. For example, if as a result of any pre-election campaign the reputation of competitors is damaged, then they may be accused of slander [75, p. 109].

This tactic can be implemented as an arbitrary, ie unreasonable combination of neutral and negatively assessed facts. As a result, the idea of causal relationship between these facts is imposed, cf.: *We remember very well how you sold all the wealth of our country to the oligarchs. Do you really think that we will believe and vote for you* [97].

For ethical reasons, one person cannot be blamed for all the problems that occurred while working in government. In addition, such allegations are usually unfounded.

The category of **manipulative** and conflict-generating tactics can include the *tactics of implicit information*, more precisely, allusions or hints [3, p. 176]. In particular, this happens in cases where judgments of negative content are implied. Thus, in the first fragment in the presupposition there is a statement that others will not hear or do not want to hear: *Give your voice to those who hear you* [99]; *For all these years our party ... has not deceived anyone, has not stolen anything from anyone* [99]; *The extinction of the nation must be stopped ... This is my motive to vote for US* [99].

In the same way, *the tactic of "implicit information"*, which is very actively used, finds its expression. Its variety is a rhetorical question. The speaker asks the audience questions that are affirmative or negative judgments [89, p. 70]. Because direct exposure is known to be less productive, the indirectness of illocution makes these judgments more effective, cf.: *You don't know what's inside, do you? Do you*

need such gifts? [99]; *What have they done for the country, for the people?* [99].
Do you think there are fewer independent initiative people in America? [97].

By the way, *the tactic of substituting concepts* is that the creators of advertising of potential American presidential candidates put a party or an individual politician in a logically heterogeneous series. It includes what is assessed negatively or positively in some social groups or in society as a whole [Braiker, p. 56]. In this case such figures as syntactic parallelism and anaphora are usually used, cf.: *By voting for the Republican Party, you are voting for the future of your family* [97]; *“We are citizens of Great America, and we are all together “Great America”* [97].

One of the techniques that is actively used in the strategy of manipulation is called *the tactics of appealing to emotions*. To attract voters to their side, participants in the pre-election debate willingly use words and expressions that evoke an emotional response in the recipient [70, p. 57]: *A beggar worker, doctor, teacher, soldier, policeman, student is a shame* [97]; *When choosing, think about the most intimate: about your family, about your loved ones ... Think about the fate of our homeland* [97].

Finally, the tactics of manipulation strategy should include the *tactics of promises*. In this case, promises can be expressed in words of another modality, ie duty or optativeness: *we should, we intend, we want*). Cf.: *We must give people a job, salary* [97]; *I promise to restore all forms of free education ... return dormitories to students, increase the scholarship for all students* [97].

We should make it clear that the principle of the presumption of innocence does not allow to consider as explicit deception all the promises made to voters by a politician. However, the experience of recent years of US political history suggests that the promises made by politicians should be attributed to manipulative means of communication [67, p. 146].

We should add that performative promises in pre-election debates are often combined with appeals, ie verbal expressions addressed directly to the addressee and include second person deictics: *Join us; Be with us* [97]; *And I advise you to*

do the same [97]; *Come, make the right choice* [97]; *Vote for Donald Trump* [97]; *Let's fight together* [97].

It is analyzed which manipulative strategies and tactics are most characteristic of the American political pre-election discourse of recent times. Strategies for self-presentation and discrediting (or attacking) are most often used in televised debates.

Conclusion to chapter 2

In the texts of the pre-election discourse, as the most frequent, political evaluative and expressive lexicon is singled out. Lexical resources of language allow not only to describe any situation of the outside world, to characterize this or that policy, but also to interpret information, giving the desired vision of the world, to manage the perception of information, to attribute a positive or negative assessment and to orient the addressee, ie the voter, for the future. The grammatical level of the text self-presentation is organized in accordance with the intentions of the addresser, ie the candidate for the US presidency in the 2020 pre-election campaign. Syntactic structures are represented by different groups in the structure and purpose of expression. They interact in different ways, ensuring the communicative success of the texts, while organizing their dialogicity. We should add that for texts of pre-election discourse the imperative and interrogative sentences have the greatest influential potential.

The political texts of the US presidential candidates in the 2020 pre-election campaign differ in a variety of stylistic devices. However, it should be noted the journalistic nature of these means, their ritual nature and predictability. This is due to the need for unambiguous interpretation and adequate explanation of imaginative and expressive means by the mass addressee. In the texts of political pre-election discourse, the use of stylistic means is subordinated to the task of communicative and pragmatic influence on the political addressee, ie the voter.

The strategy of self-presentation or self-promotion is common in political pre-election discourse. Incidentally, texts that rely on manipulative communication tactics also use tactics aimed at discrediting political competitors. Based on the commercials, the most active tactics are identification (with social groups, with the movement or the party), solidarity, distancing (from other parties), illustration of achievements (especially in debates). The strategy of discrediting is manifested in the tactics of accusation, insults (indirect insults, 'hanging labels'), belittling comparisons, illustrating the negative, as well as irony or sarcasm. The very strategy of manipulation is characterized by such communicative techniques and tactics as exaggeration, rhetorical questions, appeals to feelings, allusions (implicit information), falsification of facts and substitution of concepts.

3. RHETORIC OF CANDIDATES FOR US 2020 PRESIDENCY

3.1. Donald Trump's rhetoric

Examining the texts of the pre-election campaign, one cannot fail to mention the pre-election discourse. *Pre-election political discourse* is a speech genre that is a complex communicative event and, at the same time, a verbal presentation of this event, which has a certain role of participants; it is distinguished by its publicity and officiality [71, p. 34].

The main task of the American pre-election discourse is to instill in the addressees the need to take “politically correct” actions. The texts of the American pre-election discourse have the following features: consistency, imagery, emotionality, evaluativeness and appeal. Such texts are characterized by the widespread use of socio-political vocabulary, figurative means, figurative meaning of words, as well as words with a bright emotional connotation. The syntax of this style of speech is characterized by the use of homogeneous members, introductory words and sentences, and complex syntactic structures.

The research material are the texts of the pre-election speeches of American politicians Donald Trump and Joe Biden. The main research method is the method of complex analysis to determine the lexical and grammatical features of the text. In Donald Trump's speeches, there is a high percentage of adjectives, adverbs, and participles: *And we won the election and therefore we have the right to choose her, and very few people **knowingly** would say otherwise* [102]; *And **probably** that would happen in reverse, also. **Definitely** would happen in reverse. So, we won the election and we have the right to do it, Chris* [102]; *Prescription drug prices, we're going to allow our Governors now to go to other countries to buy drugs because when they paid just **a tiny fraction** of what we do* [102].

In Donald Trump's speech, there are many adjectives in a comparative degree, which serves to highlight certain problems that are evident in the USA:

The bigger problem that you have is that you're going to extinguish 180 million people with their private health care, that they're very happy with [102].

Donald Trump's speeches, on one hand, are distinguished by the frequent use of adjectives and adverbs in the superlative degree: *We really feel that. We have a professor at Notre Dame, highly respected by all, said she's the single **greatest** student he's ever had [102]; In fact, some of her **biggest** endorsers are very liberal people from Notre Dame and other places [102].*

In the speeches of these politicians the use of modal verbs is also indicative. In particular, in Trump's speeches, the modal verb *can* is most often encountered, and the modal verbs *should*, and *may* can also be found: *Joe, you've had 308,000 military people dying because you **couldn't** provide them proper healthcare in the military. So, don't tell me about this [102]; And that destroyed ... They **shouldn't** even call it Obamacare, then I had a choice to make, do I let my people run it really well or badly? [102]*

In Donald Trump's speeches, the verb *must* or *have to* is most often used, which gets a rather categorical connotation due to the fact that it is often used in rhetorical questions, in repetitions, in sentences where it is included in the ranks of homogeneous members of a sentence, as well as in combination with reinforcing structures: *No, I think masks are okay. You **have to** understand, if you look... I mean, I have a mask right here. I put a mask on when I think I need it. Tonight, as an example, everybody's had a test and you've had social distancing and all of the things that you **have to**, but I wear masks [102].*

Among the lexical features of these speeches, the use of antonyms and synonyms should also be noted. Their functions in the text are quite different. Let us consider how Trump uses antonyms and synonyms in his speeches: *And you look at what's going on with divorce, look at what's going on with **alcoholism** and **drugs**. It's a very, very sad thing [102].* In this case, synonyms create a unity, which is based on expressions that play the role of homogeneous members of the sentence.

In Donald Trump's speeches, antonyms also serve to create opposition, while they are often used in parallel syntactic constructions: *They give you **good press**, they give me **bad press** because that's the way it is, unfortunately. But let me just say something* [102].

It should also be noted that Trump's speeches are characterized by the use of phraseological units. This increases the imagery and expressiveness of his self-advertising texts: *If you would have had the charge of what I **was put through**, I had to close the greatest economy in the history of our country* [102].

One can also note the peculiarity of Donald Trump's speeches at the lexical level. In his lexicon, there is a frequent use of lexical units with the prefix *re-*, which emphasizes the general meaning of the speech that is to recreate, restore the country, return what has already been: *But what happened is we closed it down and now we're **reopening** and we're doing record business* [102].

Besides Donald Trump's speeches feature syntactic parallelism: *And if you were here, it wouldn't be 200, it would be two million people because you were very late on the draw. **You didn't want me to ban** China, which was heavily infected. **You didn't want me to ban** Europe* [102].

Next, we can turn to the analysis of the use of introductory words and constructions or the so-called parenthetical sentences (parenthesis). For political speech, it is common to use parenthetical words in order to determine the order of statements. For example, in Trump's speeches, one can see similar introductory words: ***Well, first of all**, I guess I'm debating you, not him, but that's okay. I'm not surprised. Let me just tell you something. There's nothing symbolic* [102].

In Donald Trump's speeches, a number of introductory words and phrases can also be distinguished, which most often indicate an emotional assessment of the statement: ***And by the way**, the Democrats, they wouldn't even think about not doing it* [102]; ***As far as a say is concerned**, the people already had their say* [102].

In addition, introductory words and phrases in his speeches may contain a relation to the statements of opponents: *We do them outside, we have tremendous*

crowds, as you see, and literally on 24 hours notice [102]. Thus, introductory words serve to indicate the degree of reliability of the information, the order of presentation of statements and the attitude to the statement.

After studying the materials devoted to the analysis of means of manipulation in the American pre-election discourse, we came to the conclusion that manipulation at the lexical level is quite frequent. In addition to the denotative meaning, words have a connotative component. It should be noted that the choice of the word may impose on the recipient of the message a specific opinion or attitude to what is contained in the message, thereby controlling the perception and understanding of the recipient [57, p. 12]. For example: *I want to thank our **great** Vice President Mike Pence and Karen Pence for being here tonight. It is great to be back in the twin cities with the **freedom-loving** American patriots, who make our country run* [101]; *For the next 13 months we are going to **fight with all of our heart and soul** and we are going to win the great state of Minnesota in 2020* [101].

In the first fragment of the lexemes *great, freedom-loving* are positively colored in this context. Thus, the addressee is trying to gain the support of the audience of Minnesota. He calls the state of potential voters majestic, and residents freedom-loving patriots. As we can see, with the help of appropriate method, Donald Trump is trying to get closer to people. In its turn, they also feel a positive mood. The second fragment of the text uses the lexeme *fight*. In this context, we can consider it as having a negative connotation. In the understanding of most people, fighting for power means making every effort, including even physical force, to gain power. Thus, Donald Trump emphasizes that his plans include the struggle for power, and, consequently, victory in the upcoming elections.

Let us consider the following example: *These **corrupt** politicians and the **radical** leftists got rich **bleeding** America dry and they knew that my election would finally end their **pillaging and looting** of our country* [101]. In this sentence it is dealt with the presence of lexemes with a negative connotation. Donald Trump uses appropriate words to describe the image of political power and political parties. According to him, they are financially enriched at the expense of material

resources of the United States. Accordingly, a negative image is created for the audience and the idea is suggested that parties other than the Republican, represented by Donald Trump, will not bring a better future to the country, and therefore it is necessary to vote only for him.

Another numerous method of manipulation is *lexical repetition*. Through multiple repetitions, he focuses the audience's attention on the units needed by the recipient of the message: *Thirteen months I gotta move fast because they're not beating us at **the polls** and they know it despite **the phony**, despite **the phony polls** that you see all the time. They're **phony polls** [101]; **Polls** are no different than crooked writers. They're **crooked polls**, **the crooked polls** [101].*

In these sentences, Donald Trump uses repetitions in the context of pre-election polls and his views on them. We can see that the attitude of the speaker is extremely negative. This is emphasized by the lexemes used such as *crooked* and *phony*. So, with the help of repetitions, Donald Trump suggests to the audience that these polls are dishonest. In other words, they contain false information and should not be trusted.

As clarified above, in modern political pre-election discourse there is a high degree of *expressiveness*, namely the use of various stylistic means, tropes and figures of language and special syntactic constructions that are not typical [59, p. 48]. In our paper, we will consider the most common stylistic means used to create various strategies and tactics of manipulation.

According to O.L. Mikhaleva, *metaphor* is one of the most effective methods to manipulate consciousness [36, p. 67]. We are inclined to think that individual author's stylistic metaphors are most often used in pre-election discourse. It is shown that one of the main properties of metaphors is their ability to change the perception of situations, push to make a decision and influence behavior [17, p. 163]. Often metaphors describing political life are used to discredit political opponents [17, p. 165]: *Democrats are on a crusade to destroy our democracy* [101]; *Sleepy Joe and his friends sold out America* [101].

In these passages, we can see the use of individual metaphors aimed at compromising the facts about Donald Trump's political rivals. In the first example, Trump is talking about the Democratic Party of the United States, which, in his opinion, is working to eradicate democracy. In another example, he exposes Joe Biden as his main rival in the election. Trump accuses him of participating in various schemes through which public funds were misused. Thus, the application of these metaphors is part of the pragmatic *tactics of accusation* and *the tactics of exposure*.

Along with metaphors, widespread use of *epithets* has been observed in pre-election English-language advertising. According to O.S. Issers, the epithet then becomes a means of influence when it conveys an emotional attitude to the subject of speech [17, p. 173]: *There's nothing that **the dirty political establishment** hates more than a President that they cannot intimidate, own and control* [101]. In this example, D. Trump uses the emotional epithet *dirty* about the political establishment of America. At the same time, the corresponding evaluative adjective serves as one of the means of *accusation tactics*.

According to M.N. Koveshnikova, rhetorical questions, ie statements that are presented in the form of a question are “an expressive means of activating the addressee” and help to identify the elements that are most important in terms of content [18, p. 393]: *Every time a President from a country calls me or I call them, we have to release the text. How can you do business that way? Who's gonna want to speak to your President?* [101]

With the help of rhetorical questions, the answer to which is obvious, Donald Trump emphasizes the truth of his ideas. In addition, the very form of the rhetorical question helps to extract the most significant information from the flow of speech and focus the audience's attention on it.

At the syntactic level, by the way, citations can be used. It accurately reproduces a passage of some text or speech. Appropriate method helps the addressee to confirm and prove his point of view. Thus, quotations, hidden metaphors and allusions can be added to political communication as a means of

dialogue. This makes the message brighter. On the other hand, such stylistic means bring a mystery for a deeper analysis [58, p. 50]: *And today I got a call from one of the top representatives. He said: “Congratulations Mr. President on having a truly great, great economy”* [101].

In this example, direct speech is used to show that the idea of a large American economy belongs not only to Donald Trump. Representatives of other states also recognize its greatness. As we can see, a reference to someone’s opinion will always work as a manipulative technique. In essence, the same thoughts that the speaker is trying to convey to the audience belong to other people. As a result, the opinion of several people, respectively, can be trusted.

O.L. Mikhaleva believes that political discourse is an area of expression of struggle. In this regard, she proposes to distinguish three pragmatic strategies in political pre-election discourse [36, p. 45]: strategy to increase, strategy to decrease and strategy of theatricality. Thus, through *a strategy to increase* a politician seeks to raise its importance: *You can’t keep it. You can’t actually make a gift. You can give it to your different agencies. So, I can give it to health. I can give it to transportation. I can give it to military...* [101]; *We’ve also implemented the strongest screening and vetting mechanisms ever put into place. We’re keeping terrorists, criminals and extremists the hell out of our country* [101].

In the first example, Donald Trump uses *self-presentation tactics*. It helps him build a positive image of himself as president of the United States. The recipient tells the audience that he is donating money for various good purposes, such as health care and the military, rather than earning it. In the context of Trump’s speech, such information is quite noticeable, as the president presented his political opponents in an unfavorable light. In terms of manipulation, we believe this move is well thought out.

The following example demonstrates both *the tactics of the presentation* and *the strategy of creating a circle of “us”*. For this purpose, inclusive pronoun of the 1st person plural *we* is most often used. A characteristic feature of the relevant pronoun should be considered its ability to combine the sender and recipient of the

message. In short, ‘we’ create the image of a whole president and the whole country. Donald Trump draws the audience’s attention to what was done during his rule. These include: improving the structure of verification and certification, the fight against international terrorism and extremism. All these actions belong not only to Trump, but also to US citizens. After all, they chose him, and he lived up to their expectations.

In his speech, Donald Trump also uses *a strategy to decrease*. O. L. Mikhaleva explains that this strategy is aimed at the opponent, in other words, the opponent. It seeks to expose or refute his settings. Let us consider the examples: *Guy walks in, no experience, no nothing, walks out with a big and five G, flies in on Air Force Two with his father, **the Vice President. Don’t forget, that’s when he was Vice President.** So, China gives his son 1.5 billion. How would you like to have Joe Biden take over negotiations right now with China? I don’t think so. I don’t think so. Meanwhile, **Biden allowed China to rip off America for eight years as Vice President...*** [101].

This passage demonstrates *the tactics of accusations and revelations*, which are manifested in the fact that Trump openly states that Joe Biden facilitated the process of misuse of public funds. However, he does not name the exact arguments for the relevant conclusions. We can conclude that these tactics can manipulate the consciousness of the audience. In other words, there is a suggestion that appeals to the feelings and emotions of people who are not indifferent to their country and to the budget, which is formed by taxing citizens.

Thus, the examples in this sub-chapter show that language manipulation is an integral part of political self-presentation (self-promotion) and the rhetoric of politicians as presidential candidates. On the one hand, the appropriate kind of discourse requires this to a greater or lesser extent. On the other hand, it is the desire of the candidates themselves for high positions, as their goal is to win the election.

In order to increase the expressiveness of his speech, the politician used comparative and superlative adjectives, rhetorical interrogative sentences, complex

sentences, on the basis of which the emotionality and pretentiousness of speech was strengthened.

Through a continuous sampling of Donald Trump's pre-election speeches, we have selected 50 text fragments to denote communication strategies. The results of the study appeared to be quite heterogeneous (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1

Distribution of communication strategies (based on D. Trump's pre-election speeches)

Communicative characteristics	Number	%
1. Expressiveness	19	38
2. Persuasiveness	10	20
3. Informativeness, imperative, descriptive slogans	5/15	10/30
4. Provocative slogans	3	6
5. Brevity	2	4
6. Comparative slogans	1	2
Total:	50	100

According to the research, Donald Trump's pre-election discourse is dominated by such communicative characteristics as expressiveness, which occurs in 19 cases (38%), persuasiveness (10 cases or 20%) and informativeness (5 cases or 10%). The corresponding percentage is also occupied by imperative (5 cases or 10%) and descriptive slogans (5 cases or 10%). Provocative slogans are represented by 3 use cases or 6%. Such a characteristic feature of communication strategies as brevity is presented the least in Trump's speeches (2 cases or 4%). Finally, only 1 case or 2% makes up a comparative slogan.

Through a continuous sampling of D. Trump's pre-election speeches, we have selected 50 text fragments to denote stylistic devices. The results of the study were quite heterogeneous (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2

Distribution of stylistic means (based on D. Trump's pre-election speeches)

Stylistic means	Number	%
1. Metaphor, hyperbole, repetition, idioms (proverbs, aphorisms, exclamations, puns)	5/20	10/40
2. Graphic and phonetic means (capitalization, onomatopoeia, alliteration, assonance), parallelism (anaphora), rhetorical questions, epithets	4/16	8/32
3. Stylistically sublime lexicon, contrast (antithesis, antonyms), precedent statements (allusion, citation), enumeration, gradation	2/10	4/20
4. Irony, sarcasm; simile (hyperbolic simile); nominative sentences; parceling	1/4	2/8
Total:	50	100

According to the Table 3.2, the most common among the stylistic devices in Donald Trump's pre-election discourse have been metaphor, hyperbole, repetition, idioms, among which are proverbs, aphorisms, exclamations, puns, a total of 20 units or 40%. While the least common are irony, sarcasm; simile (including hyperbolic simile); nominative sentences and parceling (8%).

At the same time, Donald Trump's manipulative strategies of pre-election discourse are represented, first of all, by the strategy of discrediting (25 cases or 50%). Secondly, 20 cases or 40% are occupied by the strategy of self-presentation. And only 5 cases or 10% belong to the manipulative strategy of argumentation.

3.2. Joe Biden's rhetoric

It should be stressed that political speech is the main genre of political discourse, which is widely used in politics, implemented verbally and extraverbally and aimed at a particular social status. Therefore, it has not only informative but also international character, which is necessary for the careful selection of language means at all levels of the compositional structure. If we take into account the main theme of the political pre-election discourse, it is the struggle for power, which is also the driving force of this sphere of communication. Professionals, journalists and political scientists, as well as the general public, are interested in political pre-election discourse.

In recent decades, pre-election discourse has come under the scrutiny of linguists. The issues of theoretical modeling of political pre-election discourse, ie identification of mechanisms of generation and functioning of political texts have been considered. The analysis of political metaphors as a way of understanding the world of politics has been made. The characteristics of language behavior of politicians have been highlighted and verbal and rhetorical strategies in political activity have been studied.

In the study of the lexical content of the speeches of US presidential candidate Joseph Biden, we have analyzed 72 lexical units (hereinafter 'LU'). This allowed us to single out the most commonly used vocabulary and perform a contextual analysis of lexical units, their emotional coloring, pragmatic functions and stylistic influence.

The identified lexical units were divided into five categories: political ie foreign and domestic; economic terms; legal; public and military. In this study, the category of political terms is the most commonly used.

Most political terms serve as a nominative function. Therefore, most lexical units denote positions held in the politicum: *The American people have a right to have a say in who the Supreme Court nominee is and that say occurs when they vote for United States Senators and when they vote for **the President of United***

States [102]; *We should wait and see what the outcome of this election is because that's the only way the American people get to express their view is by who they elect as **President** and who they elect as **Vice President*** [102].

The politician also refers to the concepts that denote the authorities: *He's in **the Supreme Court** right now trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, which will strip 20 million people from having health insurance now, if it goes into court* [102].

Attention is drawn to the use of units to denote political parties, associations and organizations (mainly used as abbreviations): *It does not. It's only for those people who are so poor they qualify for **Medicaid** they can get that free in most States, except Governors who want to deny people who are poor Medicaid. Anyone who qualifies for **Medicaid** would automatically be enrolled in the public option* [102]. This sentence shows how important it is to put the health of citizens first, especially those who are treated under the American state medical program for the poor, which is carried out at the state level with the support of the federal government. Medical care is provided to people who are below the official poverty line.

It can be concluded that Joe Biden in political pre-election terminology uses the terms to denote the authorities, positions in the politicum, political parties and unions. He also sometimes analyzes problems related to the situation in Ukraine.

The following group includes terms that are related to economic terminology: *The reason he would not meet with President Obama is because President Obama said we're gonna talk about denuclearization, we're not gonna legitimize you, we're gonna continue to put stronger and stronger **sanctions on you*** [102].

In the dictionary, this concept is explained as follows: a ban or restriction in the field of financial and economic, banking, investment, trade, transport and transit, defense industry of one or more countries. This phrase is used to denote the active public position of America on the imposition of economic sanctions against another country.

Let us consider the following example: *Number two, this is a president – I have released all of my **tax returns**. 22 years. Go look at them. 22 years of my **tax returns**. You have not released a single solitary year of your **tax return*** [102]. The word *tax* in this sentence can be explained as follows: Joe Biden opposes himself to his opponent in the pre-election campaign, Donald Trump, emphasizing the transparency of his own campaign, because his own *tax returns* are published in contrast to a competitor.

Thus, speaking of Joseph Biden's use of economic terms in his pre-election speeches, it can be seen that he is aware of the economic and political situation in the country, and tries to assure that he will do everything possible to improve this situation, economic development and world leadership when he will become president of the United States.

The use of legal lexicon is also noticeable in Biden's speeches. Most legal terms mean subjects of law, the field of justice and procedural features: *Well, I have and they have pushed it. Look, they passed this act all the way back in the beginning of the summer. This is like – it's not new. It's been out there. This **HEROES Act** has been sitting there* [102]. Thus, Joseph Biden emphasizes the observance of all laws and norms enshrined in the Constitution, thus trying to pacify the situation. This can be explained by the fact that the main purpose of the candidate is to try to convey to the population the idea that any change begins with the government and the court.

Military terminology is no less important. There is also a lot of military terms in Joseph Biden's speeches related both to the situation in Ukraine and other countries. We can divide this lexicon, which indicates the causes and consequences of hostilities. So, the main cause of hostilities is terrorism, military attacks, sabotage, resulting in occupation, imprisonment and invasion. These examples confirm the connection between the concepts of "politics" and "war". Let us illustrate this with the following example: *On the condition that he would agree that he would be **drawing down his nuclear capacity** to get – the Korean Peninsula should be a **nuclear free zone*** [102]. In the passage, Joe Biden insists

that Korea needs to reduce its nuclear capabilities, that is, the Korean Peninsula should be a nuclear-free zone.

Summarizing the results of the analysis of Joseph Biden's pre-election speeches, it can be seen that the main focus is on protecting the population from external threats such as terrorism, nuclear weapons, imprisonment and occupation. Joe Biden emphasizes the support of the state and believes that it is not an individual country that should fight, but a union.

Another group of Joseph Biden's political pre-election discourse includes social terms: *And so, folks, I will take care of this, I will end this, I will make sure we have a plan* [102]. From this sentence we can conclude that Joseph Biden is on the side of the population and supports the workforce. Perhaps he even focuses on such a target audience in his policy.

In the following sentence, we can see that the oligarchs are not interested in changing the higher branches of government, because the current situation allows them to invest more for their needs: *We saw oligarchs uninterested in change ousted from power only to return* [102]. It can be concluded that for Joseph Biden, the welfare and security of society is important, so he is on the side of the population and supports the working people.

Thus, this study examines the lexical items found in the speeches of Joseph Biden. We concluded that the politician uses speeches to gain the support of the general population, to present his political pre-election program and to inform voters about the state of affairs in the country.

The results of the study allowed us to come to conclusions about the functioning of phraseological units, some other techniques of the language game and antonymic oppositions as means of speech manipulation in the American pre-election discourse. For instance: *We make up 15% of the world's problem. We in fact, but the rest of the world, we've got to get them to come along. That's why we have to get back into, back into the Paris Accord* [102].

A mention should be made that the ability to control mass consciousness at this stage in the development of modern society is becoming increasingly

important. This is especially clearly manifested in the process of the pre-election race, which is due to its limited time and a quick visible result that is the election of a candidate for office. To this end, politicians use in their speeches the means of language, with the help of which the addressee's speech manipulation is carried out in order to rebuild the implicit picture of the latter's world: *And by the way, our military – they've been voting by ballots for **since the end of the Civil War**, in effect. And that's, and that's what's going to happen* [102].

A significant place in the manipulation of the masses in the American pre-election discourse is given to phraseological units. The greatest impact is possessed by phraseological units with a high degree of idiomaticity, which is due to their imagery. With the help of the context, the speaker can change the connotations of phraseological units for their own purposes. For instance: *And the justice, I'm not opposed to the justice, she seems like a very fine person. But she's written, before she **went in the bench**, which is her right, that she thinks that the Affordable Care Act is not Constitutional* [102].

In the examples, there is a predominance of phraseological units with negative connotations, and the most frequent tactics in which they are used are the *tactics of accusation* and *impersonal accusation*. Despite this, as the analysis of the linguistic material shows, the same phraseological unit can be used both in the *increase strategy* and in the *decrease strategy*, which indicates their universal character when manipulating the addressee: *The polls are open on time, and the polls stay open until the votes are counted. And this is all about trying to dissuade people from voting because he's trying **to conf-to scare people into thinking** that it's not going to be legitimate* [102].

The purpose of using phraseological units in Joe Biden's pre-election speech is to conceal the true meaning of the statement. This is achieved due to such a property of the latter as ambiguity. In addition, an important characteristic of phraseological units in pre-election discourse is to avoid overloading the addressee with "unnecessary" information or its compression.

Phraseologisms in the speeches of American speakers are often transformed. The strength of the effectiveness of the influence of the transformed phraseological units is due to their non-standardness, the expenditure of great intellectual efforts for their detection, which determines their classification as the methods of the language game: *I don't understand why this President is **unwilling to take on Putin** when he's **actually paying bounties** to kill American soldiers in Afghanistan, when he's engaged in activities that are trying to destabilize all of NATO* [102].

It should be emphasized that the language game and phraseological units are linked by such common functions in communication as creating ambiguity and enlivening the speaker's rhetoric or giving it imagery. As a result, they are retained in memory longer, and their recognition and 'correct' interpretation by the addressee serves to unite the latter with the speaker, defining them as owners of identical background knowledge and level of intelligence. At the same time, speakers in pre-election discourse use all existing types of phraseological transformations and combine several of them at the same time:

*What I'm going to do is **pass Obamacare with a public option – become Bidencare**. Public option is an option that says that if you, in fact, do not have the wherewithal to be – if you qualify for Medicaid, and you do not have the wherewithal in your state to get Medicaid, you automatically are enrolled, providing competition for insurance companies* [102].

Such transformations serve the purpose of enhancing the semantic load of the context, both positive and negative attracting the attention of the addressee. Thus, most of the transformed phraseological units are intended to denigrate the opponent and provoke addressee's negative emotions.

One of the main functions of phraseological units in American pre-election discourse is to create a comic effect of a statement. Despite the fact that the correct interpretation of the phraseological unit requires certain intellectual efforts from the addressee, the latter's laughter can be considered as a response and proves that the communication took place, and the speaker's hidden intentions were realized: *And by the way, this is **the same fellow** who told you this is going to end by Easter*

last time. **This the same fellow** who told you that, don't worry, we're going to end this by the summer. We're about **to go into a dark winter, a dark winter**, and he has no clear plan and there's no prospect that there's going to be a vaccine available for the majority of the American people before the middle of next year [102].

Along with these units, the manipulation by the addressee with the techniques of a language game by creating a comic effect of the utterance was carried out using paronymic attraction, occasional word formations, as well as the effect of deceived expectations: *Number one, he knows what I proposed. What I proposed is that we expand **Obamacare**, and we increase it. We do not wipe any. And one of the big debates we had with 23 of my colleagues trying to win the nomination that I won, were saying that Biden wanted to allow people to have private insurance still. **They can. They do. They will under my proposal*** [102].

Antonymic oppositions became the next means of manipulation in the American pre-election discourse. The type of discourse under study is based on contrast, which finds its expression in antonyms that exist in the language or are created by the speaker in a special situation for specific purposes: *More, more carbon is absorbed in that rainforest than every bit of carbon that's emitted in the United States. **Instead of doing something about that, I would be gathering up and making sure we had the comp-countries of the world coming up with 20 billion dollars, and say, "Here's \$20 billion. Stop, stop tearing, tearing down the forest. And if you don't, then you're going to have significant economic consequences."*** [102]

In the American pre-election discourse, several lines of semantic oppositions have been identified, with the help of which speakers manipulate the addressee: proposed alternatives for the development of society or state, cooperation or opposition, social stratification of society, military themes or politics of capture, development of democracy in society. Separately, the line 'imposed views' was also highlighted. It consists of a variety of thematic groups and is created to implement the goals of the speaker during a particular pre-election campaign: *The*

platform of the Democratic Party is what I, in fact, approved of, what I approved of. Now, here's the deal. The deal is that it's going to wipe out pre-existing conditions. And, by the way, the 200,000 people that have died on his watch, how many of those have survived? Well, there's seven million people that contracted COVID. What does it mean for them going forward if you strike down the Affordable Care Act? [102]

As in the case with other investigated means of speech manipulation in the American pre-election discourse, most antonymic oppositions are part of 'negative' rhetoric. Moreover, in the case of antonyms, this "negative" rhetoric is a threat, a prohibition on the "wrong" choice of the addressee, forcible persuasion of the latter to his side, which proves the possibility of classifying the contrast realized by systemic antonyms and author's oppositions to the means of realizing a threatening speech act:

Compared to what's going on in Europe, as the New England Medical Journal said, they're starting from a very low rate. We're starting from a very high rate. The expectation is we'll have another 200,000 Americans dead by the time, between now and the end of the year. If we just wore these masks – the President's own advisors have told him – we could save 100,000 lives. And we're in a circumstance where the President, thus far, still has no plan. No comprehensive plan. What I would do is make sure we have everyone encouraged to wear a mask, all the time [102].

Through a continuous sampling of Joseph Biden's pre-election speeches, we have selected 72 text fragments to denote communication strategies. The results of the study have been quite heterogeneous (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.3

Distribution of communication strategies (based on J. Biden's pre-election speeches)

Communicative characteristics	Number	%
1. Expressiveness	21	29
2. Informativeness	14	19

3. Persuasiveness	10	13
4. Intertextuality	8	11
5. Brevity	5	6,9
6. Imperative, descriptive, provocative slogans	4/12	5,5/16
7. Comparative slogans	2	2,7
Total:	72	100

According to the research, Joe Biden's pre-election discourse is dominated by such communicative characteristics as expressiveness, which occurs in 21 cases (29%) and informativeness (14 cases or 19%). The second place is dominated by persuasiveness (10 cases or 13%) and intertextuality (8 cases or 11%). Such a characteristic of communicative strategies as brevity is presented the least in J. Biden's speeches (5 cases or 6,9%).

Among the advertising slogans of the pre-election speeches of the American politician as a candidate for the presidency of the United States should be noted, first of all, imperative, descriptive, provocative slogans, which account for 12 cases of use or 16%. Whereas comparative slogans make up only 2,7% of the total number of selected language units.

Through a continuous sampling of J. Biden's pre-election speeches, we have selected 72 text fragments to denote stylistic devices. The results of the research appeared to be quite heterogeneous (see Table 3.4).

Table 3.4

Results of the research

Stylistic means	Number	%
1. Idioms; hyperbole	8/16	11/22
2. Metaphor	7	9,7
3. Allusion, citation	6	8,3
4. Repetition; contrast, antonyms	5/10	6,9/13,8

5. Irony, sarcasm; simile; epithets	4/12	5,5/16,6
6. Parallelism; parceling; nominative sentences; metonymy	3/12	4,1/16,6
7. Graphic and phonetic means; gradation	2/6	2,7/8,3
8. Stylistically sublime lexicon; enumeration; rhetorical questions	1/3	1,3/4,1
Total:	72	100

According to the Table 3.4, idioms, and hyperbole (11%) became the most common among stylistic devices in J. Biden's pre-election discourse. Slightly less common were metaphor (9,7%), allusion, citation (8,3%) and repetition, contrast (6,9%).

Less common stylistic devices in Joe Biden's pre-election discourse include irony, sarcasm, simile, epithets (5,5%); parallelism, parceling, nominative sentences, metonymy (4,1%); graphic-phonetic means, gradation (2,7%) and stylistically sublime lexicon, enumeration, and rhetorical questions (1,3%).

At the same time, Joe Biden's manipulative strategies of pre-election discourse are represented, first of all, by the strategy of self-presentation (37 cases or 51%). Second, 24 cases or 33% is a discrediting strategy. And only 11 cases or 15,2% belong to the manipulative strategy of argumentation.

The study proves that phraseological units, transformed phraseological units, metaphors and other means are an effective means of influence in the pre-election discourse of Joe Biden. The ending result of all the allocated means of manipulation in the American pre-election discourse is the impact on the addressee, a change in his views and assessments, which, due to the prevalence of negative rhetoric, has a negative effect on the emotional state of the latter.

Conclusion to chapter 3

It is shown that language manipulation is an integral part of political self-presentation and the rhetoric of politicians as presidential candidates. On the one hand, the appropriate kind of discourse requires this to a greater or lesser extent. On the other hand, it is the desire of the candidates themselves for high positions, as their goal is to win the election. In order to increase the expressiveness of his speech, the Donald Trump used mostly comparative and superlative adjectives, rhetorical interrogative sentences, complex sentences, on the basis of which the emotionality and pretentiousness of speech was strengthened.

According to the research, Donald Trump's pre-election discourse is dominated by such communicative characteristics as expressiveness, which occurs in 19 cases (38%), persuasiveness (10 cases or 20%) and informativeness (5 cases or 10%). The corresponding percentage is also occupied by imperative (5 cases or 10%) and descriptive slogans (5 cases or 10%). Provocative slogans are represented by 3 use cases or 6%. Such a characteristic feature of communication strategies as brevity is presented the least in Trump's speeches (2 cases or 4%). Finally, only 1 case or 2% makes up a comparative slogan.

According to the research, the most common among the stylistic devices in Donald Trump's pre-election discourse have been metaphor, hyperbole, repetition, idioms, among which are proverbs, aphorisms, exclamations, puns, a total of 20 units or 40%. While the least common are irony, sarcasm; simile (including hyperbolic simile); nominative sentences and parceling (8%). At the same time, Donald Trump's manipulative strategies of pre-election discourse are represented, first of all, by the strategy of discrediting (25 cases or 50%). Secondly, 20 cases or 40% are occupied by the strategy of self-presentation. And only 5 cases or 10% belong to the manipulative strategy of argumentation.

It is specially noted that Joe Biden's pre-election discourse is dominated by such communicative characteristics as expressiveness, which occurs in 21 cases (29%) and informativeness (14 cases or 19%). The second place is dominated by

persuasiveness (10 cases or 13%) and intertextuality (8 cases or 11%). Such a characteristic of communicative strategies as brevity is presented the least in J. Biden's speeches (5 cases or 6.9%). Among the advertising slogans of the pre-election speeches of the American politician as a candidate for the presidency of the United States should be noted, first of all, imperative, descriptive, provocative slogans, which account for 12 cases of use or 16%. Whereas comparative slogans make up only 2,7% of the total number of selected language units.

Less common stylistic devices in Joe Biden's pre-election discourse include irony, sarcasm, simile, epithets (5,5%); parallelism, parceling, nominative sentences, metonymy (4,1%); graphic-phonetic means, gradation (2,7%) and stylistically sublime lexicon, enumeration, and rhetorical questions (1,3%). Joe Biden's manipulative strategies of pre-election discourse are represented, first of all, by the strategy of self-presentation (37 cases or 51%). Second, 24 cases or 33% is a discrediting strategy. And only 11 cases or 15.2% belong to the manipulative strategy of argumentation.

CONCLUSIONS

The literary style of the texts of the American pre-election discourse can be defined as being at the junction of the journalistic style and the style of advertising messages. To its distinctive features we can refer: laconic presentation, economy of language; selection of language means in order to achieve clarity of presentation; the use of social and political lexicon and phraseology borrowed from other styles; the use of speech stereotypes, clichés; genre diversity and variety of linguistic means, the use of ambiguity, emotionally expressive lexicon; imperative character, semantic and informative richness, demonstrativeness.

The choice of presentation style, linguistic means, composition of the text in the pre-election discourse is carried out taking into account the characteristics of the audience for which the text is intended, speech stereotypes familiar to this target segment, its mentality, educational level, types of perception prevailing in the audience.

In addition, the organization of the text in the American pre-election discourse (subject to the fulfillment of the norms and rules of the competent conduct of the electoral game with the expectation of achieving the maximum effectiveness of the message) cannot but rely on the well-known methods of psychological influence.

We have identified the following methods of constructing texts of pre-election discourse: the use of nominalizations, indefinite or nonspecific verbs, the technique of 'skipping information', the construction of phrases by proposing different choices or excluding one of the choices, the use of oppositions, the reforming of meaning or context.

Among the lexical features inherent in written and oral speech in pre-election advertising, one can note the use of homonyms, phonetic plurality of meanings, ambiguous phrases, and negative commands, as well as the use of verbal symbols.

For the oral speech, generalization, presentation of specific evidence, amendments, repetitions, construction of a phrase using contrast, softening, evasion are very relevant. Of the more private semantic and syntactic techniques used in American pre-election speeches of D. Trump and J. Biden, the following can be named: designation of communication participants, designation of existing objects, designation of the characteristics of the pragmatic context and relations between participants, the so-called 'reading thoughts', causal modeling, formation of authoritarianism by the method of quotation marks and 'indefinite attitude', designation of states, events, actions.

Both in the Internet texts and in public speeches, techniques are used to model qualitative expression with the help of comparative degrees of adjectives, modeling of choice, and indefinite mention.

Syntactic techniques of verbal communication used in American pre-election discourse include: the use of real cause-and-effect relationships between phenomena to express an unambiguous understanding of what is happening, the unification on the basis of the causal relationship of such phenomena that, in essence, have no relation to each other, the use of complex sentences indicating for a time, ordinal numerals, the use of the conjunction 'or' to form a proposal of a false choice.

Considering the stylistic features of the texts of the American pre-election discourse, one cannot ignore the winged words, figurative expressions, comparative phrases, metaphors, metonymy, that is, all possible means that give the texts expressiveness, emotionality, multiplying the effect of influence, that improve the communication properties of messages, both written and oral.

In the American pre-election discourse playing out set phrases, fragments of famous songs, poems that are firmly embedded in the language of phraseological units, quotations, wordplay, deliberate violation of lexical compatibility, as well as aphoristic statements become extremely popular.

The correct choice of the ratio of the common language and the specific political lexicon is also of great importance: the recommended correlation is the prevalence of political vocabulary over the general one.

The range of linguistic possibilities and speech strategies and tactics of influencing the audience that can be used in pre-election discourse is extremely wide. Skillful use of linguistic resources, a competent and creative combination of stylistic techniques can ensure the true success of pre-election communication.

SUMMARY

Магістерську роботу присвячено дослідженню передвиборчої президентській кампанії у США у 2020 році.

Незважаючи на те, що в останні роки дискурсу присвячено чимало досліджень, вивчення окремих видів дискурсу, зокрема передвиборчого, зберігає свою актуальність.

Актуальність дослідження обумовлена підвищеною увагою сучасних мовознавців до вивчення передвиборчої президентській кампанії у США у 2020 році.

Мета роботи полягає у виявленні та характеристиці передвиборчої президентській кампанії у США у 2020 році.

Для досягнення поставленої мети дослідження необхідно вирішити такі **завдання**:

- 1) з'ясувати теоретичні основи дослідження політичного дискурсу;
- 2) розглянути політичний дискурс як об'єкт лінгвістичного аналізу;
- 3) проаналізувати передвиборчу риторику політичного дискурсу;
- 4) розкрити передвиборчу риторику кандидатів у президенти США під час передвиборчої кампанії 2020 року;
- 5) проаналізувати комунікативні стратегії, стилістичні ознаки, а також маніпулятивні стратегії і тактики передвиборчої риторики;
- 6) проаналізувати риторику кандидатів у президенти США 2020 року, а саме риторику Дональда Трампа та Джо Байдена у зіставному аспекті.

Об'єктом дослідження є передвиборча президентська кампанія у США у 2020 році.

Предметом дослідження є особливості передвиборчої президентської кампанії у США у 2020 році.

Матеріалом дослідження стали текстові фрагменти, відібрані з американських рекламних текстів та слоганів, соціальних мереж, дебатів у

передвиборчих компаніях американських політиків Дональда Трампа та Джо Байдена.

Методи дослідження зумовлені метою, завданнями та проаналізованим матеріалом: зіставний метод; контекстуально-інтерпретаційний; описовий; метод суцільної вибірки.

Наукова новизна дослідження полягає в тому, що у ньому комплексно розглядаються лінгвістичні прийоми комунікації та маніпуляції в американському передвиборчому дискурсі. Проводиться дослідження конкретних особливостей текстів політичного передвиборчого дискурсу президентської кампанії у США у 2020 році.

Практичне значення роботи полягає в тому, що отримані результати можуть бути використані під час розробки теоретичних та практичних курсів із загального мовознавства. Результати цього дослідження можуть бути корисними при написанні курсових, дипломних та магістерських робіт, а також у подальшій розробці проблеми перекладу текстів передвиборчого дискурсу.

Мовне маніпулювання є невід'ємною частиною політичної самопрезентації та риторики політичних діячів як кандидатів у президенти. З одного боку, передвиборчий дискурс вимагає цього в більшій чи меншій мірі. З іншого боку, це бажання самих претендентів на високі пости, оскільки їх метою є перемога на виборах. За результатами дослідження, у передвиборчому дискурсі Дональда Трампа переважають такі комунікативні характеристики, як експресивність (38%), персуазивність (20%) and інформативність (10%). Така характеристика комунікативних стратегій як стислість представлена найменше у промовах Д. Трампа (4%).

За отриманими даними, найбільш поширеними серед стилістичних засобів у передвиборчому дискурсі Дональда Трампа стали метафори, гіперболи, повтори та фразеологічні одиниці (40%). Тоді як найменш поширеними виявилися іронія, сарказм, порівняння та парцеляція (8%). У той же час маніпулятивні стратегії передвиборного дискурсу Д. Трампа

представлені, в першу чергу, стратегією дискредитації (50%). По-друге, 40% займає стратегія само презентації і лише 10% належить маніпулятивній стратегії аргументації.

За результатами дослідження, у передвиборчому дискурсі Джо Байдена переважають такі комунікативні характеристики, як експресивність (29%) та інформативність (19%). На другому місці переважає персуазивність (13%) та інтертекстуальність (11%). Така характеристика комунікативних стратегій як компресія або стислість у промовах Д. Байдена представлена найменше (6,9%). Найбільш поширеними серед стилістичних засобів у передвиборчому дискурсі Дж. Байдена стали ідіоми і гіперболи (11%). Трохи менш поширеними виявилися метафоричні одиниці (9,7%), алюзії та цитати (8,3%), а також прийоми контрасту (6,9%). У той же час маніпулятивні стратегії передвиборного дискурсу Джо Байдена представлені, в першу чергу, стратегією самопрезентації (51%). По-друге, 33% займає стратегія дискредитації і 15,2% належить маніпулятивній стратегії аргументації.

Дослідження доводить, що фразеологічні одиниці, контрасти, градації, паралельні конструкції, а також інші тропи і фігури є ефективним засобом впливу в передвиборчому дискурсі як Дональда Трампа, так і Джо Байдена. Кінцевим підсумком усіх виділених засобів маніпулювання в американському передвиборчому дискурсі є вплив на адресата, зміна його поглядів і оцінок, яке, в зв'язку з переважанням негативної риторики, також негативно позначається на емоційному стані останнього.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Акінчиць Н. Розвиток політичної лінгвістики як автономної науки [Електронний ресурс] / Н. Акінчиць // Вопросы духовной культуры. Филологические науки. – URL: <http://dspace.nbuiv.gov.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/35201/10-Akinchits.pdf?sequence=1>.
2. Андерсон Р. Дискурсивне походження диктатури і демократії / Р. Андерсон / пер. з англ. А. Ф. Карася // Універсум. Журнал політології, футурології, економіки, науки та культури. – 2003. – № 11-12.
3. Аникин Е. Е. Тактика імпліцитного сопоставлення в рекламному дискурсе США [Електронний ресурс] / Е. Е. Аникин. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/taktika-implitsitnogo-sopostavleniya-v-reklamnom-diskurse-ssha/viewer>.
4. Бабайлова А. Э. Текст как продукт, средство и объект коммуникации при обучении неродному языку: социопсихолінгвістическіе аспекти / А. Э. Бабайлова. – Саратов: Изд-во Саратов. ун-та, 1987. – 151 с.
5. Барт Р. Від твору до тексту / Р. Барт // Антологія світової літературнокритичної думки ХХ ст. / пер. Ю. Гудзя. – Львів: Літопис, 1996. – С. 378-384.
6. Баталов Э. Я. Политическая культура современного американского общества / Э. Я. Баталов. – М.: Наука, 1990. – 256 с.
7. Бахтин М. М. Эстетика словесного творчества / М. М. Бахтин. – М.: Искусство, 1979. – 423 с.
8. Бодріяр Ж. Симулякри і симуляція / Ж. Бодріяр / пер. з фр. В. Ховхун. – К.: Вид-во Соломії Павличко «Основи», 2004. – 230 с.
9. Будаев Э. В. Современная политическая лингвистика [Електронний ресурс] / Э. В. Будаев, А. П. Чудинов. – URL: <http://tinyurl.com/kljoeu4>.
10. Валгина Н. С. Теория текста: учеб. пособие / Н. С. Валгина. – М.: Логос, 2003. – 280 с.

11. Ван Дейк Т. А. Дискурс и власть: репрезентация доминирования в языке и коммуникации / Т. А. Ван Дейк. – М.: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2013. – 344 с.
12. Гайкова О. В. Предвыборный дискурс как жанр политической коммуникации: на материале английского языка: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. спец. 10.02.04. / О. В. Гайкова. – 2003. – 23 с.
13. Дебре Р. Интелектуальна влада у Франції / Р. Дебре. – К.: Дух і Літера., 2008. – 308 с.
14. Демьянков В. Политический дискурс как предмет политологической филологии [Электронный ресурс] / В. Демьянков // Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: история и современные исследования. – 2002. – № 3. – URL: <http://tinyurl.com/pekyanc>.
15. Еко У. Роль читача: дослідження з семіотики текстів / У. Еко / пер. з англ. Марія Гірняк. – Львів: «Літопис», 2004. – 383 с.
16. Заломов В. Что такое самопрезентация? / В. Заломов. – URL: <https://donkovie.ru/samoprezentaciya.html>.
17. Иссерс О. С. Речевое воздействие: учебное пособие / О. С. Иссерс. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2009. – 224 с.
18. Ковешникова М. Н. Речевая манипуляция и приемы речевого манипулирования / М. Н. Ковешникова // XVIII Царскосельские чтения: материалы междунар. науч. конф. (22-23 апр. 2014 г.): в 3-х т. / под общ. ред. В. Н. Скворцова. – СПб.: Изд. Ленингр. гос. ун-та, 2014. – Т. 1. – С. 387-394.
19. Культура русской речи: Энциклопедический словарь-справочник / под ред. Л. Ю. Иванова, А.П. Сковородникова, Е. Н. Ширяева и др. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2003. – 840 с.
20. Карасик В. И. О категориях дискурса / В. И. Карасик // Языковая личность: социолингвистические и эмотивные аспекты: сб. научн. тр. / ВГПУ; СГУ. – В.: Перемена, 1998. – С. 185-197.

21. Карасик В. И. О социолингвистическом анализе дискурса / В. И. Карасик // Основное высшее и дополнительное образование: проблемы дидактики и лингвистики: сб. научн. тр. – В.: Политех, 2000. – С. 109-113.
22. Карасик В. И. О типах дискурса / В. И. Карасик // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс: сб. научн. тр. – В.: Перемена, 2000. – С. 5-20.
23. Карасик В. И. Этнокультурные типы институционального дискурса / В. И. Карасик // Этнокультурная специфика речевой деятельности: сб. обзоров. – М.: ИНИОН РАН, 2000. – С. 37-64.
24. Карасик В. И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс / В. И. Карасик. – В.: Перемена, 2002. – 477 с.
25. Карасик В. И. Язык социального статуса / В. И. Карасик. – М.: Институт РАН; Волгог. гос. пед. ин-т, 1992. – 330 с.
26. Клименко І. Теоретичні засади лінгвістичного аналізу політичного дискурсу [Електронний ресурс] / І. Клименко. – URL: <http://litmisto.org.ua/?p=8416>.
27. Ковалева Е. И. Преемственность традиций классической риторики в американском публичном выступлении (на материале выступлений общественно-политических деятелей США): автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук / Е. И. Ковалева. – М., 2000. – 16 с.
28. Кожемякин Е. Дискурсный подход к изучению культуры [Електронний ресурс] / Е. Кожемякин. – URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/diskursnyy-podhod-k-izucheniyu-kultury>.
29. Кривенко С.-В. О. Семантична парадоксальність політичного дискурсу (теоретико-методологічний аналіз): дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. політичних наук: спеціальність 23.00.01 – теорія та історія політичної науки / Кривенко Соломія-Василина Олександрівна. – Львів, 2016. – 216 с.
30. Кронгауз М. Семантика: учебник для вузов / М. Кронгауз. – М.: Рос. гос. гуманит. ун-т, 2001. – 399 с.

31. Лакло Э. К радикальной демократической политике: предисловие ко второму изданию «Гегемонии и социалистической стратегии» [Электронный ресурс] / Э. Лакло, Ш. Муфф / пер. с англ. Иван Гололобов. – URL: <http://www.politizdat.ru/outgoung/15/>.

32. Лассуэлл Г. Д. Психопатология и политика: монография / Г. Д. Лассуэлл / пер. с англ Т. Н. Самсоновой, Н. В. Коротковой. – М.: Изд-во РАГС, 2005. – 359 с.

33. Леви-Стросс К. Три вида гуманизма. Первобытное мышление / К. Леви-Стросс. – М.: Республика, 1994. С. 220-222.

34. Миньяр-Белоручева А. П. Язык предвыборной политической рекламы США: динамика развития / А. П. Миньяр-Белоручева // Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Ser. Linguistics. – 2015. – Vol. 12. – № 4. – P. 26-33.

35. Миронова Н. Н. Дискурс-анализ оценочной семантики / Н. Н. Миронова. – М.: НВИ «Тезаурус», 1997. – 160 с.

36. Михалева О. Л. Политический дискурс: специфика манипулятивного воздействия / О. Л. Михалева. – М.: ЛИБРОКОМ, 2009. – 256 с.

37. Михалева О. Л. Политический дискурс: способы реализации агональности / О. Л. Михалева // Построение гражданского общества: материалы международного гуманитарного конгресса. Ч. 3: Русский язык: его современное состояние и проблемы преподавания. – Иркутск: Изд-во Ирк. гос. пед. ун-та, 2002. – С. 96-105.

38. Мишланов В. А. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики в современном политическом дискурсе (на материале политической рекламы предвыборных кампаний 2003, 2007, 2008 гг.) / В. А. Мишланов // Вестник Пермского ун-та. 2009. – Вып. 6. – С. 5-13.

39. Нагорна Л. Політична мова і мовна політика. Діапазон можливостей політичної лінгвістики / Л. Нагорна. – К.: Світогляд, 2005. – 315 с.

40. Паршина О. Н. Российская политическая речь: теория и практика / О. Н. Паршина / под ред. О. Б. Сиротининой. – [2-е изд., испр. и доп.] – М.: Издательство ЛКИ, 2007. – 232 с.
41. Петлюченко Н. В. Харизматика: мовна особистість і дискурс: монографія / Н. В. Петлюченко. – Одеса: Астропринт, 2009. – 464 с.
42. Пирс Ч. С. Избранные философские произведения / Ч. С. Пирс / пер. с англ. К. Голубовича, К. Чухрукидзе, Т. Дмитриева. – М.: Логос, 2000. – 448 с.
43. Полякова Т. Л. Жанр твиттинг в сфере политической интернет-коммуникации: основные коммуникативные характеристики / Т. Л. Полякова // Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Харків. Серія: Іноземна філологія. Методика викладання іноземних мов. – 2014. – № 1102. – Вип. 77. – С. 166-171.
44. Почепцов Г. Семиотика / Г. Почепцов. – М.: «Рефл-бук»; К.: «Ваклер», 2002. – 432 с.
45. Пропп В. Фольклор и действительность / В. Пропп. – М.: Наука, 1989. – 233 с.
46. Романченко А. П. Стратегія самопрезентації та її тактики (на матеріалі лінгвістичного дискурсу) / А. П. Романченко // Записки з українського мовознавства. – 2018. – № 25. – С. 197–209. URL: <http://zum.onu.edu.ua/article/view/141379>.
47. Серажим К. Дискурс як соціолінгвальне явище: методологія, архітектоніка, варіативність [на матеріалах сучасної газетної публіцистики]: монографія / Серажим К. / за ред. В. Різуна. – К.: Нац. ун-т ім. Тараса Шевченка, 2002. – 392 с.
48. Соссюр Ф. де. Заметки по общей лингвистике / Ф. де Соссюр. – М.: Прогресс, 2001. – 280 с.
49. Сотников А. В. Ключові слова в політичному дискурсі / А. В. Сотников // Лінгвістика ХХІ століття: нові дослідження і перспективи. – 2009. – № 3. – С. 216-224.

50. Сотников А. В. Маніпулятивний вплив в політичному дискурсі (на матеріалі передвиборчих промов) / А. В. Сотников // Лінгвістика ХХІ ст.: нові дослідження і перспективи. – 2016. – С. 123-128.

51. СЭС – Стилистический энциклопедический словарь / под ред. М. Н. Кожинной. – М.: Флинта, Наука, 2006. – 696 с.

52. Суханов Ю. Ю. Семантические и когнитивные особенности предвыборной риторики в политическом дискурсе (на материале выступлений политиков США): дисс. на соискание ученой степени канд. филол. наук.: специальность 10.02.19 – теория языка / Юрий Юрьевич Суханов. – 2018. – 160 с.

53. Филлипс Л. Дискурс-анализ. Теория и метод / Л. Филлипс, М. Йоргенсен. – Х.: Изд-во Гуманитарній Центр, 2004. – 336 с.

54. Фуко М. Археология знания / М. Фуко / пер. с фр. М. Б. Раковой, А. Ю. Серебрянниковой. – СПб.: ИЦ «Гуманитарная Академия»; Университетская книга, 2004. – 416 с.

55. Хабермас Ю. Философский дискурс о модерне / Ю. Хабермас / пер. с нем. – М.: Изд-во «Весь Мир», 2003. – 416 с.

56. Хомський Н. Роздуми про мову / Н. Хомський / пер. з англ. – Львів: Ініціатива, 2000. – 352 с.

57. Чернявская В. Е. Дискурс власти и власть дискурса: проблемы речевого воздействия: учебное пособие / В. Е. Чернявская. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2006. – 136 с.

58. Чудинов А. Основные направления в современной российской политической лингвистике: учебное пособие / А. Чудинов. – М.: Изд-ва «Флинта», «Наука», 2006. – 254 с.

59. Чудинов А. П. Политическая лингвистика / А. Чудинов. – М.: Флинта, Наука, 2012. – 256 с.

60. Чудинов А. П. Современная политическая коммуникация: учебное пособие / А. Чудинов. – Е.: Уральский государственный педагогический университет, 2009. – 292 с.

61. Шейгал Е. И. Семиотика политического дискурса: монография / Е. И. Шейгал. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. – 386 с.
62. Школьник Л. С. Исследования речевого воздействия: целевой подход (обзор) / Л. С. Школьник // Язык как средство идеологического воздействия. Сборник обзоров. – М., 1983. – С. 122-138.
63. Щербаков А. В. Риторические фигуры в политическом дискурсе / А. В. Щербаков // Медиариторика и современная культура общения: наука – практика – обучение: сб. статей XXII международной научной конф. (30 января – 1 февраля 2019 г.). – М.: Гос. ИРЯ им. А. С. Пушкина, 2019. – С. 257-262.
64. Серман И. З. Эйхенбаум Б. М. и проблема истории [Электронный ресурс] / И. З. Серман. – URL: https://www.persee.fr/doc/slave_0080-2557_1985_num_57_1_5469.
65. Экспрессивность. Словари и энциклопедии на Академике [Электронный ресурс]. – URL: <http://psychology.academic.ru/7269>.
66. Якобсон Р. Лингвистика и поэтика / Р. Якобсон // Структурализм: «за» и «против» [Электронный ресурс]. – М.: Наука, 1975. С. 193-230. – URL: <http://www.philology.ru/linguistics1/jakobson-75.htm>.
67. Ярославцева А. Е. Репрезентация речевых стратегий и тактик в агитационном тексте: дисс. канд. филол. наук. / Ярославцева Анна Евгеньевна. – Томск, 2007. – 230 с.
68. Agranoff R. The Management of Election Campaigns / R. Agranoff. – Boston: Holbrook Press, 1976. – 481 p.
69. Barwise J. Situations and Attitudes / J. Barwise, J. Perry. – Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983. – 352 p.
70. Braiker H. B. Who's Pulling Your Strings? How to Break The Cycle of Manipulation / H. B. Braiker. – McGraw-Hill Prof Med/ Tech, 2004. – 256 p.
71. Campbell B. A. The American Electorate. Attitudes and Action / B. A. Campbell. – New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, cop. 1979. – 320 p.

72. Campbell G. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric. A new ed.* / G. Campbell. – London, 1999. – 426 p.
73. Chilton P. *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse* / P. Chilton, C. Schaffner. – Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2002. – 245 p.
74. Connoly W. E. *The Terms of Political discourse* / W. E. Connoly. – [3rd ed.]. – New York, 2014. – 257 p.
75. Coulthard M. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis (Applied Linguistics and Language Study)* / M. Coulthard. – L.: Longman, 2005. – 211 p.
76. Fairclough N. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language* / N. Fairclough. – L. and N.Y.: Longman, 1995. – 265 p.
77. Gastil J. *Undemocratic discourse. A review of theory and research on political discourse* / Gastil J. // *Discourse & Society*. – 1992. – Vol. 3. – № 4. – P. 469-500.
78. Harris Z. *The background of transformational and metalanguage analysis* / Z. Harris // *Introduction to The Legacy of Zellig Harris: Language and Information into the 21st Century*. – John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2002. – Vol. 1: Philosophy of science, syntax, and semantics.
79. Harris A. C. *Sell! Buy! Semiolinguistic manipulation in print advertising* / A. C. Harris. – URL: <http://www.csun.edu/~vcspc005/advertis.html>.
80. Hershey M. R. *The Campaign and the Media* / M. R. Hershey // *The Election of 2000: Reports and Interpretations*. – Chatham House Publishers of Seven Bridges Press, LLC, 2001. – P. 46-73.
81. Holly W. *Tabloidisation of political communication in the public sphere* / W. Holly // *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*. – Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008. – P. 317-341.
82. Jamieson K. H., Birdsell D. S. *Presidential Debates. The Challenge of Creating an Informed Electorate* / K. H. Jamieson. – New York, Oxford, 2016. 264 p.
83. Kessel J. H. *Presidential Campaign Politics* / J. H. Kessel / Brooks / Cole Publishing Company, Pacific Grove, California, 1992. – 334 p.

84. Kloch Z. Language and social change. Public communication, Nation and identity / Z. Kloch // Psychology of language and Communication. – 2012. – Vol. 16. – № 3. – P. 254-267.

85. Lakoff G. The Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide to Your Brain and Its Politics / G. Lakoff. – New York: Penquin book, 2009. – 292 p.

86. Lasswell H. D. Language Of Politics: Studies In Quantitative Semantics / Harold D. Lasswell, Nathan Leites // Copiright assigned to the Massachusetts Institute of technology. – 1965. – 398 p.

87. Leech G. English in Advertising: A Linguistic Study of Advertising in Great Britain / G. Leech. – L.: Longman, 2009. – 210 p.

88. Lippmann W. Public Opinion / W. Lippmann. – New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 2016. – 427 p.

89. McConnell F. D. Toward a Lexicon of Slogans / F. D. McConnell // The Midwest Quarterly. – 1971. – Vol. XIII. – № 1. – P. 69-90.

90. McWilliams W. C. The Meaning of the Election / W. C. McWilliams // The Election of 1988: Reports and Interpretations. – Chatham, NJ, 2001. – P. 177-206.

91. Morris Ch. Signs, language, and behavior / Ch. Morris // Writings on the general theory of signs. – The Hague: Mouton. 1971. – P. 73-397.

92. Obeng S. G. Language and politics: Indirectness in political discourse / S. G. Obeng // Language and politics / ed. by John E. Joseph. – Routledge; London; New York, 2010. – Vol. II. – P. 273-309.

93. Pomper G. M. The Election of 2000: Reports and Interpretations / G. M. Pomper. – CQ Press, 2001. – 216 p.

94. Rorty R. The Linguistic Turn: Essays in Philosophical Method / R. Rorty. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. – 407 p.

95. Wodak R. Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology / R. Wodak. – URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265678850_Critical_Discourse_Analysis_History_Agenda_Theory_and_Methodology_1.

DATA SOURCES

96. PCLS – Presidential Campaign Logos and Slogans, 2020. – URL: https://ballotpedia.org/Presidential_campaign_logos_and_slogans,_2020.

97. DTJB – Donald Trump & Joe Biden 1st Presidential Debate Transcript 2020. – URL: <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-joe-biden-1st-presidential-debate-transcript-2020>.

98. PDTB – Presidential debate 2020: Trump and Biden final debate fact-checked by Reality Check team. – URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/election-us-2020-54645608>.

99. DT – Donald Trump. URL: <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump>.

100. JB – Joe Biden. URL: <https://twitter.com/joebiden>.

101. PTRM – President Trump rally in Minneapolis. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vT3O5WFYUxo>.

102. TCPD – The Commission on Presidential Debates. URL: <https://www.debates.org/voter-education/debate-transcripts/>.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Text fragments	Means of rhetoric (communicative- pragmatic, manipulative and stylistic)
1. <i>A Fresh Start for America</i> [96].	imperative slogans; metaphor; argumentation
2. <i>Win the Era</i> [96].	imperative slogans; hyperbolization; self-presentation
3. <i>Make America Great Again</i> [96].	imperative slogans; hyperbolization; argumentation
4. <i>Promises Made, Promises Kept</i> [96].	imperative slogans; repetition; self-presentation
5. <i>Come Together</i> [96].	imperative slogans; assonance; self-presentation
6. <i>A New Choice for Democrats</i> [96].	imperative slogans; nominative sentence; self-presentation
7. <i>Fighting for Our Future</i> [96].	imperative slogans; idiom; self-presentation

8. <i>One Nation. One Destiny</i> [96].	imperative slogans; parallelism self-presentation
9. <i>Focus on the Future</i> [96].	descriptive slogans; stylistically sublime lexicon; argumentation
10. <i>For the People</i> [96].	descriptive slogans; self-presentation
11. <i>Brave Wins</i> [96].	descriptive slogans; aphorisms; self-presentation
12. <i>Our Best Days Still Lie Ahead!</i> [96]	descriptive slogans; simile; self-presentation
13. <i>Lead with Love</i> [96].	provocative slogans; self-presentation
14. <i>Stand up with Tulsi</i> [96].	provocative slogans; idiom; self-presentation
15. <i>We Rise</i> [96].	provocative slogans; self-presentation
16. <i>A Fair Shot for Everyone</i> [96].	provocative slogans; metaphor; self-presentation
17. <i>No More Wars</i> [96].	comparative slogans; self-presentation
18. <i>America Deserves Better</i> [96].	comparative slogans; self-presentation

19. <i>Actions Speak Louder than Words</i> [96].	comparative slogans; proverb; self-presentation
20. <i>Folks, thanks to you we raised \$1.2M from nearly 30,000 donors yesterday. And I was even happier to hear that 1/3rd of those donors were new. I can't begin to tell you what your support means. South Carolina is just a few days away</i> [100].	brevity; simile; self-presentation
21. <i>Well, first of all, I guess I'm debating you, not him, but that's okay. I'm not surprised. Let me just tell you something. There's nothing symbolic. I'm cutting drug prices. I'm going with Favored Nations, which no President has the courage to do because you're going against big pharma. Drug prices will be coming down 80 or 90%. You could have done it during your 47 year period in government, but you didn't do it. Nobody's done it. So we're cutting healthcare</i> [97].	brevity; simile; self-presentation
22. <i>"Pres Trump is correct to ask for recusal & question justices' bias. Political opposition is inappropriate coming from a sitting SCOTUS Justice, even couched in a dissent"</i> [99].	expressiveness; sentences in capital letters; self-presentation
23. <i>Yes. Well, that's what he's going to try to do, but there's thousands of scientists out there, like here at this great hospital that don't work for him. Their job doesn't depend on him. They're the people... And by the way –</i> [97].	expressiveness; exclamations; self-presentation
24. <i>Nevada, y'all did it for me! Thank you to all of our incredible supporters, volunteers, and organizers around the state. We couldn't have done this without you. Next stop: South Carolina!</i> [100]	expressiveness; epithets; self-presentation

<p>25. <i>Let me guess what you will say. Bla bla bla fake news, bla bla bla ratings, bla bla bla [99].</i></p>	<p>expressiveness; onopatopoeia; irony; discrediting</p>
<p>26. <i>Virus incubation event. Have fun! [99]</i></p>	<p>expressiveness; nominative sentences; discrediting</p>
<p>27. <i>The platform of the Democratic Party is what I, in fact, approved of, what I approved of. Now, here's the deal. The deal is that it's going to wipe out pre-existing conditions. And, by the way, the 20, the 200 mil- the 200,000 people that have died on his watch, how many of those have survived? Well, there's seven million people that contracted COVID. What does it mean for them going forward if you strike down the Affordable Care Act? [97]</i></p>	<p>informativeness; hyperbole; self-presentation</p>
<p>28. <i>150 million people have been killed since 2007 when Bernie voted to exempt the gun manufacturers from liability, more than all the wars, including Vietnam from that point on [100].</i></p>	<p>informativeness; hyperbole; discrediting</p>
<p>29. <i>Get ready for DumbleDork – and wear face masks... he just came back from India, meeting with tons of people...some who might have the Corona virus ALSO, vaccines are MONTHS away [99].</i></p>	<p>informativeness; capitalization of words; discrediting</p>
<p>30. <i>Better stay at Home and resign. Save America [99].</i></p>	<p>persuasiveness; metaphor; self-presentation</p>
<p>31. <i>We all have a responsibility to declare with conviction that hatred and bigotry and white supremacy have no place in America. We must give hate no safe harbor [100].</i></p>	<p>persuasiveness; metaphor; self-presentation</p>

<p>32. <i>The right to vote is the most fundamental American right there is. We should be making voting easier – not harder [100].</i></p>	<p>persuasiveness; antonyms; self-presentation</p>
<p>33. <i>Housing should be a right – not a privilege. But far too many Americans lack access to affordable, quality, and safe housing [100].</i></p>	<p>intertextuality; citation; self-presentation</p>
<p>34. <i>We fall into the same pattern every time: a senseless act of violence occurs, politicians offer “thoughts and prayers,” and calls for reform fade away until the next tragedy inevitably occurs. I’m sick and tired of saying “enough is enough.” We can’t go on like this any longer [100].</i></p>	<p>intertextuality; citation; self-presentation</p>
<p>35. <i>I know that with folks like Bernice and the Reckoning Crew, we will win the battle for the soul of our nation. I’m so grateful to have them on our team. Join them and get involved in your community: http://JoeBiden.com/Volunteer [100].</i></p>	<p>intertextuality; citation; self-presentation</p>
<p>36. <i>I think Barack Obama was one hell of a President. I was proud to stand alongside him every step of the way – and fought like hell to make sure he was re-elected [100].</i></p>	<p>intertextuality; precedent statements; self-presentation</p>
<p>37. <i>It’s long past time we take action to end the scourge of gun violence in America. As president, I’ll ban assault weapons and high-capacity magazines, implement universal background checks, and enact other common-sense reforms to end our gun violence epidemic [100].</i></p>	<p>expressiveness; metaphor; self-presentation</p>
<p>38. <i>I want to extend my prayers and condolences to the Chaldean Assyrian Community this 10th anniversary of Our Lady of Deliverance church massacre in Baghdad. The right to worship is fundamental, and as Americans we should be proud that people from around the world find a</i></p>	<p>expressiveness; stylistically elevated lexicon; self-presentation</p>

<i>home here [100].</i>	
39. <i>The words of a president matter. And time and time again, Donald Trump has callously used his to incite violence, stoke the flames of hatred and division, and drive us further apart. It's time for it to end [100].</i>	expressiveness; gradation; discrediting
40. <i>Every single American deserves access to regular, reliable, and free COVID-19 testing. Period [100].</i>	expressiveness; parceling; self-presentation
41. <i>The Trump Administration knew how deadly this virus was back in February. But they didn't tell you or your family. Instead, they gave a heads up to their friends on Wall Street so investors could make a profit before the recession hit. They hid the truth. It's unforgivable [100].</i>	expressiveness; stylistic contrast; discrediting
42. <i>President Trump doesn't care about you. He doesn't even care about his own supporters [100].</i>	expressiveness; syntactic parallelism; discrediting
43. <i>More than 9 million cases of COVID-19 have been now confirmed in the United States – and more than 228,000 Americans have lost their lives. It is as severe an indictment of a president's record as one can possibly imagine, and it is utterly disqualifying [100].</i>	expressiveness; hyperbolic simile; discrediting
44. <i>My faith has been a source of immeasurable solace in times of grief and a daily inspiration to fight against the abuse of power in all its forms. As president, it will continue to serve as my anchor, as it has my entire life [100].</i>	expressiveness; alliteration, assonance; self-presentation
45. <i>More than 230,000 Americans have died from COVID-19 — and Donald Trump has given up on trying to get the virus under control. He may have quit on you, but I</i>	expressiveness, informativeness; antithesis;

<i>promise I never will</i> [100].	self-presentation, discrediting
46. <i>Health care is deeply personal to me – like it is for so many Americans. And I promise you that as president, I will protect your family’s health care as if it were my own</i> [100].	persuasiveness; simile; self-presentation
47. <i>There are just two days until Election Day, and our campaign is working around the clock to get folks to vote. Can you chip in to help us reach every last voter before polls close on Tuesday?</i> [100]	persuasiveness; rhetorical question; self-presentation
48. <i>I promise you this: I’ll end Donald Trump’s chaos and end this crisis</i> [100].	persuasiveness; repetition; self-presentation
49. <i>From his heinous acts of separating families at our border to his neglect of the people of Puerto Rico after Hurricane Maria, President Trump has attacked the dignity of Latino families time and time again. It will end when I’m president</i> [100].	expressiveness; epithets, metaphor; discrediting
50. <i>Tonight marks our last end-of-month fundraising deadline – and it’s our most important one yet. With three days until Election Day, we can’t afford to fall short</i> [100].	persuasiveness; idiom; self-presentation
51. <i>Not Me. Us</i> [96].	descriptive slogans parceling; self-presentation
52. <i>Deval for All</i> [96].	imperative slogans self-presentation
53. <i>We’re All In This Together</i> [96].	descriptive slogans; hyperbole; self-presentation

54. <i>Our Future is Now</i> [96].	descriptive slogans; self-presentation
55. <i>We are the only party responsible for ...</i> [99].	descriptive slogans; hyperbole; self-presentation
56. <i>They need great shocks, we need Great America</i> [100];	descriptive slogans; hyperbolic epithets; self-presentation
57. <i>They decide where and with whom we must live</i> [100];	provocative slogans; discrediting
58. <i>We don't need such power</i> [99].	provocative slogans; discrediting
59. <i>Only one party does not vote on orders from above</i> [98].	provocative slogans; self-presentation
60. <i>The Democratic Party has a clear program for the revival of the countryside, it knows how to stabilize prices ... There are real professionals on the electoral list</i> [97].	expressiveness, epithets; self-presentation
61. <i>I used to work three jobs ... And the salary could not be paid for months ... Now everything is different</i> [97].	brevity; contrast; self-presentation
62. <i>When Obama came to power, there were only 345 billionaires, today there are already 788</i> [97].	informativeness; contrast; self-presentation
63. <i>This is our moment to root out systemic racism and build a nation true to our founding ideals. A nation where all men and women are not only created equal – but treated equally</i> [100].	expressiveness; epithets; metaphor; discrediting
64. <i>Donald Trump's COVID-19 response has been the</i>	expressiveness;

<i>greatest failure of presidential leadership in our nation's history</i> [100].	hyperbole; discrediting
65. <i>Donald Trump claimed he would be "the greatest jobs president God ever created". Instead, he's on track to become the worst jobs president in 100 years</i> [100].	expressiveness; hyperbole; sarcasm; discrediting
66. <i>Donald Trump sees the world from Park Avenue. I see it from where I came from: Scranton, Pennsylvania. It's why I'll fight every day as president to make this country work for middle class and low-income Americans – not just the wealthy and well-connected</i> [100].	expressiveness; sarcasm; discrediting
67. <i>Together, we can make Donald Trump a one-term president</i> [100].	expressiveness; hyperbole; discrediting
68. <i>Donald Trump is trying to eliminate the entire Affordable Care Act in the middle of a pandemic. If he gets his way, more than 100 million Americans with pre-existing conditions could see their costs skyrocket or be denied coverage altogether. We can't let him win</i> [100].	expressiveness; hyperbole; discrediting
69. <i>We remember very well how you sold all the wealth of our country to the oligarchs. Do you really think that we will believe and vote for you</i> [97].	expressiveness; hyperbole; irony; discrediting
70. <i>Give your voice to those who hear you</i> [99].	expressiveness; allusion; discrediting
71. <i>For all these years our party ... has not deceived anyone, has not stolen anything from anyone</i> [99].	expressiveness; citation; discrediting
72. <i>The extinction of the nation must be stopped ... This is my motive to vote for US</i> [99].	persuasiveness; sublime words;

	discrediting
73. <i>You don't know what's inside, do you? Do you need such gifts?</i> [99].	expressiveness; rhetoric questions; discrediting
74. <i>What have they done for the country, for the people?</i> [97].	expressiveness; rhetoric questions; discrediting
75. <i>Do you think there are fewer independent initiative people in America?</i> [97].	expressiveness; rhetoric questions; discrediting
76. <i>By voting for the Republican Party, you are voting for the future of your family</i> [97].	expressiveness; anaphora; discrediting
77. <i>"We are citizens of Great America, and we are all together "Great America"</i> [97].	expressiveness; parallelism; discrediting
78. <i>A beggar worker, doctor, teacher, soldier, policeman, student is a shame</i> [97].	expressiveness; enumeration; discrediting
79. <i>When choosing, think about the most intimate: about your family, about your loved ones ... Think about the fate of our homeland</i> [97].	expressiveness; gradation; discrediting
80. <i>We must give people a job, salary</i> [97].	persuasiveness; enumeration; discrediting
81. <i>I promise to restore all forms of free education ... return dormitories to students, increase the scholarship for all students</i> [97].	persuasiveness; enumeration; discrediting
82. <i>Join us; Be with us</i> [97].	persuasiveness;

	discrediting
83. <i>And I advise you to do the same</i> [97].	persuasiveness; discrediting
84. <i>Come, make the right choice</i> [97].	persuasiveness; discrediting
85. <i>Vote for Donald Trump</i> [97].	persuasiveness; discrediting
86. <i>Let's fight together</i> [97].	persuasiveness; discrediting
87. <i>I want to thank our great Vice President Mike Pence and Karen Pence for being here tonight. It is great to be back in the twin cities with the freedom-loving American patriots, who make our country run</i> [101].	persuasiveness; epithets; self-presentation
88. <i>For the next 13 months we are going to fight with all of our heart and soul, and we are going to win the great state of Minnesota in 2020</i> [101].	informativeness; metaphor; argumentation
89. <i>"The Biden Plan for Investing in Our Communities through Housing – Joe Biden for President Joe Biden is running for President to rebuild the middle class and ensure that this time everyone comes along. He believes the middle class isn't a number, but a value set which includes the ability" ... joebiden.com</i> [100].	informativeness; idioms; argumentation
90. <i>These corrupt politicians and the radical leftists got rich bleeding America dry, and they knew that my election would finally end their pillaging and looting of our country</i> [101].	expressiveness; epithets; discrediting
91. <i>Thirteen months I gotta move fast because they're not beating us at the polls and they know it despite the phony, despite the phony polls that you see all the time. They're</i>	expressiveness; repetitions; discrediting

<i>phony polls</i> [101].	
92. <i>Polls are no different than crooked writers. They're crooked polls, the crooked polls</i> [101].	expressiveness; repetitions; discrediting
93. <i>Democrats are on a crusade to destroy our democracy</i> [101].	expressiveness; metaphors; discrediting
94. <i>Sleepy Joe and his friends sold out America</i> [101].	expressiveness; metaphors; discrediting
95. <i>There's nothing that the dirty political establishment hates more than a President that they cannot intimidate, own and control</i> [101].	expressiveness; epithets; discrediting
96. <i>Every time a President from a country calls me or I call them, we have to release the text. How can you do business that way? Who's gonna want to speak to your President?</i> [101]	expressiveness; rhetorical questions; discrediting
97. <i>And today I got a call from one of the top representatives. He said: "Congratulations Mr. President on having a truly great, great economy"</i> [101].	expressiveness; epithet; repetition; self-presentation
98. <i>You can't keep it. You can't actually make a gift. You can give it to your different agencies. So, I can give it to health. I can give it to transportation. I can give it to military...</i> [101].	persuasiveness; anaphora; gradation; self-presentation
99. <i>We've also implemented the strongest screening and vetting mechanisms ever put into place. We're keeping terrorists, criminals and extremists the hell out of our country</i> [101].	persuasiveness; metaphors; self-presentation
100. <i>Guy walks in, no experience, no nothing, walks out</i>	informativeness;

<p><i>with a big and five G, flies in on Air Force Two with his father, the Vice President. Don't forget, that's when he was Vice President. So, China gives his son 1.5 billion. How would you like to have Joe Biden take over negotiations right now with China? I don't think so. I don't think so. Meanwhile, Biden allowed China to rip off America for eight years as Vice President... [101].</i></p>	<p>idiom; repetition; argumentation</p>
<p>97. <i>The American people have a right to have a say in who the Supreme Court nominee is and that say occurs when they vote for United States Senators and when they vote for the President of United States [102].</i></p>	<p>informativeness; repetition; argumentation</p>
<p>102. <i>We should wait and see what the outcome of this election is because that's the only way the American people get to express their view is by who they elect as President and who they elect as Vice President [102].</i></p>	<p>informativeness; repetition; argumentation</p>
<p>103. <i>He's in the Supreme Court right now trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, which will strip 20 million people from having health insurance now, if it goes into court [102].</i></p>	<p>informativeness; argumentation</p>
<p>104. <i>It does not. It's only for those people who are so poor they qualify for Medicaid they can get that free in most States, except Governors who want to deny people who are poor Medicaid. Anyone who qualifies for Medicaid would automatically be enrolled in the public option [102].</i></p>	<p>informativeness; paralellism; argumentation</p>
<p>105. <i>The reason he would not meet with President Obama is because President Obama said we're gonna talk about denuclearization, we're not gonna legitimize you, we're gonna continue to put stronger and stronger sanctions on you [102].</i></p>	<p>intertextuality; quotes, self-presentation</p>
<p>106. <i>Number two, this is a president – I have released all</i></p>	<p>invormativeness;</p>

<p>of my tax returns. 22 years. Go look at them. 22 years of my tax returns. You have not released a single solitary year of your tax return [102].</p>	<p>repetitions, self-presentation</p>
<p>107. Well, I have and they have pushed it. Look, they passed this act all the way back in the beginning of the summer. This is like – it’s not new. It’s been out there. This HEROES Act has been sitting there [102].</p>	<p>intertextuality; irony, self-presentation</p>
<p>108. On the condition that he would agree that he would be drawing down his nuclear capacity to get – the Korean Peninsula should be a nuclear free zone [102].</p>	<p>persuasiveness; metaphor; discrediting</p>
<p>109. And so folks, <u>I will take care of this</u>, <u>I will end this</u>, <u>I will make sure we have a plan</u> [102].</p>	<p>persuasiveness; parallelism; self-presentation</p>
<p>110. We saw oligarchs uninterested in change ousted from power only to return [102].</p>	<p>brevity; idiom; argumentation</p>
<p>111. We make up 15% of the world’s problem. We in fact, but the rest of the world, we’ve got to get them to come along. That’s why we have to get back into, back into the Paris Accord [102].</p>	<p>brevity; idioms; argumentation</p>
<p>112. And by the way, our military – they’ve been voting by ballots for since the end of the Civil War, in effect. And that’s, and that’s what’s going to happen [102].</p>	<p>brevity; idioms; argumentation</p>
<p>113. And the justice, I’m not opposed to the justice, she seems like a very fine person. But she’s written, before she went in the bench, which is her right, that she thinks that the Affordable Care Act is not Constitutional [102].</p>	<p>brevity; idioms; argumentation</p>
<p>114. The polls are open on time, and the polls stay open until the votes are counted. And this is all about trying to</p>	<p>informativeness; metonymy;</p>

<p><i>dissuade people from voting because he's trying to conf-to scare people into thinking that it's not going to be legitimate [102].</i></p>	<p>argumentation</p>
<p>115. <i>I don't understand why this President is unwilling to take on Putin when he's actually paying bounties to kill American soldiers in Afghanistan, when he's engaged in activities that are trying to destabilize all of NATO [102].</i></p>	<p>informativeness; idioms; discrediting</p>
<p>116. <i>What I'm going to do is pass Obamacare with a public option – become Bidencare. Public option is an option that says that if you, in fact, do not have the wherewithal to be – if you qualify for Medicaid, and you do not have the wherewithal in your state to get Medicaid, you automatically are enrolled, providing competition for insurance companies [102].</i></p>	<p>informativeness; pun; argumentation</p>
<p>117. <i>And by the way, this is the same fellow who told you this is going to end by Easter last time. This the same fellow who told you that, don't worry, we're going to end this by the summer. We're about to go into a dark winter, a dark winter, and he has no clear plan and there's no prospect that there's going to be a vaccine available for the majority of the American people before the middle of next year [102].</i></p>	<p>intertextuality; quotes; repetition; metonymy; discrediting</p>
<p>118. <i>Number one, he knows what I proposed. What I proposed is that we expand Obamacare and we increase it. We do not wipe any. And one of the big debates we had with 23 of my colleagues trying to win the nomination that I won, were saying that Biden wanted to allow people to have private insurance still. They can. They do. They will under my proposal [102].</i></p>	<p>intertextuality; gradation; discrediting</p>
<p>119. <i>More, more carbon is absorbed in that rainforest than</i></p>	<p>informativeness;</p>

<p><i>every bit of carbon that's emitted in the United States. Instead of doing something about that, I would be gathering up and making sure we had the comp-countries of the world coming up with 20 billion dollars, and say, "Here's \$20 billion. Stop, stop tearing, tearing down the forest. And if you don't, then you're going to have significant economic consequences." [102]</i></p>	<p>contrast; discrediting</p>
<p>120. <i>The platform of the Democratic Party is what I, in fact, approved of, what I approved of. Now, here's the deal. The deal is that it's going to wipe out pre-existing conditions. And, by the way, the 200,000 people that have died on his watch, how many of those have survived? Well, there's seven million people that contracted COVID. What does it mean for them going forward if you strike down the Affordable Care Act?</i> [102]</p>	<p>informativeness; metonymy; self-presentation</p>
<p>121. <i>Compared to what's going on in Europe, as the New England Medical Journal said, they're starting from a very low rate. We're starting from a very high rate. The expectation is we'll have another 200,000 Americans dead by the time, between now and the end of the year. If we just wore these masks – the President's own advisors have told him – we could save 100,000 lives. And we're in a circumstance where the President, thus far, still has no plan. No comprehensive plan. What I would do is make sure we have everyone encouraged to wear a mask, all the time [102].</i></p>	<p>informativeness; contrast; discrediting</p>