

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

Master's Thesis

LANGUAGE PROFILE OF JOE BIDEN

Marta Reznik

2nd year student of the Education Program
'English Communication Studies and Translation
and Two Western European Languages'

Field of science: 03 "Humanities"

Specialty: 035 "Philology"

Supervised by:

Assoc. Prof. Svitlana Pereplotchykova

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології
та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 8 від 22.04.2024

Зав. кафедри _____ д. філол. н., проф. Алла БСЛОВА

KYIV – 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
1. LINGUISTIC INVESTIGATION OF LANGUAGE PERSONALITY IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	6
1.1. Political discourse as the object of linguistic research.....	6
1.2. The notions “language personality” and “language portrait”.....	14
1.3. Formation of language personality: Joe Biden.....	24
Conclusions to chapter 1.....	30
2. LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF JOE BIDEN’S LANGUAGE PROFILE.....	31
2.1. Lexical peculiarities of the individual style.....	32
2.2. Grammatical aspect of the individual style.....	49
2.3. Stylistic peculiarities of Joe Biden’s speeches	51
Conclusions to chapter 2.....	63
3. REALIZATION OF COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES IN THE SPEECHES OF JOE BIDEN.....	64
3.1. Communicative strategies and tactics in political discourse.....	64
3.2. Strategy of image creation.....	68
3.3. Strategy of persuasion.....	74
3.4. Strategy of formation of emotional mood.....	80
3.5. Strategy of discrediting.....	83
Conclusions to chapter 3.....	92
CONCLUSIONS	93
LIST OF LITERATURE.....	100

INTRODUCTION

In today's interconnected world, people are influenced by a vast amount of information from diverse fields such as culture, technology, economy, medicine, and science. Among these, the political domain stands out as one of the most influential in the 21st century. With the rise of anthropocentrism as a significant trend in contemporary linguistics, considerable attention is directed towards analyzing how language usage influences people.

Over recent decades, as politics has assumed a more prominent role in society, political discourse has emerged as one of the key objects of linguistic research. Scholars are increasingly delving into the concept of "language personality," particularly as political leaders wield significant influence not only over their target audiences but also over the broader ethical, social and cultural norms guiding communication.

In addition to the fact that the study of language portraits provides an opportunity to analyse the speech behavior of an individual, as well as to discover the peculiar features of one's speech, this type of research also makes it possible to identify both hidden and explicit motives of the individual, as well as one's communicative goals and the specifics of the realization of communicative needs and intentions.

The intensification of research in the field of political linguistics was encouraged by the studies of T. van Dijk, R. Wodak, D. Graber, M. Putnam, A. Gaidulin, M. Didenko, L. Slavova. The notion "language personality" was investigated by L. Weisgerber, A. Tarasova, F. Batsevych, L. Struhanets, M. Pentyliuk, M. Vashulenko. Also, the notion "idiolect" was studied by L. Stavyska, S. Yermolenko, F. Batsevych and others.

It is worth noting that despite the attempts of many scholars to develop a structure of describing the language portrait of a person, there is no single model recognized by the scientific community as a standard.

Relevance of the research lies in the fact that the material analyzed represents the modern English language used by an American politician in his speeches as well as in the need to conduct a complex research of the language portrait of Joseph Biden, which includes linguistic and communicative features and the use of manipulative strategies and tactics. The evolution of governmental dynamics in the United States of America is profoundly impacted by the actions and, notably, the speeches of politicians. A meticulous study of the trends shaping the political discourse of Joe Biden is crucial for characterizing his language profile, as well as for identifying the manipulative strategies and tactics that are used to influence public opinion.

The **aim** of the research is to create a language portrait of modern American politician Joseph Biden and identify the peculiar features of his language style and methods of influence on an individual's actions and decisions.

The **tasks** of the research:

- to investigate the theoretical foundations of the study of political discourse;
- to study the concepts of "language personality" and "language portrait", to draw distinction between these concepts; to examine the specific principles of creating a language portrait of a politician;
- to identify and analyze the factors of the formation of Joe Biden's linguistic personality;
- to examine lexical, grammatical and stylistic peculiarities of Joseph Biden's individual style;
- to study strategies and tactics of manipulation in political discourse;
- to elucidate the strategies and tactics of influence used by Joe Biden, to identify the verbal means of their realization.

The **object** of the research is speech of the 46th President of the United States Joe Biden.

The **subject** of the research is verbal means that ensure the achievement of communicative goals in the statements of Joe Biden at lexical, grammatical and

stylistic levels of the language system and the strategic and tactical organization of the political narrative of the US President.

The research is based on the transcribed speeches of Joe Biden, the total number of tokens is 117 546.

The **research methods** used were observation method to study the process of speech communication, identify the characteristics of a politician's speech (observation of the behavior, actions and speech) and descriptive method. Also, the following methods were used: content analysis (to analyze the content of speech utterances, this method allows to highlight the features of a speech utterance and the current emotional states of the speaker); intent analysis (to reconstruct the intentions of the speaker from his speech, to reveal the hidden meaning of his words); discourse analysis (to identify the hidden interests and communicative intentions of the person under study, discover and reveal strategies and tactics for manipulating and influencing the audience).

The **novelty** of the research lies in the investigation of various linguistic aspects of American political speeches. The complex analysis of language profile of an American politician revealed the ways of its formation, the potential of specific language means that constitute the language profile of American political leader. The influence of an American politician's speeches on people was investigated.

The **practical significance** of the research is that the findings can be used in the study of political discourse, in learning effective manipulative strategies and tactics used in political sphere, to study the concept of "language personality", as well as for studying and further description of the language personality of Joe Biden. The results of the research can become the basis for teaching such disciplines as "Fundamentals of Public Speaking" and "Stylistics" and can also be used for writing courseworks, qualifying papers and preparing textbooks for high school students.

The **structure** of the research paper. The research paper consists of introduction, three chapters, conclusions and reference list. The total number of pages is 112.

1. LINGUISTIC INVESTIGATION OF LANGUAGE PERSONALITY IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

1.1. Political discourse as the object of linguistic research

Communication is a fundamental aspect of our life, and is subject to various influences. These influences encompass the participants involved, their individual backgrounds, cognitive states, objectives, and the contextual elements of communication such as the environment, societal norms, and cultural values. Within diverse communication environments and social roles, individuals may articulate the same concept differently, resulting in a personalized set of communicative approaches tailored to specific circumstances. In contemporary humanities, this culturally and socially shaped tradition of human interaction is termed “discourse.”

In today’s increasingly multinational, multilingual, and globalized world, the significance of political discourse takes on particular relevance, including the language personality of politicians and their influence on shaping both internal and external perceptions of their countries.

A modern politician must possess essential attributes including literacy, erudition, a high level of education, and communicative competence. Moreover, their style, clarity, and articulation play pivotal roles in shaping their image not only at home but also on the global stage. The burgeoning importance of political communication necessitates the examination of the evolving linguistic characteristics within the profiles of politicians.

According to the etymological dictionary the word “discourse” comes from the Latin “discursus” and means “communication of thought by words; talk; conversation” [43]. In the period of medieval Latin, it takes on the additional meaning: “logical reasoning, proof, argument” [57, p. 6]. Later, the word “discourse” took root in the main European languages and received a broader meaning: “public speech”, and over time it became synonymous with the word “text”. In addition, the text is understood not only as the product of speech activity

itself, but also as any phenomenon of reality that has a symbolic nature and is structured in a certain way, for example, rallies, debates.

There is no single generally accepted definition of political discourse yet, because many modern scholars from the fields of linguistics, journalism, philosophy, and political science have their own concepts for defining this concept.

The German philosopher J. Habermas, known for his work on the topic of communicative action and discourse, has an interesting opinion on this matter. He quite accurately defined the essence of this concept. Habermas believed that discourse is “communication of a special kind, a specific dialogue, the purpose of which is an impartial analysis of reality, cleared of the subjectivity of the researcher” [2, p. 72].

The appearance of the terminological unit “discourse” is attributed to different sources. Thus, according to some scholars, the first person to use this term is the founder of the theory of structuralism, Ferdinand de Saussure. The Swiss scholar tried to expand the linguistics of language (*langue*) with the help of the concepts of *parole* (a single act of speech utterance) and *discours* (communication as a social interaction) [42, p. 31]. However, in further scientific works the linguist does not develop the concept of discourse.

The origins of the Anglo-American concept of discursive analysis can be traced back to the pioneering work of Zellig Harris. Harris is credited with introducing the term “discourse analysis” and defining it as a method for analysing connected speech or writing, thereby extending the scope of descriptive linguistics beyond individual sentences to study the relationship between language and culture [54, p. 1]. In Harris’s framework, discourse is the consecutive utterances spoken or written by one or more individuals within a specific context [ibid., p. 3].

Harris asserts that language manifests not merely in isolated words or sentences but in cohesive discourse, spanning from brief utterances to extensive texts [ibid.]. This perspective underscores the continuum of language usage, from brief remarks to extensive debates, reflecting the diverse contexts in which communication unfolds.

M. Stubbs emphasizes the formal and substantive characteristics of the discourse. In his opinion, by formal feature, discourse is a unit of language, which is larger in volume than a sentence. In terms of content, discourse is associated with the use of language in a social context [81, c. 189].

This also seems to be the scientific view of Deborah Shifrin, who believes that discourse consists of two or more related sentences regarding content (formal aspect) and “any use of language” (content aspect). The scientist also notes the functional nature of discourse and argues that discourse acts as an integral complex of linguistic units that are functionally organized and contextually determined [79, c. 83-90].

Linguists J. Blommaert and S. Balken emphasize the significance of the social aspect in the definition of discourse. They argue that discourse cannot be studied outside of society, culture and politics, because it is it that turns our environment into a socio-cultural significant environment. As we see, discourse for scientists is a manifestation of “language in action” [36, c. 447-466].

In the domestic linguistic dictionary literature, the term “discourse” is presented as “situationally determined intersubjective speech-mental activity aimed at mutual orientation in living space on the basis of imparting semiotic significance to the linguistic form” [26, p. 11].

According to Batsevych, discourse represents a dynamic flow of communication occurring within specific channels, shaped by the strategies and tactics employed by participants. It integrates cognitive linguistic elements with extralinguistic factors, reflecting the diverse contexts and social frameworks within which communication unfolds. The outcome of this communicative process is the emergence of various speech genres, influenced by the subject matter and participants of the communication [3, p. 138].

Ukrainian researcher A. Selivanova summarizes different approaches to understanding the concept of discourse and considers the most widespread in the linguistic field to be the theoretical provisions of the French tradition, in which discourse is associated with speech. She considers discursive space from the point of view of distinguishing it from the concept of “text” and considers speech “a means

of communication, text is an integral semiotic form of organizing communication.” Using the terminological unit “discourse”, the scientist means “a communicative event containing text and other constituent parts.” [23, c. 42-43].

At the present stage of development of linguistic research, political discourse, as Ukrainian scholars rightly note, acquires a deeper sense. Among a number of factors that have caused numerous scientific studies of political discourse, there are the internal needs of linguistics, which at different stages of its development explored the functioning of language in real spheres, the need to study political thinking and political behavior, analyze political texts, as well as the order of a certain part of society, which prefers understand the essence of political communication.

In linguistics, there is usually a narrow and broad approach to understanding the concept of “political discourse”. Within the framework of the first approach (institutional), political discourse is conceptualized as speech associated with the institutions of political and socio-political life. In other words, political institutional discourse covers the speeches of politicians, government documents, party programs, texts of parliamentary and election debates, and campaign materials [84, p. 26]. The second approach involves the study of speech in non-institutional political discourse, which is characterized by a free style and character, and the basis of political discourse is formed by genres of the exclusively political environment, and the periphery is created by genres containing elements of political and mass media discourses.

A broad understanding of political discourse implies the inclusion in the corpus of the above-mentioned texts of “response discourse”: analytical articles by journalists, political scientists, public activists, ordinary citizens on social networks on a particular event in the political life of society from different perspectives – everyday, artistic, journalistic [31, p. 6].

I. V. Klymenko underscores the pragmatic dimension of political discourse, characterizing it as a multifaceted communicative phenomenon. At its core, political discourse aims to assert power by shaping public opinion through the interplay of

verbalized texts and situational sociocultural contexts. Moreover, it employs specialized linguistic tools that serve the dual purpose of advancing discourse objectives and fulfilling communicative tasks [13, p. 185].

A. Gaidulin claims that political discourse, as a rule, is understood “as the practical structuring of verbal-semantic reality through the communicative interaction of subjects of power intentions in political reality” [6, p. 23]. In his opinion, political discourse is the verbalization of political ideas for their implementation in political action.

All these definitions can be attributed to a broad understanding of political discourse, which is characterized by the inclusion in this concept of any actual use of language in the socio-political sphere, that is, political discourse is a word about politics, a system of judgments filled with political content. According to a narrow understanding, political discourse is only the discourse of politicians. It consists of “government discussions, parliamentary debates, party programs and speeches of politicians” [85, p. 28].

As we can see, political discourse is interpreted by T. van Dijk as political communication carried out by political figures. However, the Austrian scholar Ruth Wodak significantly expands the concept of political discourse and believes that participants in the political discursive space are not only representatives of the political sphere, but also citizens, demonstrators, voters, etc [91, p. 17].

Scholar N. Kondratenko considers political discourse from the perspective of a communicative-discursive approach and presents it as “a distinct form of political communication characterized by the dynamic exchange of political narratives between a political entity (such as a politician, political faction, or governing body) and a recipient audience (comprising the electorate or broader public)” [14, p. 12].

According to K. Serazhim, political discourse is “a text determined by the situation of political communication” [24, c. 240].

L. Slavova interprets political discourse as “the totality of all speech acts, as well as the rules of public policy, which have taken shape in accordance with existing traditions and have been tested by experience” [25, p. 67].

In the context of pragmatics, T. Vashchuk comprehends political discourse and defines it as “speech formations (oral or written) relating to the sphere of politics, implemented verbally and extraverbally, actualized in a certain situational context and aimed at implementing specific pragmatic semantics” [4, c. 183].

It is important to note that quite often, researchers of political language problems use both the term “political discourse” and the term “political language” and, as a rule, use them as synonyms. At least, they do not state that they distinguish between these concepts. Only some people are trying to separate them. In particular, P. Chilton does this. In his opinion, political discourse is the totality of all linguistic acts that are used in political discussions, as well as the rules of public policy that have been formed according to tradition and have been tested by experience. By political language, the scientist understands a special sign system intended specifically for political communication [39, p. 139]. That is, the concept of “political speech” is broader than the concept of “political discourse”.

In general, Ukrainian researchers use the term “political discourse” more often than Western scientists. The latter primarily use the terms “political language” or “language of politics.”

An significant problem in modern humanities is the problem of generalizing the main features inherent in political discourse. There is no doubt that one of the basic characteristics of political discourse is its communicative nature, as evidenced by a number of definitions of this terminological unit given above.

Political discourse is also characterized by institutionality, determined by subject-address relations, represented by both social-institutional communication and communication between the institution and the citizen. The subjects of political communication are the political leader, political parties, an individual, society, etc. Carrying out communication determined by status and certain roles, subjects are forced to follow the strategies of such communication. It is the addressee who must be more active in order to instill in the addressee his assessment, political realities and attitudes.

The next characteristic feature of political discourse is its focus on the power aspect. M. Foucault argues that politicians use the political orientation of discourse in order to control the masses [49, p. 80].

Let us note that the vast majority of scholars involved in the study of political discourse focus on the key role in modern political communication of the ideological component, which is based on the conflictual confrontation of opponents. Ideology is the embodiment of ideas, knowledge, opinions, beliefs based on certain norms, values and interests of social groups [10, p. 13]. It is the ideological component that is mentioned in the definition of the purpose of political discourse by researchers I. Golubovska and T. Orlova: "... the conquest and retention of power by disseminating a certain system of ideological views, which can be realized thanks to the communicative influence (explicit and implicit) on the cognitive sphere of the target audience (electorate)" [7, p. 13]. This aspect brings political discourse closer to military discourse, because war is a continuation of politics, but by other means.

In addition to the ideological component, a specific feature of political discourse is agonism (from *αγων* in Greek for "struggle, competition"). Agonality (competitiveness), which implies the need to compete in order to appropriate someone else's space, is considered a universal quality of any culture [45, p. 164]. In the context of communication, agonism is interpreted as a mode of communication in which there are opposing parties who, using certain strategies and tactics, achieve an advantage in any parameter [89, p. 289].

The next feature of political communication is aggression. In its most general form, aggression is associated with hostile feelings, behavior, and attitudes. However, in the political discursive space, aggression is associated with the concept of hierarchy and domination, because the main goal is the struggle for power, recognition of status in society, etc [51, p. 230].

A number of scholars believe that political discourse is characterized by theatricality, which unites it with advertising and stage discourses. Politicians, when communicating with each other and with journalists, have to constantly mind the "viewing audience" and, intentionally or unintentionally, "work for the public",

trying to impress them. Consequently, the political “performance” component is essential for creating a positive image of a politician [18, p. 46].

Among other fundamental features of political discourse, its focus on the future context is also distinguished [19, p. 57], which is to a certain extent an advantage, because it is this feature of political discourse that makes it difficult to deny, given the fact that its future context has not arrived. As we see, researchers are constantly adding to the list of basic features in order to study in more detail and gain a deeper understanding of the features of the content, formation and functioning of political discourse in society.

D. Graber writes that the instrumental function (the struggle for power and its preservation) is the main one. Also within this policy language function, she identifies the following functions:

- control over people (creating prerequisites for the unification of thoughts, feelings and ideas of the people; manipulation of consciousness);
- legitimization of power (explanation of decisions made by authorities on the distribution of public resources);
- reproduction of power (ritual use of symbols to strengthen citizens' commitment to power);
- orientation (shaping people's understanding of political reality through setting goals and solving problems);
- social solidarity (unification of people within an entire society or individual social groups) [52, p. 35].

The linguist aptly notes that the most significant manifestation of the instrumental function of a politician’s language is mobilization to action. Stimulation to action manifests itself in different forms: direct appeals (slogans, appeals, proclamations) or legislative acts. Also, people are instilled with an appropriate emotional state, namely fear, hostility, hatred, hope, a sense of pride and unity. In addition, linguistic acts such as threats, accusations, promises, expressions of support and trust are used to stimulate appropriate actions.

Thus, we can conclude that political discourse has a fairly multifunctional political purpose. It aims not only to gain and retain power, but also develops the formation of values, ideas, norms and decision-making based on compelling arguments to achieve social harmony in society. In contemporary linguistics, there is a pressing need to incorporate a comprehensive array of elements pertaining to linguistic activity when analyzing political discourse. This includes considering the politician's political beliefs, various types of discourse expressed both overtly and implicitly, pragmatic and sociological dimensions of discourse, non-verbal forms of communication, and the broader political context.

It should be noted that in Ukrainian linguistics there is a descriptive approach to discourse analysis, which is associated with the study of the linguistic behavior of political figures, and a critical one, which studies language as a means of power.

In our study, we use a descriptive approach and use the definition of political discourse by N. Derenchuk: "... political discourse is a complex multidimensional linguistic and communicative phenomenon with a clear sociocultural orientation and pragmatic semantics, expressed by a complex of verbal and nonverbal means" [9, p. 26].

1.2. The notions "language personality" and "language portrait"

In the dynamic and contradictory world of the beginning of the 21st century, amid the complexity of intercultural and interpersonal relationships, the competitive person is the one who freely navigates the information space, masters communication strategies and tactics, is able to use information in accordance with one's intentions, and create one's own creative speech patterns to achieve the desired communicative result.

Language cannot exist independently of culture; they are inherently intertwined. Language is more than just a set of words; it embodies a way of thinking and is deeply rooted in the specific context of human life. In this sense, language is not merely a tool for communication but a reflection of the culture from which it

emerges. Culture shapes language just as language shapes culture. They are symbiotic, each influencing and informing the other. As such, any understanding of language must also encompass an understanding of the culture it belongs to.

In contemporary linguistics, there is a growing emphasis on the human element within speech. Recognizing the pivotal role individuals play in both the creation and usage of language, researchers increasingly adopt an anthropological approach. This approach delves into the intricate relationship between language, culture, and human behavior, enriching our comprehension of the complexities inherent in linguistic expression. The concept of “language personality” naturally occupies a central place in the scope of anthropological linguistics and contributes to the emergence of a new scientific discipline – language personology [21, p. 69]. So, in the center of modern anthropocentric linguistics, there is an understanding of a person who is able to perform speech acts.

In modern linguistics, the doctrine of language personality has been popularized, since it allows us to explore the communicative essence of the language. To date, there is no universal definition of “language personality”, but there are many interpretations introduced by different researchers.

The problem of language personality, one of the most important in modern science, can be solved at the interdisciplinary level. The concept of language personality has many different interpretations and views on its definition.

The origin of the idea of “language personality” is credited to the German scholar Leo Weisgerber, who introduced it in his seminal work “Muttersprache und Geistesbildung” (“Mother tongue and the formation of the mind”) published in 1927. Weisgerber proposed that language represents a collective cultural legacy rather than an individual possession. According to him, individuals don't speak a language solely due to their own linguistic traits; rather, they do so because they are part of a specific linguistic community. This perspective underscores the notion that language is deeply embedded within social and cultural contexts, shaping and being shaped by the communities that use it.

Furthermore, Weisgerber posits that humans have language ability (Sprachfähigkeit) which enables them to retain life experiences in memory, process them, and juxtapose them with others. This ability finds expression in both thought and speech, thereby exerting a profound influence on human cognition and behavior across various domains. Weisgerber introduces the concept of the "language picture of the world," suggesting that language serves as a stimulus to the shaping an individual's perception of reality. Later on, Weisgerber refines this idea, asserting that each language embodies a distinct worldview, reflecting the perspective of the community that created it. From the 1950s onwards, he highlights that the influence of language on an individual primarily stems from the uniqueness of their worldview rather than from any universal components inherent in language itself.

Ukrainian scholar O. Selivanova interprets the terminological unit "language personality" as "...an immanent sign of a person as a native speaker and communicator, characterizing her linguistic and communicative competence and their implementation in the generation, perception, understanding and interpretation of verbal messages. interaction of discourse" [22, p. 370].

In a number of scientific studies, linguist S. Avramenko considers a language personality as a generalized image of an individual, who is characterized by a certain linguistic thinking, an ethno-linguistic worldview, linguistic knowledge and skills, linguistic norms and tastes, and linguistic practical activity. A language personality, according to the researcher, is realized surrounded by other language personalities representing a particular community. It is the nationally specific and universal features that contribute to the formation of the speech style of an individual language personality, which necessitates an in-depth study of the language personality, focused on understanding the influence of the individual on language and discourse [1, p. 138-143].

According to F. Batsevych, a language personality is an individual with a distinct set of abilities and characteristics, predermining the creation and interpretation of texts by this individual. These texts vary in their levels of structural-linguistic complexity and their depth and precision in reflecting reality [3, p. 212].

L. Struganets defines the concept of language personality as an individual who, being a native speaker, exhibits competence in the intricate system of linguistic knowledge. This encompasses a profound understanding of linguistic concepts and rules. Additionally, the language personality actively engages in speech activities, demonstrating proficiency in manipulating words with skill and precision. Moreover, they demonstrate a sense of responsibility in nurturing the language, actively contributing to its care and advancement [28, p. 38].

A well-known modern Ukrainian linguodidact M. Vashulenko presents the following definition: “A language personality is a person considered from the point of view of readiness to perform speech actions; it is the one who appropriates language, for whom language is speech. A language personality is characterized not only by what one knows about language, but also by how one can use it” [6, p. 11].

This diversity of interpreting of the terminological unit “language personality” explains a number of different scientific proposals on the structure of language personality.

Considering that the language personality in the aspect of communication is recognized as a communicative personality, which is a generalized bearer of cultural, linguistic and communicative values, knowledge and attitudes, scholars distinguish in the language personality from this point of view the value, cognitive, cognitive and behavioral plans.

The value plan of a communicative personality is associated with moral standards of behavior characteristic of a certain community in a certain period of time. These norms are fixed in the moral code and depict the history and worldview of people connected by language and culture.

The cognitive plan of a communicative personality is revealed by the analytical procedure for depicting the surrounding world, which is based on subject-substantive and categorical-formal methods of explaining reality, which have a disseminator of knowledge about society and speech. So, the cognitive plane represents the mental area of the individual.

The behavioral characteristics of a verbal personality contain a complex of verbal and non-verbal indicators that express it as an individual person. This personality plane is associated with the choice of language indicators and means of communication and is determined by sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic factors: the first aspect is correlated with the language indices of women and men, as well as with native speakers who are proficient and less knowledgeable in it, or speak a native and foreign language. , the second aspect is associated with discursive moves in the natural communication of people. A behavioral stereotype includes many different characteristics, and any deviation from the stereotype signals the unnatural nature of communication.

The basis for the study of language personality is discursive practices, explained by a number of reasons. Among them, national markings and a number of universal features are traditionally distinguished, thanks to which intercultural communication occurs. Firstly, they are nationally marked, and secondly, they have a number of universal features, thanks to which intercultural communication is realized. Discourse includes the following dimensions: linguistic (use of language), cognitive (transfer of knowledge, ideas, information) and interactive, reflecting the interaction of subjects of linguistic activity in social situations) [83, p. 1-34].

The problem of researching and creating a speech portrait is closely related to the theoretical understanding of the concept of “language personality”.

The term “language portrait” is represented by a number of scientific interpretations in linguistics. Typically, a language portrait is a set of characteristics included in the linguistic image of a person and realizing his communicative potential in a certain period of time [47, p. 75].

Ukrainian linguist L. Matsko analyses the notion “language portrait” in terms of stylistics: “Language personality is the personality of a specific person, expressed in language and through language in his discourses and texts” [17, p. 10].

Ukrainian linguist G. Syuta notes that the development of various individual portraits, interacting with a deep study of language and genre, their works and

linguistic practice, is an attempt to notice the features of improving the literary language on various spatial and idiostyle sections [29, p. 35-38].

Syuta promotes his own conclusion regarding the presentation of the language portrait of a person in the context of a systemic representation of defining parameters, including:

- semantic-stylistic dominants of individual style;
- identify the influence of the era, socio-political conditions, linguistic and cultural environment on idiostyle;
- allow the introduction of a certain language personality into the chronicle of a literary language.

The above information contributes to the assimilation of general (in diachrony) and individual (in synchrony) features of speech development [30, p. 139].

Summarizing the opinions of modern researchers in the field of linguistics and linguodidactics, in this work we will use the terms “language personality” and “language portrait”, defining them as follows: a language personality is a person built into the conceptual system of language, looking at the world through “language glasses” (an object formed by the culture of speech); language portrait is a system of linguistic means that a certain person prefers in communication in order to influence the audience, achieve a set goal, overcoming communication barriers and skillfully using contexts – linguistic (verbal), paralinguistic (voice, tempo, intonation), extralinguistic (facial expressions, gestures), proxemic (space organization, kinesthetics), situational (actualization of speech personality, subjective choice of speech means in speech behavior). At the same time, we use the method of language portraiture, which provides for selective characterization of the most striking features of the speech of an individual language personality, in particular US President Joseph Biden.

When delving into the concept of “language personality” and analyzing an individual's speech characteristics, scholars also focus on the notion of “idiolect.”

This term originated in American linguistics during the 1940s, coined by combining “ídios” (from Greek) meaning "one's own, special" with “lectós” meaning “able to talk” [27, p. 3].

L. Stavytska defines “idiolect” as a specific language of an individual, encompassing the collection of texts produced by the speaker and studied by linguists to explore the language system. In a narrower sense, it refers to the distinctive speech traits exhibited by a particular native speaker [ibid.]. Additionally, Stavytska asserts that the study of “idiolect” necessitates the consideration of sociological characteristics of the speaker and the communicative contexts in which speech occurs. This broader perspective allows for a comprehensive understanding of how individual linguistic patterns are shaped by both personal characteristics and external factors.

According to S. Ya. Yermolenko, an individual’s linguistic style is rooted in the interplay between language and cognition, facilitating the formation of a linguistic worldview where collective and individual elements converge ” [11, p. 305].

F. Batsevych defines idiolect as a distinct communication depending on the characteristics of an individual, comprising both linguistic and extralinguistic elements that contribute to the linguistic and communicative competence of the native speaker within their language and cultural context [3, p. 325-326].

According to A Dictionary of Stylistics, idiolect is a framework encompassing an individual's unique stylistic features, reflecting their personal linguistic style [87, p. 211]. The concept of personal identity and individual stylistic nuances extends beyond spoken language to encompass writing as well. Even within the realm of politics, it is observable that politicians develop their own distinctive rhetorical styles. This is often manifested through the use of particular grammatical or lexical features that are characteristic of the specific individual.

To underscore the aforementioned definitions, the term “idiolect” refers to a unique language profile, characterized by specific parameters such as phonological,

semantic, lexical, and syntactic features. These parameters can be indicative of the speech characteristics of an individual or a group of individuals.

When considering a social-status type of language personality, such as a politician, a comprehensive approach is required to analyze their verbal behavior effectively.

If we consider foreign political linguistics, it is worth noting that in the context of the typology of rhetorical portraits, the institutional approach has become most widespread. This approach is predominant in the American political system, in which almost every politician is a nominee of the corresponding political party. Consequently, the politician has the responsibility, in the process of political public speeches, to implement and implement the rhetoric of the party to which he belongs [74, p. 116].

In accordance with tradition, in English-language political discourse there are two types of political rhetoric, the adherence to which is immediately revealed by the speeches of politicians – conservative and liberal. The emergence of such specific types of political rhetoric is associated with the formation of political parties of conservatives and liberals in the middle of the 19th century.

When analyzing conservative political rhetoric, it is worth noting that in a politician's speech it is distinguished by the following speech features: the politician addresses the middle class, talks a lot about benefits, focuses on protecting achievements and preventing losses [55, p. 25]. At the same time, conservative rhetoric emphasizes the politician's high assessment of the current state of affairs, pride in the group that nominated him and confidence in its leaders and the correctness of the course [70, p. 45].

Liberal or progressive rhetoric is the rhetoric of dissatisfaction, which has roots in dissatisfaction with the existing state of things. Usually this is the rhetoric of the opposition – the political party that is actively seeking power. There are many different types of portraits of politicians who implement such rhetoric. Their spectrum includes both reformist politicians, whose goals involve implementing only a partial, selective transformation of the system, and revolutionary politicians,

striving for the complete abolition of the existing system and replacing it with a new, better one. This type of rhetoric promotes the image of a politician as an intercessor, patron of the weak, poor and disadvantaged.

Also an important part of studying the speech portrait of a politician is the study of speech styles [66, p. 185]. Thus, if we consider the speech styles of American presidents, we can learn a lot about their “American ideals,” since every public speech of the president reflects his kind of American ideal vision of a problem or political issue.

M. Putnam believes that in the process of communication there is a tendency for individuals to judge their own statements and messages as persuasion, and consider the statements of the opposite side to be propaganda [74, 176]. This belief formed the theoretical basis for the typology of speech portraits of politicians developed by this researcher. Each participant in political communication perceives his own arguments as more justified, and the arguments of the other side as unfounded propaganda, especially when interacting with political opponents. In most cases, the speeches and speeches of political figures constitute political propaganda or indoctrination, and therefore, in the eyes of society, it represents something that should be viewed negatively a priori.

When analyzing modern political rhetoric, M. Putnam notes that its means and techniques are becoming more and more sophisticated as society develops. Political leaders of the past often relied solely on intelligence, wit, and other personal verbal skills. Currently, when preparing political messages, computer programs are actively used to create any message and instantly disseminate it.

In modern political communication, each participant has the opportunity to combine methods of rhetoric, psychological techniques and new propaganda technologies to influence political opponents. Therefore, the basis for constructing a speech portrait should be a concentration on what the politician says and how. On this basis, it is possible to identify a standard rhetorical pattern, which can be expanded by analyzing the metaphors used by the politician, specific speech techniques, red herrings, etc.

It is worth noting that the political narrative is formed by the efforts of many narrators – participants in the political struggle, members of their headquarters, political analysts, as well as representatives of the press, each of whom brings to it their own rational and emotional assessments, interpreting the political situation and events in their own way, thereby creating an original political picture of the world in their texts.

Political texts are perceived through the prism of perception of the participants in the narrative, forming their own political picture of the world – this is the specificity of the political sphere, as well as any public communicative sphere. This specificity also affects the creation of a speech portrait of a public language personality. The speech portrait is created not only by the individual himself; significant adjustments are made to it by certain subjects or commentators external to him [33, p. 306]. If we talk about the speech portrait of a politician, then such subjects include the following:

1. Society, represented by its representatives;
2. The media, represented by journalists and other specialists;
3. Opposition politics [80, p. 68].

The influence of the expert points of view of these commentators, through the prism of which the speech portrait is perceived, often significantly distorts it. A significant difficulty in analyzing political rhetoric for any external observer is that at his disposal are exclusively fragmented elements available in open sources (media, etc.). In addition, it is worth taking into account the fact that almost all messages are seriously edited by the press services of political institutions, and then also by editors of news media services, which makes it even more difficult to conduct a scientific analysis of political rhetoric. Also, the subjective perception of the researcher has a significant influence on the study of political rhetoric, since when forming conclusions regarding the rhetoric of a particular politician, each researcher relies on his own political beliefs.

Thus, we can conclude that the language portrait of a politician is a multifaceted concept, the perception of which is often influenced by external factors. Representing, on the one hand, a certain systemic complex of content and communication components, the speech portrait of a politician, on the other hand, is not directly demonstrated to society. Perceived through the prism of one's own beliefs, as well as distorted by the interpretation of the media, the opposition and public opinion, the speech portrait of a politician takes on the appearance of an approximate, often inaccurate copy.

1.3. Formation of language personality: Joe Biden

The aim of this study is to describe the language portrait of the American statesman and politician who has been acting as the 46th President of the United States since January 20, 2021, Joe Biden.

Before proceeding directly to the description of the language portrait of this politician, it is necessary to understand the background and influences shaping Biden's speech patterns.

Joseph Robinette (Joe) Biden Jr., was born on November 20, 1942 in Scranton, Pennsylvania, to Joseph Robinette Biden Sr. (1915–2002) and Catherine Eugenia (Jean) Finnegan (1917–2010) in a Catholic family of Irish-English origin. He was the eldest of four children of Catholics from British and Northern Irish families [61].

It should be noted about Joe Biden's early childhood that he grappled with a severe stutter, facing not only the challenge of speech impediment but also enduring the cruelty of bullies and the shame it brought. Despite undergoing speech therapy in kindergarten, which proved ineffective, he opted to confront his struggle independently [64].

Later on, at the Archmere Academy, a private Catholic school for boys, Joe Biden's peers even called him "Dash," a moniker reflecting the staccato rhythm of his speech. Describing his condition as akin to Morse code, Joe Biden recounted in

his memoir, “Promises to Keep,” the challenges he faced. Determined to overcome his impediment, he devoted hours to practice in his bedroom, meticulously watching his reflection in the mirror by flashlight. Memorizing works by Yeats and Emerson, he strived for flawless speech, determined to excel in the classroom. Biden recalled: “Other kids looked at me like I was stupid. I wanted so badly to prove I was like everybody else” [ibid.]. This journey of self-reliance toughened him, instilling within him remarkable confidence which manifests in his adult speech behavior. Moreover, his empathy for individuals facing similar challenges with speech disorders might shape his communication style, making him more patient and understanding in his interactions.

Joe Biden often pays tribute to his parents, with a particular focus on his mother, whom he credits as a significant influence throughout his life. Both his mother and father played pivotal roles, albeit for distinct reasons, shaping both his personal and political journey.

Jean emerges as a source of inspiration and unwavering support in Joe’s narrative. During his acceptance speech for the VP nomination at the 2008 Democratic National Convention, Joe singled out Jean, who was present in the audience, echoing her creed: “My mother’s creed is the American creed: No one is better than you. You are everyone’s equal, and everyone is equal to you” [58]. Having a supportive mother like Jean instilled in Biden a sense of authenticity and warmth in his communication style. He come across as genuine and approachable, traits often associated with individuals who have strong support systems. Jean’s creed, emphasizing equality and inclusivity, may have influenced Biden’s rhetoric. He may frequently use language that promotes unity and fairness, reflecting his mother's values and the importance she placed on treating everyone as equals.

Reflecting on his father’s impact during his second unsuccessful presidential campaign in 2008, Joe Biden shared with the Times how his father’s resilience amidst unemployment molded him into the man he is today. Emphasizing his father’s profound influence on his achievements, Biden underscored: “My dad

always said, “Champ, the measure of a man is not how often he is knocked down, but how quickly he gets up.” ” [41].

Indeed, working and supportive environment influenced Joe Biden’s linguistic style as well as the form of power. Linguists Robert Körner, Jennifer R. Overbeck, and Astrid Schütz point out that while Donald Trump’s approach to power is based on coercive power forms, Biden’s is characterized by collaborative power forms. Aristotle acknowledged the presence of coercive power but advocated for the supremacy of virtuous power, asserting that it leads to more favorable outcomes for both individuals and society. In alignment with this perspective, Russell (1938) posited that raw and revolutionary power eventually succumbs to traditional authority rooted in factors such as inheritance, expertise, and the esteem accorded to such expertise, rather than relying on political force [63].

At its core, collaborative power serves as a means to promote the welfare of others, advance the common good, and foster social cohesion. Individuals who subscribe to a collaborative understanding of power are inclined to view traditional authority, which prioritizes collective institutions and consensus-building, as the most suitable model of political governance [82].

Biden’s oratory style often leans towards analysis while frequently intertwining themes of moral significance. When expressing himself through tweets, Biden tends to employ a greater abundance of socially oriented language, emphasizing virtues, honesty, and accomplishments, a contrast to the approach favored by Trump. In one of his tweets Biden states that his father used to say that a job was a much more than a paycheck, but it was about a person’s dignity, respect and a place in the world. Biden emphasizes dignity and social responsibility that still reflects in extensive use of language that reflects his values, his linguistic style conveys empathy, sincerity, and a sense of moral urgency, reflecting his commitment to addressing issues related to economic inequality, social justice, and community well-being.

A notable strength of Biden’s political behavior lies in his adeptness at forging connections with working-class and middle-class Americans. Throughout his

speeches and interviews, he often emphasizes his modest upbringing. “I grew up in a family where, if the price of food went up, you felt it,” Biden recalled in his 2022 State of the Union address [46]. In his speeches, Biden always addresses the working class, talks a lot about the challenges and achievements of ordinary people, while expressing himself simply and clearly, positioning himself as one of them.

Biden graduated from St. Helena High School in Wilmington, Delaware. He later attended the University of Delaware, graduating in 1965 with a bachelor’s degree in history and political science. In 1968, Biden graduated from Syracuse University Law School in New York. In 1966, Joe Biden married Neilia Hunter, they had three children.

In 1969, beginning his professional career, Biden joined the Wilmington Bar, and a few months later he became a clerk in a law firm under a Republican director. Having taken office, Joe Biden became interested in politics, and he leaned towards the program of the US Democratic Party. New views led to the dismissal and the organization of their own company, which was engaged in civil and criminal proceedings.

The experience gained in his youth helped Biden become a senator at the age of 30 and since then he has regularly won the vote and was a representative of the state of Delaware. The politician took the 6th place in the list of the youngest senators in the history of the United States. In this position, he initiated the adoption of bills on strengthening liability for harassment of women (the Violence Against Women Act) and on checking the personal information of firearms buyers.

Biden’s approach to power isn't solely evident in his professional background; his personality and demeanor also offer insight into his collaborative theory of governance. Biographical accounts and media portrayals depict Biden as cooperative, diplomatic, and sociable, emphasizing teamwork and seeking approval from others [59]. This inclination towards building alliances and fostering friendships aligns with a traditional power paradigm centered on collaboration and influence.

In January 2009, the politician became the 47th Vice President of the United States. In his new position, the politician took on the role of a behind-the-scenes adviser, questioning government decisions and forcing ministers to think and argue.

On January 20, 2021, 78-year-old Joe Biden took office as the country's president, becoming the oldest US president elected to a first term.

Another aspect that had a strong influence on the formation of Biden's language personality is religion. Biden stands as the second Catholic president in American history, with those close to him asserting that his Catholicism profoundly shapes his worldview. His speeches are infused with allusions to God, biblical references, and acknowledgments of the pope. During his 2020 campaign as the Democratic presidential nominee, Biden addressed a faith-based anti-poverty group, characterizing the nation under President Trump as akin to a "nation in the wilderness" [62]. Recognized for his devout faith, Biden sought to present the election as a moral juxtaposition between himself and Trump.

It is necessary to mention Jacques Maritain, a Catholic philosopher credited with laying the groundwork for the Christian democratic movement, who played a significant role in shaping Joe Biden's thinking. Maritain's philosophy likely resonated with Biden's own values and beliefs. Maritain advocated for a political approach rooted in the promotion of human dignity, social justice, and the common good. Specifically, Maritain's emphasis on the importance of moral principles in governance and the role of government in promoting social welfare may have influenced Biden's views on the role of government in society. Biden's support for policies aimed at addressing income inequality, expanding access to healthcare, and promoting social justice can be seen as consistent with the principles espoused by Maritain.

Regarding the contribution of literature to the formation of Biden's language personality, it is necessary to mention the Irish poet, Nobel Prize winner, Seamus Heaney [69]. Joe Biden's admiration for Seamus Heaney and his frequent citation of the poet's works reflect a deep appreciation for Heaney's literary prowess and the resonance of his poetry with Biden's own values and beliefs. Heaney's poems often

explore themes of resilience, empathy, and the human condition, qualities that resonate strongly with Biden's own personal and political philosophy. In addition, Biden's choice to cite Heaney's poetry during significant moments, such as during his presidential campaigns and upon receiving the Medal of Freedom from President Obama, suggests that Heaney's words hold special significance for Biden and are used deliberately to convey his message and sentiments. Biden turned to Heaney in his remarks at the end of the Obama administration, drawing inspiration from the poem "From the Republic of Conscience" as he commended Obama for his humility: "You carried your own burden and very soon your symptoms of creeping privilege disappeared" [60].

Also, Biden's sincere interest and concern for the lives of ordinary Americans may be associated with the figure of the Irish writer James Joyce. The President sometimes quotes one of Joyce's most important novels, *Dubliners*. In his depiction of the inhabitants of Dublin, Joyce delves into the intricacies of their everyday existence, portraying the minutiae of their lives, including both triumphs and setbacks, aspirations and disappointments. Biden may draw parallels between Joyce's exploration of the human condition and his own empathetic approach to politics, which emphasizes unity and inclusivity in his rhetoric, connecting with the everyday concerns of Americans.

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 1

Political discourse is of particular interest for research. The main goal of political communication is the propaganda of certain ideas, therefore this type of communication both reflects the existing reality and has an emotional impact on the addressee, transforming the political picture of the world existing in his mind.

The notions “language portrait” and “language personality” also represent a current subject of linguistic research. Language portrait is a set of speech preferences of an individual in the process of communication in specific circumstances for the implementation of certain communicative intentions and strategies for influencing the audience, while language personality refers to an individual’s unique relationship with language. It is shaped by cultural and linguistic influences, forming a conceptual system through which the individual interprets and interacts with their environment.

Joe Biden’s communication style is characterized by collaborative power forms primarily due to his background. The supportive upbringing has instilled in him a sense of teamwork and cooperation. Biden views government as a tool for positive change and believes in the power of collective action to address societal challenges. This philosophy is reflected in his communication style, which often emphasizes the shared responsibility in tackling pressing issues facing the nation.

2. LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF JOE BIDEN'S LANGUAGE PROFILE

The research materials are 33 speeches by Joseph Biden, delivered between 2021 and 2024. The total number of lexical units in the analysed speeches by President Joe Biden is 117 546 tokens. The transcripts of the speeches were taken from the electronic archive of the official website of the White House [92-124].

The analysis of the speech communication of Joe Biden involved a combination of research methods aimed at understanding the process of speech communication, identifying characteristics of politicians' speech, and revealing underlying intentions and strategies. Content analysis focused on speech content and emotional states. Intent analysis aimed to reveal hidden meanings and agendas. Discourse analysis uncovered strategies and tactics for manipulation.

Biden's language portrait is characterized by the extensive use of terminology, including socio-political, military, and economic terms, reflecting his efforts to communicate effectively with the audience. The analysis highlights the tendency to use evaluative language to convey his stance on different issues, often employing contrasting positive and negative connotations to underscore key points. Additionally, Biden's speeches are characterized by a mix of formal and colloquial language, aiming to establish a connection with the audience while maintaining authority as a political leader. However, the analysis also points out instances of speech errors, including slips of the tongue, confusion in names and numbers, and occasional use of swearing, which may impact his image and effectiveness as a communicator.

The analysis provides a detailed examination of the use of modal verbs in Joe Biden's speeches, particularly focusing on how he employs them to convey willingness, intention, obligation, and possibility in his speeches. Biden's frequent use of modal verbs like "will," "can," and "would" reflects his commitment,

determination, and optimism in addressing various issues, from political strategies to societal challenges.

Joe Biden's speeches also contain various rhetorical devices: metaphors, allusions, syntactic parallelism, anaphora, rhetorical questions, epizeuxis, wordplay, asyndeton, antithesis, alliteration, and assonance. These devices are used to enhance persuasion, emphasize key points, and create memorable and impactful messages.

2.1. Lexical peculiarities of the individual style

The 21st-century society brims with the pervasive presence of influence and manipulation. The imperative of investigating the myriad factors shaping decision-making and choices has never been more pronounced. People are constantly inundated with the voices and perspectives of others, various ideas are embedded into their consciousness that subtly alter life decisions and reshape value systems. The selection of vocabulary employed to convey information, particularly regarding socio-political dynamics, profoundly impacts its interpretation and reception by the audience.

Certain linguistic scholars argue that the societal significance inherent in words, serving as the foundation of their meaning, presents both the opportunity and imperative to regulate the lexical semantics of linguistic elements, thereby exercising a form of control over the semantic landscape of language. This necessity for regulation stems from the demands of scholarly comprehension, enabling a deeper understanding of the fundamental principles governing phenomena, processes, and their interconnectedness within the tangible world. Despite diverse interpretations regarding the need to regulate the lexical meaning of words and the utilization of specific lexical elements, the fundamental nature of this process remains consistent: the deliberate selection of lexical elements used to represent societal phenomena and events serves as a means of influencing and manipulating individual consciousness.

In institutional discourse, the selection of lexical means is very dynamic, given its direct responsiveness to evolving social dynamics. The vocabulary used in political discourse reflects a tendency for linguistic precision, where words are carefully chosen to align with underlying ideas. This linguistic alignment signifies a commitment to ensuring coherence between language and thought processes.

The distinctive feature of political discourse isn't solely confined to the use of specific vocabulary but also extends to the deliberate selection and arrangement of linguistic structures in line with pragmatic objectives and communication conditions shaped by politicians' endeavors.

An integral feature of the language portrait of Joseph Biden at the lexical level is terminological units. It is important to note that the lexical unit "term" (from the Latin *terminus* "border, boundary") is "a special word or phrase used to denote a certain concept" [12]. A term, in contrast to an ordinary lexical unit, is used to designate only one object of reality, a denotation, a concept, as a result of which the terms are distinguished into a special category of linguistic signs.

The language portrait of Biden is represented by lexical units of socio-political, medical, military, economic and legal terminological systems.

The dominant part of the language portrait of Joe Biden in the lexical aspect is socio-political terminology. In the most general sense, the socio-political vocabulary is represented by nominative units, "...which denote the realities of social life, political phenomena, and also serve to express the worldview and ideological position of an individual" [16, p. 135].

Biden prefers widely used socio-political terms, the meaning of which is known to the average native speaker. The socio-political vocabulary is dominated by words that affirm democracy, freedom, and other values of a democratic system. Moreover, it helps to effectively communicate his priorities, and vision for the nation.

We single out vocabulary that names abstract concepts, terms of philosophy, political science, politics, ideology, which perform a generalizing function and form concepts about a class of subjects, for example: *Freedom, liberty, democracy*.

American democracy [92]; *For the first time on our history, insurrectionists had come to stop the peaceful transfer — transfer of power in America... [ibid.]; And if we are to advance liberty and justice, we need to secure the border and fix the immigration system* [121]; *Tonight, we meet as Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. But most importantly as Americans* [ibid.]. By mentioning terms like “freedom,” “liberty,” and “democracy,” President Biden underscores his commitment to core American values and principles. He highlights the significance of upholding these ideals, particularly in the face of challenges such as the insurrectionists’ attempt to disrupt the peaceful transfer of power, which he condemns. Additionally, President Biden’s focus on securing the border and fixing the immigration system reflects his priorities regarding national security and immigration reform. These terms underscore his dedication to addressing pressing issues that impact the country’s stability and prosperity. Furthermore, his acknowledgment of Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and Americans underscores his call for unity and collaboration across party lines. By emphasizing the importance of coming together as a nation, he highlights his commitment to inclusivity and bipartisanship in addressing the country’s challenges.

A group represented by the terminological systems of the legislative, executive, judicial power and institutional system is also inherent in the language portrait of Biden: *Tonight. I call on the Senate to: Pass the Freedom to Vote Act. Pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Act. And while you’re at it, pass the Disclose Act so Americans can know who is funding our elections* [ibid]; *We’re putting in place dedicated immigration judges so families fleeing persecution and violence can have their cases heard faster* [ibid.]. Referencing legislative acts such as the Freedom to Vote Act and the John Lewis Voting Rights Act underscores the authority and legitimacy of these proposed measures. By calling on the Senate to pass these acts, Biden portrays himself as a leader who is actively engaged in advocating for legislative change to address pressing issues such as voting rights and campaign finance transparency. By highlighting specific legislative proposals and policy initiatives, such as immigration reform and electoral transparency, Biden

communicates his administration's focus on key issues and demonstrates his commitment to enacting meaningful change through the legislative process. Also, Biden emphasizes the significance of expediting the adjudication process for families seeking refuge from persecution and violence, advocating for dedicated immigration judges to handle their cases promptly. Thus, he underscores his commitment to upholding principles of judicial fairness and due process. This portrays his administration as responsive to the needs of vulnerable populations and committed to ensuring a fair and efficient judicial process.

Further, the language portrait of Joe Biden is represented by a significant number of military terminological units that reflect the current crisis situation in some countries, in particular, in Ukraine, Afghanistan, etc. The politician's use of military terms is identified in Biden's political speeches of February 24, 2022 regarding Russia's treacherous attack on Ukraine and the need for comprehensive support of the Ukrainian people: *We'll continue to supply Ukraine with **critical weapons and equipment** as long as we can, including \$200 million I just approved today in a critical needed equipment: additional **air-defense interceptors, artillery, and ammunition*** [93]. By using specific names of weapons like *air-defense interceptors, artillery, ammunition*, etc. Biden communicates a sense of urgency and seriousness, highlighting the importance of providing essential military equipment to address the brutal war in Ukraine. Additionally, the wide enumeration of these terms helps to underscore the United States' commitment to assisting Ukraine in defending itself against aggression, as well as demonstrating solidarity with the Ukrainian people in their time of need.

The concern about the situation in another country, Afghanistan, is reflected, for example, in speeches from July 8 and August 16, 26, 2021: *I've instructed **the military**, whatever they need – if they need additional force – I will grant it. But **the military** – from the **Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the Joint Chiefs, the commanders in the field** – have all contacted me one way or another...* [120]. Referring to military ranks like the *Chairman of the Joint Chiefs* and the *commanders in the field* emphasises Biden's reliance on military expertise and leadership in making

decisions related to national security and defense. It highlights his trust in the military's judgment and underscores his commitment to ensuring that they have the resources they need to carry out their missions effectively.

As we can see, the military terminology that forms the language portrait of Joseph Biden is used to denote concepts directly associated with the armed forces, military ranks, equipment, and means of armed struggle. Wide use of terminological units of a military orientation by politicians in their speech reflects not only the current crisis situation in a number of countries, but also the tension that existed during the so-called "cold war".

The extensive use of terminology in the language portrait of Joseph Biden indicates the politician's attempts to ensure the effectiveness of his communication with the audience. The use of terminological lexical units by the US President contributes to a better understanding of the essence of the issue under discussion, reduces losses in the perception and assimilation of information by participants in communicative activities, because usually the terms, as noted above, are characterized by unambiguity and accuracy.

Politicians use a lexical arsenal primarily characterized by emotive language. Their assessment of the objective world is affected by subjective attitudes, weighed against values such as good and evil, beauty versus hostility, truth versus falsity, intelligence levels, etc.

Words and word combinations with evaluative semantics are represented in the language in two main types: generally evaluative and partially evaluative. The first type comprises positive (reclamation) and negative (pejorative, derogative) lexical units. Hence, these evaluations are based on axiological interpretation. Its axiological foundation simplifies analysis to a single question: does the author of the statement harbor a positive or negative perception toward the subject in question, thus acknowledging or disregarding its inherent value? The second type is represented by lexical units that evaluate a separate aspect of the object, in particular, sensory, sublimated and rationalistic types [88, p. 121].

It's important to clarify that when referring to lexical units, the analysis specifically targeted nouns, adjectives, and verbs. These parts of speech were chosen to showcase the framework of evaluating people, concepts, and phenomena, conveying both positive or negative evaluation, and encompassing emotional or rational assessments.

The number of evaluative lexemes with positive connotation prevails, compared with vocabulary with negative connotation. Nouns dominate in both groups, with the largest proportion found within the group of nouns carrying positive connotations.

Positive connotation		Negative connotation
glory	Nouns	fortitude
freedom		horror
liberty		pain
patriotism		suffering
opportunity		disbelief
dignity		dictator
prospect		desperation
growth		loss
justice		agression
protection		chaos

Table 1. Nouns with positive and negative connotation in Joe Biden's speeches

Adjectives constitute the second group. In this category, a prevalence of adjectives with negative connotation was observed. These adjectives often reflect the challenges, concerns, and negative outcomes associated with the ongoing wars, diseases, terrorist attacks etc:

Positive connotation		Negative connotation
-----------------------------	--	-----------------------------

powerful	Adjectives	deadly
peaceful		difficult
free		harsh
fair		daunting
brave		horrific
strong		bloody
unwavering		brutal
proud		tragic
resilient		violent

Table 2. Adjectives with positive and negative connotation in Joe Biden's speeches

Verbs constitute the third group of lexical units. It was found that the overall tone leans more towards positive connotations:

Positive connotation	Verbs	Negative connotation
win		hurt
preserve		invade
strengthen		steal
support		suffer
benefit		humiliate
restore		undermine
secure		attack
protect		terrorize

Table 3. Verbs with positive and negative connotation in Joe Biden's speeches

In order to highlight the modern image of Russia on the world stage, for example, Joe Biden actively uses a number of words with negative semantics. In the statement made during the speech ahead of the one-year anniversary of Russia's invasion of Ukraine on the 21th of February, 2023, President Joe Biden uses an adjective with negative connotation: *Nearly one year ago I spoke at the Royal Castle*

here in Warsaw, just weeks after Vladimir Putin had unleashed his **murderous** assault on Ukraine [94]. This adjective is supported by many next statements of the politician: *This war was never a necessity; it's a **tragedy*** [ibid.]. Biden extensively uses the “friend/foe” dichotomy.

In another eloquent example, he contrasts positive concepts with the ones that belong to the “minus” zone, highlighting the dichotomy between empowerment and oppression, progress and destruction, and optimism and fear outlining severe consequences of the January attack: *And while decisions are ours to make now, the principles and the stakes are eternal. A choice between **chaos** and **stability**. Between **building** and **destroying**. Between **hope** and **fear**. Between **democracy** that **lifts up** the human spirit and the **brutal** hand of the **dictator** who **crushes** it. Between nothing less than **limitation** and **possibilities**, the kind of possibilities that come when people who live not in **captivity** but in **freedom*** [ibid.]. Biden creates a rhetorical contrast that emphasizes the importance of the choices being made. By juxtaposing positive and negative connotations, the speaker aims to underscore the urgency of the decision-making process.

The stringing of words with negative and positive meanings can also be observed in speeches on the topic of the brutal war in Ukraine. Biden firmly condemns Russian brutality and praises NATO efforts: *And before the **war** started, I told Putin that if he **invaded** Ukraine, NATO would not only get **stronger** but would get more **united**. And we would see **democracies** in the world **stand up** and **oppose** his **aggression** and **defend** the **rules-based** order... This summit was about **strengthening** our Alliance... and the **threats** we're going to face in the future* [117]. Such an extensive number of evaluative lexical units creates a nuanced and complex picture of the situation. On one hand, there are negative connotations associated with brutality and aggression, highlighting the grim reality of the conflict and the suffering it inflicts on the Ukrainian people. These words evoke images of violence, destruction, and human rights violations perpetrated by Russian forces. On the other hand, there are positive elements interwoven throughout the speech. Biden's

condemnation of Russian brutality is paired with praise for NATO efforts and the solidarity of democratic nations.

The following examples also illustrate how contrasting evaluative lexical items helps influence the audience: *Another **massacre**. Uvalde, Texas. An elementary school. **Beautiful, innocent** second, third, fourth graders. And how many scores of little children who witnessed what happened see their friends **die** as if they're on a **battlefield**, for God's sake* [96]. The word *massacre* evokes a sense of horror, violence, and tragedy, immediately sets a tone of distress and sorrow, painting a grim picture of the school shooting, and a harsh word *die* underscores the severity and finality of the situation, amplifying the emotional impact on the audience. By contrast, the words *beautiful* and *innocent* are used to describe the young children involved in the massacre and evoke sympathy and empathy from the audience by emphasizing the innocence and vulnerability of the victims.

Evaluative lexical items create a vivid contrast in the following statement as well: *Throughout our history, America has often made the **greatest progress** coming out of some of our **darkest** moments...* [97]. By juxtaposing the concept of “greatest progress” with “darkest moments,” the speaker evokes a range of emotions within the audience. They are reminded of the struggles and challenges faced throughout history, but also of the triumphs and advancements that have emerged from those difficult times. It inspires hope and optimism among the audience by emphasizing that even in times of darkness and adversity, progress and positive transformation are possible.

Also, Biden uses the contrast of lexical units with positive and negative connotations many times in his speech on the United States' Response to Hamas's terrorist attacks against Israel given on October 20, 2023: *In Israel, I saw a people who are **strong, determined, resilient**, and also **angry, in shock**, and in deep, deep **pain*** [98]. By using words with both positive and negative connotations, the speaker provides a nuanced depiction of the Israeli people's experiences. This influences the audience by presenting a balanced portrayal that acknowledges both the strength and resilience of the community, as well as the challenges and hardships they face.

It is important to note that the use of evaluative lexical units is the basis of strategies for manipulating the audience, such as strategies for forming an emotional mood, discrediting, self-presentation and others (more on this in section 3).

Biden's language portrait is also represented by standard clichés, which not only facilitate the process of perceiving his thoughts, but also reflect the overall linguistic picture. In the same speech on Hamas's terrorist attacks against Israel, Biden states: *That's why, tomorrow, I'm going to send to Congress an urgent **budget request** to fund America's **national security needs**, to support our **critical partners**, including Israel and Ukraine* [ibid.]. The usage of political clichés often evoke emotions of patriotism, fear, or solidarity. National security threats taps into people's concerns about safety and protection, while critical partners implies the importance of alliances and cooperation. By appealing to these emotions, politicians can sway public opinion in their favor. Political clichés often oversimplify complex issues, making them more digestible for the general public. This can help politicians convey their message more effectively and capture the attention of a broader audience.

Another example was taken from Joe Biden's speech on fighting the COVID-19 pandemic of September 9, 2021: *The fifth piece of my plan is protecting our **economic recovery**. Because of our vaccination program and the American Rescue Plan, which we passed early in my administration, we've had record **job creation** for a new administration, **economic growth** unmatched in 40 years. I'll also be taking additional steps to help **small businesses** stay afloat during the pandemic* [95]. The clichés *economic growth*, *economic recovery*, *small businesses* are current stereotypes that reflect the reality of American society at the present stage of development, in particular the economic sector. Biden is trying to portray the economic policies of the Democratic Party in a favorable light and impose on the electorate the idea that it is the Democrats who care about the well-being of both the country and each citizen.

In a political speech in Warsaw on March 26, 2022, dedicated to supporting Ukraine, the clichéd phrase *the rule of law* is repeatedly used: *And their brave resistance is part of a larger fight for essential democratic principles that unite all*

*free people: **the rule of law**; free and fair elections... [111]; Over the last 30 years, the forces of autocracy have revived all across the globe. Its hallmarks are familiar ones: contempt for **the rule of law**, contempt for democratic freedom, contempt for the truth itself [ibid.]; Republicans do not respect the Constitution. They do not believe in **the rule of law** [97]; This is a nation that believes in **the rule of law**. We do not repudiate it [ibid.].*

It is not surprising that this cliché is quite repeatedly used, because the topic of equality of everyone before the law turns out to be relevant for modern politics. Thus, the politician focuses the audience's attention on the importance of law in the life of any society, cementing important social stereotypes in the recipient's mind.

The next aspect of communication style is the monologic or dialogical nature of the politician's statements. The purpose of political speech is to influence the voter, and therefore such speech is dialogical in nature. Modern politicians often strive to present their political texts in the form of dialogue with other people [79, p. 933]. As a public figure, Joe Biden actively communicates with the public, not only delivering speeches, but also giving various interviews and press conferences. Speaking about the communicative component of Joe Biden's speech portrait, firstly, it is worth noting the dialogical nature of his statements. In his speeches, Biden often addresses the people directly, using the following informal expressions: *my fellow Americans, folks, fellow citizens: Hello, **folks**. How are you?* [99].

Also, the politician often imitates dialogue and direct speech, asking questions to himself, or retelling questions addressed to him by other people: *Gun violence in America — for those of you who think of this from an economic standpoint listening to me — estimated to cost the nation \$280 billion -- let me say it again — \$280 billion a year. They said, “**How could that be, Joe?**”* [115]. Also, at the Summit on Fire Prevention and Control, 2022, Biden stated: *I just got off with the president of the Delaware volunteer fire company who said, “**Joe, do you remember I was in your first campaign in 1972?**”* [101]. The purpose of this technique is to demonstrate that the politician is open to interacting with his audience in a language they understand, presenting ideas that are difficult to understand in an accessible

way. It can be concluded that Biden seeks to position himself as an equal in the eyes of ordinary Americans in order to increase his level of self-confidence.

As for the preferred role of an agent or coagent, Joe Biden positions himself in the role of an agent, that is, a person actively carrying out any action or participating in any situation, in cooperation with a coagent society, nation [90, p. 200]. As noted earlier, Biden is committed to being seen as an equal by voters, and he has repeatedly called for unity and emphasized that the country can overcome its current difficulties if it acts as one. In this way, Biden emphasizes the active role of citizens in transforming the political situation and his cooperation with them. The active role that Biden is trying to play in the eyes of the public can be seen in such frequently used verbs as: *I do, I act, I promise, I will do my best*, etc.: *So, I'll keep my commitment to be president for all of America, whether you voted for me or not. I've done it for the last three years, and I'll continue to do it* [92]. By portraying himself as an active agent, Biden presents himself as a decisive leader who is capable of taking charge and making things happen. This can instill confidence in the audience regarding his ability to address pressing issues and lead the country effectively. Demonstrating his participation in the destiny of the nation, his personal position of protecting the interests of Americans and responsibility to the country, the US President uses the personal pronoun "I", which shows that Biden takes responsibility for his country: *And I promise you I will fight* [114].

Joe Biden positions himself as an agent in cooperation with the co-agency of society and the nation. As emphasized earlier, he notes the merits of his colleagues, his team, and also emphasizes that the country will be able to overcome difficulties if the people act as one. Thus, he emphasizes the active role of citizens as well as his administration: *While that production is ramping up, my administration has worked with top retailers, like Walmart, Amazon, and Kroger's, and tonight we're announcing that...*[95]. Joe Biden even mentions what the members of his family do for the country: *And this week, my wife, Jill Biden, is traveling to Africa to help bring attention to this critical issue* [94]. By mentioning his wife's work, Biden humanizes the situation and emphasizes the personal connection to the issue. This

can make the problem more relatable to the audience and highlight its importance on a human level rather than just a political or diplomatic one.

The last aspect characterizing the communicative component of the language portrait is communicative success and speech errors made by the person under study in the communication process. Drawing a conclusion about communicative success, it is worth noting that Joe Biden's speaking style is quite choppy, he occasionally confuses words when reading texts from a teleprompter.

One of the most frequently repeated errors in Joe Biden's speech includes periodical slips of the tongue. Biden spoke to reporters about Trump's freezing of military aid to Ukraine and mixed up names of countries: *People are being killed in western, in eastern **Afghan** – excuse me, in eastern, uh, Ukraine* [102]. Likewise, during a visit to Israel in 2022, Biden confused the words *horror* and *honor* in his speech, saying *honor of the Holocaust* – before correcting himself and saying *horror of the Holocaust*. As a rule, official transcripts of Biden's speeches are published on the White House website with errors corrected: *Global ~~inflammatory~~ [inflationary] pressures – were made worse by Putin's brutal and unprovoked war against Ukraine... [103]; We read the obituaries and remembrances, and they all feel like people we knew: doting grandparents, devoted parents, ~~christened~~ [cherished] children, longtime neighbors [104]; I'm encouraged by all the ~~stories~~ [stores] that – that are – that are opening up.. [ibid.]; They arranged ~~canvases~~ [caravans] to bring food, water, and other supplies and commodities to communities [ibid.]*.

Another common group of mistakes inherent in Joe Biden's speech is confusion in names, surnames and positions. For example, during one of the recent speeches on Hamas's terrorist attacks against Israel (October 20, 2023), Biden said: *Look, at the same time, **President** [Prime Minister] Netanyahu and I discussed again yesterday the critical need for Israel to operate by the laws of war [98]*. However, this time Biden did not correct himself. Obviously, this could lead to some problems in relations with Israel, not to mention the fact that it undermines the image of Biden himself and alienates potential electorates and donors. Also, at a White House ceremony, in a speech dedicated to International Women's Day in

2021, Biden forgot the name of the Secretary of Defense, retired Army General Lloyd Austin, although he read his name from the teleprompter a few minutes ago: *So I want to thank you both. And I want to thank Sec- — the former general — I keep calling him “General.” My — **the guy who runs that outfit** over there [105].* In his remarks on the Safer America Plan Biden had a confusing situation with the surname of the chancellor of Germany: *Then we had a discussion with ~~Schmidt~~ [Scholz] and all of them — everything... [124].* Also repeatedly, Joe Biden makes the mistake of referring to his vice president, Kamala Harris, as “president.” For example, this slip of the tongue had place in his 2021 South Carolina State University commencement address: *But, all kidding aside, of course, [Vice] President Harris, who’s a proud Howard alum... [106].* Later that same year, 2021, in a speech on vaccination against Covid-19, and then in 2022, Biden makes the same mistake: *Now, when [Vice] President Harris and I took a virtual tour of a vaccination center in Arizona not long ago... [123].*

Joe Biden’s speech behavior also includes confusion in the names of countries and cities: *For example, in ~~Libya~~ [Syria], we should be opening up the passes to be able to go through... [118]; My deceased son Beau, who spent six months in Kosovo and a year in Iraq as a Navy captain and then major-- I mean, as an Army major. And, you know, I'm sure h – he had regrets comin' out of **Afganista** – I mean, out of **Iraq** [119].* During a speech in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, at the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) summit, the US President mistakenly referred to the Prime Minister of Colombia rather than Cambodia when trying to thank the summit organizers: *And I want to thank the Prime Minister of – for **Colombia’s** [Cambodia’s] leadership in the ASEAN – as ASEAN chair and for hosting all of us [107].* This is not the first time Biden has confused Cambodia and Colombia. Earlier in the week, speaking to reporters at the White House, the US President said: *Anyway, you guys, I'm heading down to first of all, going to Cairo for the environmental effort [COP27], then heading over to **Colombia** and then – I mean, **Cambodia**.*

Another noticeable group of mistakes inherent in Joe Biden's speech behavior is mistakes in numbers: *Earlier today, we announced a new America[s] Health Corps with ~~50,000~~ [500,000] public health and medical professionals being trained in the region over the next five years* [103]. In late October 2022, Biden made a mistake while campaigning for incumbent US Senator John Fetterman of Pennsylvania by saying there are 54 states in the US, not 50, when talking about the Affordable Care Act: *We went to **54** states* [108].

Among other things, it is worth noting that although Biden's speech generally fits into the traditional norms of American political discourse, this politician also sometimes resorts to an informal style of speech. It should be noted that recently there has been a growing tendency in the discourse of politicians to use colloquialisms. In this aspect, Joseph Biden's political speech is no exception.

Colloquialism in the Anglophone dictionary literature is interpreted as a word or phrase limited to use in informal communication [71]. According to many researchers, the turn of politicians to vocabulary is associated with a significant decrease in the role of strict regulation, which determined strict adherence to linguistic, genre, compositional, ethical and other norms.

Among the colloquialisms that Joe Biden uses in political speech, the following groups can be distinguished: lexical units used to designate persons and their qualitative characteristics; lexical intensifiers; phrasal verbs; reduction; exclamations.

The active penetration of colloquialisms of the first group into the political discourse of the American president demonstrates the repeated use of the vocative form of the noun in the plural *folks*, which, according to the Oxford Dictionary, is defined as follows: (especially in North American English) [plural] (informal) people in general [ibid.].

In the following example, in addition to the colloquialism *folks*, Joe Biden uses the lexical unit *guts* ([plural] (informal) the courage and strength of mind that it takes to do something difficult or unpleasant) [ibid.], to denote the masculinity and courage of Americans, which also serves as an indicator of the politician's transition

to more informal, intimate communication with the audience: *And think about it, folks. I think it's important – I know the American people have a lot of guts* [121]. The colloquillization of Joe Biden's language portrait is also evidenced by the use of the lexical unit *okay*, which is inherent in communication in everyday life: *But I want you to know that we are going to be okay* [ibid.].

In our opinion, the introduction of colloquial vocabulary into the political discourse by the US President is explained by his desire to eliminate the distance in communication with the ordinary citizen and an attempt to “be closer to the people.” Also, the politician sometimes resorts to swearing. Such precedents have a negative impact on the formation of the general image of Joe Biden in the eyes of the audience. For example, during an interview in January 2022, the US President insulted a reporter: *Q: Do you think inflation is a political liability? JB: No, it's a great asset – more inflation. What a stupid son of a bitch* [109]. Also in 2021, after a summit in Geneva, Switzerland, when asked by a journalist why Biden was “so confident” that Russian President Vladimir Putin would “change his behavior,” Biden responded rather sharply: *I'm not confident he'll change his behavior! What the hell? What do you do all of the time? When did I say I was confident?* [118].

It is important to note that our research identified cases where Joseph Biden uses lexemes that are understandable only to a narrow circle of politicians and specialists, for example: *He thought he'd [Putin] get the Finlandization of NATO. Instead, he got the NATOization of Finland — and Sweden* [94]. “*Finlandization*” a geopolitical concept that typically describes a situation where a smaller nation, such as Finland, adopts a policy of neutrality and accommodation towards a larger neighboring power, usually the Soviet Union during the Cold War era. This often involved the smaller nation refraining from actions that might provoke the larger power, such as joining military alliances hostile to it, in exchange for maintaining a degree of autonomy and independence in domestic affairs. So, when President Biden mentions “*the Finlandization of NATO*,” he means that Putin expected NATO to adopt a stance of neutrality or accommodation towards Russia, akin to the way Finland historically navigated its relationship with the Soviet Union.

Biden's speeches also contain newly coined words and expressions (*neologisms*) to enhance the emotional impact on the audience. He continues saying that instead of NATO taking on a passive stance, the situation turned out differently, as reflected in the phrase, "*he got the NATOization of Finland — and Sweden.*" "*NATOization*" appears to be a neologism. It is created by blending "NATO" with the suffix "-ization," which is commonly used to denote the process or action of making something like or conforming to a particular entity or organization. In the context of the passage "*NATOization*" refers to the process of bringing Finland and Sweden closer to NATO.

Also in Biden's speech on the third anniversary of the attack on the Capitol there is another neologism describing Trump's negative actions: *Now, in 2024, Trump in running as the "denier-in-chief" — the election denier-in-chief. Once again, he's saying he won't honor the results of the election if he loses* [92]. This refers to the fact that Trump refused to accept the results of the 2021 US elections. The neologism effectively conveys the intended meaning, which is to characterize Trump as someone who consistently denies the results of elections despite evidence to the contrary.

Overall, Biden's language reflects a nuanced approach aimed at engaging and mobilizing the public, underscoring his commitment to effective leadership and collective action in navigating complex political landscapes.

2.2 Grammatical aspect of the individual style

Grammar is a foundational pillar of language, indispensable for effective communication. A thorough understanding of grammatical rules is essential for proficient language use. Delving into the details of grammatical units provides a comprehensive insight into political discourse. Politicians use these units to construct their linguistic profile.

Of particular interest to linguists is the category of modality because of its versatility and different manifestations. Modal meanings and their expression are subjects of extensive study across various linguistic levels: syntactic, semantic, textual, and communicative-functional.

Modality is defined as a category encompassing speech acts or the level of certainty conveyed. Modality is often associated with speakers' attitudes and perspectives towards the propositions they articulate [73, p. 16].

Modality, a complex linguistic phenomenon, is subject to various classifications, although scholars commonly identify two principal types: epistemic (knowledge-related) modality and deontic (obligation-related) modality. Epistemic modality encompasses possibility, necessity, predictability, and ability. Modal verbs such as *must/have to*, *should/ought to*, *will/shall*, *would/should*, *may/might*, and *can/could/be able to* are frequently used to convey epistemic modality. On the other hand, deontic modality pertains to obligations, volition, and permissions in language. Modal verbs like *must/have to*, *will/shall*, and *may/can* are commonly used to express deontic modality [67].

The modal verbs *will*, *can* and *would* in the language portrait of Joe Biden express willingness and intention. The verb *will* is present mostly in speeches where Joe Biden outlines his political strategy, his future actions, actions of his administration and promises, especially while having been elected as President: *Before God and all of you I give you my word. I will always level with you. I will defend the Constitution. I will defend our democracy. I will defend America. I will give my all in your service thinking not of power, but of possibilities* [114]. In this example, *will* denotes a promise. The modal verb *will* indicates Joe Biden's strong determination and willingness to defend principles such as the Constitution, democracy, and the nation. Biden's resolve and reliability in fulfilling his duties and promises as a leader is reinforced.

The modal verb *will* in the negative form is used rarely and mainly in promises: *But there should be no doubt: Our support for Ukraine will not waver, NATO will not be divided, and we will not tire* [94]; *Mr. President, I will not walk*

away from Ukraine and neither will the American people; And Ukraine **will not** remain alone against such a critical terrorist as the Russian Federation [93]. The usage of *will not* in the examples highlights the speaker's firm commitments and assurances regarding future actions during the ongoing war in Ukraine. By using *will not* in the first example, Joe Biden makes a strong assertion that these entities will not experience wavering or division despite Putin's efforts to shatter them, while the rest of examples assure that Ukraine will not be left isolated in confronting the Russian Federation. This usage conveys solidarity and determination to stand alongside Ukraine in facing external threats.

The use of the verb of epistemic modality *can* expresses ability and possibility of Joe Biden and the United States: *But together — together, we **can** choose a different path. We can choose a better path* [97]; *For a fraction of the cost of gun violence, we **can** save lives, create safe and healthy communities...; I'm going to use all the resources at my disposal as President to keep the American people safe from gun violence. But there's much more that Congress **can** do to help that effort. And they **can** do it right now* [115].

Sometimes Joe Biden uses the verb *can* and the verb *will* in one sentence for emphasis: *We **can** and we **will** address prices by expanding productivity capacity in our economy so we move more goods to market, get more Americans working...* [99].

Also, the use of both epistemic and deontic modal verbs in neighboring sentences by Biden serves to emphasize different aspects of the statements: *We **can** do this. We **have to** do this. We just **need to** remember who we are. And when we are united, there is not a single thing we cannot do — not a single thing* [124]. The modal verb *can* is used to express epistemic modality, specifically the ability of both President and the people to accomplish the task. The modal verb *have to* is used to convey deontic modality, indicating obligation or necessity to perform the task. The modal verb *need to* is used to express deontic modality, suggesting necessity to remember one's identity. Biden effectively communicates both the potential and the imperative of the action, motivating his audience by highlighting both the capability

and the obligation to act. This combination helps to convey a sense of urgency and determination while also emphasizing the importance of taking action to address the situation at hand.

As it was observed, there is a noticeable trend of politicians avoiding the use of modal verbs in their negative form, such as *couldn't*, *mustn't*, and *shouldn't* etc. Joe Biden's speeches are no exception. This tendency may stem from the inherent negative connotations associated with these forms. Politicians aim to maintain a positive image and avoid creating perceptions of limitations or restrictions. Instead, they prioritize emphasizing what can, will, and must be achieved, rather than focusing on what cannot or should not be done. By accentuating possibilities and affirmatives, they seek to inspire confidence and convey a proactive approach to addressing challenges.

2.3. Stylistic peculiarities of Joe Biden's speeches

In today's dynamic and competitive political world, gaining and retention of power demands increasing effort from politicians. A compelling speech by a good speaker relies not only on assembling credible statements but also on structuring them logically and cohesively, employing an effective style. Politicians are aware of the importance of language and actively consider ways to reinforce their ideas through various rhetorical techniques. They use various stylistic devices to communicate their intentions to the audience. Some focus on propaganda, while others are purely aimed at persuasion and style.

In political discourse, the usage of linguistic rhetorical devices is highly recommended for conveying the speaker's pragmatic goals [68, p. 1]. R.A. Harris identifies a total of 60 rhetorical devices. Within rhetoric, stylistic means are categorized into stylistic figures and tropes, each serving to enhance the persuasive impact of political communication.

A figure of speech is defined as “an expression departing from the accepted literal sense or normal word order, often emphasizing patterns of sound” [35, p. 130]. This definition underscores the alterations in word order and meanings of language elements, which in turn create stylistic effects.

Essentially, this involves grammatical choices, such as collocation, repetition, or unconventional word order, while tropes pertain to vocabulary selection and the interpretation of polysemic units. Both categories contribute to the persuasiveness of political speech units [9, p. 53-54]. Persuasiveness, a key characteristic of text, encompasses strategies such as inculcation and manipulation aimed at influencing the audience.

It should be noted that *metaphor* is one of the key characteristics of political discourse, which is due to the fact that metaphor serves as an indicator of public opinion and mood through which certain social groups try to disseminate their political points of view [56, p. 38].

At the present stage of development of cognitive science, one of the promising academic directions is the theory of conceptual metaphor, within which the latter is interpreted as the emergence of a new meaning due to the transfer of a name from one object (class, type, variety of objects) to another to characterize or nominate the latter on the basis of similarity, analogy [9, c. 413].

The process of metaphorization occurs through the interaction of knowledge structures of two conceptual planes – the source sphere and the target sphere, and the source sphere is based on sensory experience and is concrete, in contrast to the abstract target sphere. The basis of a metaphor is not lexical meanings, but concepts or meaningful units formed in memory.

Joe Biden’s language portrait is characterized by the extensive use of metaphorical expressions, and we found that lexical metaphors slightly prevail in comparison with syntactic ones. In the speeches analysed, metaphors are used more when it comes to positive topics rather than negative ones. When discussing positive themes such as progress, unity, hope, and the future of America, metaphors are employed to paint a vivid picture of the future.

Joe Biden uses metaphoric expression demonstrating his negative attitude towards the former President Donald Trump whose supporters incited the insurrection on January 6th, 2021, at the United States Capitol. They stormed the Capitol building in an attempt to disrupt the certification of the Electoral College results, which would formalize Joe Biden's victory in the 2020 presidential election. Delivering a speech dedicated to marking one year since the January 6th, Biden stated: *Those who stormed this Capitol and those who instigated and incited and those who called on them to do so held a dagger at the throat of America – at American democracy* [92]. It is interesting that in his speech on the third anniversary of the attack, Joe Biden used the same metaphor: *This is the first national election since January 6th insurrection placed a dagger at the throat of American democracy — since that moment. We all know who Donald Trump is* [94]. In the examples above, Joe Biden represents US democracy as a human being whose throat his opponents are trying to hurt. The conceptual characteristic “parts of the body” of the conceptual field “physiology” is subject to metaphorical transfer to the conceptual field of “democracy”. The metaphor implies that the insurrection was a direct and imminent threat to the fundamental principles of American democracy.

In the same speech, Biden continues to talk about democracy, the level of which, in his opinion, is exemplary for the whole world: *I tell you from my experience working with leaders around the world — and I mean this sincerely, not a joke — that America is still viewed as the beacon of democracy for the world* [92]. The metaphor means that America serves as an inspiration and model for other countries striving to establish or maintain democratic systems of government. It suggests that America's commitment to democracy, including principles such as freedom, equality, justice, and the rule of law, sets a standard that others aspire to match.

Joe Biden used various vivid metaphorical expressions to characterize the political actions of Donald Trump: *The current president has cloaked America in darkness for much too long* [100]. To highlight the differences between him and his rival, Joe Biden used the following metaphor: *I will be an ally of the light not of the*

darkness [ibid.]. It should be noted that this expression has become quite popular; it can be found on the pages of many American publications, such as *Politico*, *Vanity Fair*, *People's World*, etc. Thus, Joe Biden created a strong association among the American people, after which he began to be called “light” and Trump “darkness.”

Further, President Biden is known to be a fierce opponent of dictatorial regimes, particularly Vladimir Putin's, so in many of his speeches he does not miss the opportunity to remind America and the whole world of the critical need to support Ukraine in its struggle for freedom and democratic values. In the following example, Biden makes his case by citing history that has already “seen” Russia's bloodthirsty wars: *Now, as I've said before, and I mean this in the literal sense: **History is watching. History is watching the House of Representatives. The failure to support Ukraine at this critical moment will never be forgotten*** [110]. In the expression history is watching, history is anthropomorphized, or given human-like qualities, specifically the ability to observe or witness events. The metaphor suggests that the actions taken now will be remembered and judged by future generations, similar to how a person's actions are observed and evaluated by others in real-time.

Recently, metaphors have been widespread in Joe Biden's political discourse, emphasizing the need to destroy the Russian economy with sanctions, hitting it at the very heart (the key organ of the human body) – the energy sector: *We've aimed at the heart of Russia's economy by stopping the imports of Russian energy to the United States* [122].

Another stylistic device that Joe Biden uses is *allusion*. On September 1, 2022, Biden spoke at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on the continued battle for the soul of the nation. Speaking about Independence Hall, Biden noted: *This is where we set in motion the most extraordinary experiment of self-government the world has ever known with three simple words: “We, the People.” “We, the People”* [97]. It is a well-known fact that “We, the People” is the opening phrase of the Preamble to the United States Constitution which was written and debated at that place. Biden uses the allusion to the Constitution to evoke the fundamental principles of American democracy and the values upon which the nation was founded.

Furthermore, by connecting the concept of “We, the People” to the American experiment that began more than two centuries ago, Biden highlights the enduring nature of democracy and the ongoing responsibility of citizens to uphold and protect it. Biden develops these ideas in the following statements: *We must never forget: **We, the people**, are the true heirs of the American experiment that began more than two centuries ago. **We, the people**, have...* [ibid.].

Moreover, there is another metaphor in the same passage: *We, the people, have burning inside each of us **the flame of liberty** that was lit here at Independence Hall — a **flame that lit** our way through abolition, the Civil War, Suffrage, the Great Depression, world wars, Civil Rights. That sacred **flame still burns** now in our time...* [ibid.]. By referring to the flame, Biden is invoking an image of a powerful, enduring force that has illuminated the nation's path through various challenges and struggles. The metaphor emphasizes the importance of preserving and nurturing these ideals as the country continues to evolve and face new challenges. It serves to inspire and rally support for the ongoing pursuit of justice, equality, and freedom for all Americans.

Joe Biden represents various images that fill the content of political speeches, in particular, countries and cities as human beings with different physical and psychological characteristics: *One year ago, the world was bracing for the **fall of Kyiv**. Well, I have just come from a visit to Kyiv, and I can report: **Kyiv stands strong! Kyiv stands proud. It stands tall. And most important, it stands free*** [94]. All these expressions are examples of metonymy suggesting people living in Kyiv possess strength. The expression *Kyiv stands strong* describes Kyiv as being resilient and unyielding, suggesting that people of the city have withstood challenges or threats.

The second largest group includes the stylistic device that is based on repetition of linguistic units – *syntactic parallelism*. Syntactic parallelism refers to the repetition of similar syntactic structures in a sentence or passage. It involves maintaining a consistent grammatical structure across multiple phrases, clauses, or sentences. In one of the most common pattern of syntactic parallelism used to

motivate audience, the verb “let is followed by the infinitive without the particle “to and is addressed to third person plural: ...*let us now have that faith again. Let us resolve to put the strength of democracies into action to thwart the designs of autocracy. Let us remember that the test of this moment is the test of all time* [111]. By beginning each sentence with *Let us*, the speaker or writer includes themselves in the action, creating a sense of unity and shared purpose with the audience. It encourages the audience to join together in taking specific actions, such as having faith, resolving to act, or remembering the significance of the moment. The use of syntactic parallelism adds rhythm and emphasis to the sentences, making them more memorable and persuasive.

Parallel constructions can also be used to present or explain information:

Repeatedly, he asserted, “We have no interest in war.” Guaranteed he would not move.

Repeatedly saying he would not invade Ukraine.

Repeatedly saying Russian troops along the border were there for “training” — all 180,000 of them [ibid.].

It is obvious that syntactic parallelism is a powerful rhetorical device that helped Biden to emphasize key points and create a sense of rhythm to highlight the repetition of Putin’s lies and deceptive statements regarding the situation in Ukraine. The consistent structure draws attention to the repeated actions and statements made by Putin, reinforcing the idea that these are deliberate and intentional falsehoods rather than isolated incidents.

To have a clearer understanding of how Biden uses syntactic parallelism to emphasize certain ideas, it is necessary to pay attention to one more example: *I’ve not met a cop who likes a bad cop. There’s bad in everything. There is lousy senators. There is lousy presidents. There is lousy doctors. There is lousy lawyers. No, I’m serious. But I don’t know any police officer that feels good about the fact that there may be a lousy cop* [124]. The repeated structure *There is lousy* followed by different nouns maintains consistency and balance in the sentence, enhancing its rhythmic flow. This repetition serves to emphasize the speaker’s point

about the presence of incompetence or inadequacy across various professions, which is completely unacceptable and can be life-threatening when it comes to the work of a police officer.

The next stylistic figure often found in Biden's speeches is *anaphora*. Anaphora is a rhetorical device where a word or phrase is repeated at the beginning of successive clauses or sentences, thereby lending them emphasis: ***Democracy means having the freedom to speak your mind, to be who you are, to be who you want to be. Democracy is about being able to bring about peaceful change. Democracy is how we've opened the doors of opportunity...*** [92]. The repetition of *Democracy* at the beginning of each sentence serves to emphasize the importance of democracy and to highlight different aspects of it.

The third biggest group of rhetoric devices used by Joe Biden is rhetorical questions. Rhetorical questions are used for persuasive or dramatic effect rather than to elicit a direct response. In the following example, President Biden is expressing strong disapproval at the actions of former President Trump, particularly his alleged derogatory remarks about fallen soldiers: *This coming from a president who called — when he visited a cemetery, called dead soldiers “suckers” and “losers.” Remember that? How dare he? Who in God’s name does he think he is?* [ibid.]. By framing these statements as rhetorical questions, Biden emphasizes the outrage and incredulity he feels toward Trump’s behavior. It reinforces Biden's condemnation of it and invites the audience to reflect on the egregiousness of Trump’s actions.

Biden poses rhetorical questions in the following passage to engage the audience and prompt them to reflect on the challenges faced by Europe, America, NATO, and democracies in general: *All democracies were being tested. And the questions we faced were as simple as they were profound. Would we respond or would we look the other way? Would we be strong or would we be weak?... Would we be — all of our allies — would be united or divided? One year later, we know the answer. We did respond. We would be strong. We would be united. And the world would not look the other way* [94]. By posing these questions, he creates a sense of

urgency and emphasizes the significance of the choices made in response to those challenges. An interesting feature of Biden's speeches is that he often answers rhetorical questions himself, as we can see in this example. By doing so, he reinforces his message with clarity and conviction. This technique allows him to guide the audience toward the conclusions he wants to convey, emphasizing the positive outcomes of responding decisively and unitedly to the challenges faced by democracies. It also reinforces Biden's leadership role by presenting himself as someone who understands the situation and has the determination to address it effectively.

During the analysing of Joe Biden's speeches, examples of the use of such a stylistic device as *epizeuxis* were also found. Epizeuxis, or palilogia, serves as a powerful rhetorical tool, involving the repetition of a word or phrase in immediate succession within the same sentence [75, p. 82]. Its purpose is to instill vehemence and emphasis, aiming to evoke strong emotional responses from the audience: *Trump lost **recount** after **recount** after **recount** in state after state* [92]. The repetition of *recount* emphasizes the frequency and persistence of the recounts that former President Trump lost in multiple states. It adds emphasis to the point being made about the outcome of the recounts.

Also, wordplay can be found in Biden's speeches. For example, in the following statement one can observe a stylistic device called *paronomasia*, also known as a *pun*. Paronomasia involves the clever use of words that sound similar but have different meanings, often for rhetorical effect or to create wordplay: *We're seeing again today what the people of Poland and the people all across Europe saw for decades: Appetites of the autocrat cannot be **appeased**. They must be **opposed*** [94]. By juxtaposing the words *appeased* and *opposed*, which sound similar but have opposite meanings, the statement creates a clever play on words. This wordplay draws attention to the contrasting actions that are being suggested: while *appeased* implies giving in to the autocrat's desires or demands, *opposed* suggests resistance or defiance against those desires or demands. The deliberate use of paronomasia in this context adds emphasis to the idea that simply trying to satisfy the autocrat's

desires will not work; instead, active opposition is necessary. It helps to convey the message in a memorable and impactful way, making it more likely to resonate with the audience. In addition, the word *appetites* sounds similar to *appeased* and *opposed*. This adds another layer of wordplay and coherence to the statement because repetition of similar sounds strengthens the rhetorical impact of the message and makes it more memorable to the audience.

Biden uses paronomasia when talking about the sanctions that are being imposed on Russian oligarchs and companies and the consequences of such economic actions on the Russian national currency: *As a result of these unprecedented sanctions, the **ruble** almost is immediately reduced to **rubble**... It takes about 200 rubles to equal one dollar* [98]. The words *ruble* and *rubble* are homophones. *Ruble* refers to the currency of Russia, while *rubble* refers to broken fragments of rock, brick, or other material. Paronomasia helped to create a stinging and memorable message. By emphasizing the ruble's dramatic decline in value, Biden illustrates the severe economic impact of the sanctions on Russia.

Further, Biden often uses such a stylistic device as *asyndeton*. Asyndeton is a rhetorical device where conjunctions (such as “and” or “but”) are intentionally omitted between words, phrases, or clauses in a sentence. This omission creates a concise and impactful effect, emphasizing each point or idea. In his speech on fighting the Covid-19 pandemic, Biden said: *If you're seeking care at a health facility, you should be able to know that the people treating you are vaccinated. Simple. Straightforward. Period* [95]. In this case, the use of asyndeton in the one-word sentences adds emphasis and force to each statement, making them stand out and reinforcing the speaker's message. Biden took a strong stance on the importance of vaccination in healthcare settings for the safety and well-being of both patients and healthcare workers.

In Joe Biden's inauguration speech, asyndeton was used to highlight all the problems and vices that the newly elected president was going to fight. By presenting these issues in a concise and uninterrupted manner, Biden emphasizes the urgent need for unity and collective action in confronting these shared challenges, inviting

every American to join him in this cause: *I ask every American to join me in this cause. Uniting to fight the common foes we face:*

Anger, resentment, hatred.

Extremism, lawlessness, violence.

Disease, joblessness, hopelessness [114].

Cases of the use of *antithesis* were also identified. Antithesis involves the juxtaposition of contrasting ideas, usually in parallel structure, to highlight their differences and create emphasis. Speaking about the war waged by the criminal regime of Vladimir Putin, Biden said: *President Putin — President Putin is confronted with something today that he didn't think was possible a year ago. The democracies of the world have grown **stronger, not weaker**. But the autocrats of the world have grown **weaker, not stronger*** [94]. In this statement, the contrast between *stronger* and *weaker* emphasizes the shift in power dynamics between democracies and autocracies, with the former gaining strength and the latter losing it. Indeed, this use of antithesis adds depth and impact to the Biden's argument, making it more persuasive and compelling to the audience.

On the one-year anniversary of the Capitol attack, Biden used the antithesis to condemn the actions of the insurrectionists: *This wasn't a group of tourists. This was an armed insurrection. They weren't looking to uphold the will of the people. They were looking to deny the will of the people. They were looking to uphold — they weren't looking to uphold a free and fair election. They were looking to overturn one. They weren't looking to save the cause of America. They were looking to subvert the Constitution* [ibid.]. Antithesis is used to juxtapose opposing concepts: *uphold the will* versus *deny the will*, *uphold a free and fair election* versus *overturn one*, and *save the cause of America* versus *subvert the Constitution*. In Biden's speech, it clarifies the egregious nature of the Capitol attack and underscores the threat it posed to democratic norms. The statements appeal to the audience's sense of reason and morality, aiming to sway opinions and strengthen support for upholding democratic institutions.

Besides, we pay attention to the fact that Joseph Biden's speeches possess many occasions of *alliteration*. Alliteration is a literary device where the same consonant sound is repeated at the beginning of neighboring or closely connected words. Giving a response to Hamas's terrorist attacks against Israel, Biden used this stylistic device: *I met with Israelis who had personally lived through **h**orrific **h**orror of the attack by Hamas on the 7th of October* [98]. The repetition of the "h" sound in *horrific* and *horror* creates a rhythmic and memorable effect, drawing attention to the intensity and severity of the described experience. The use of alliteration here serves to emphasize the emotional impact of the horror experienced by the Israelis mentioned in the statement.

In the following example, Biden again uses alliteration in enumeration of concepts when talking about the Ukrainian people's struggle for freedom: *That was the dream of those who declared Ukraine's independence more than 30 years ago... and those who continue still to root out Kremlin's efforts to **c**orrupt, **c**oerce, and **c**ontrol* [94]. The repetition of the "c" sound creates a rhythmic and memorable effect. The use of alliteration here serves to emphasize the actions being described—efforts by the Kremlin to influence Ukraine through corrupt practices, coercion, and control. By employing alliteration, the speaker draws attention to these actions, highlighting their significance and reinforcing the message of resistance against them.

Biden sometimes even resorts to combination of alliteration with *assonance* (the repetition of vowel sounds within nearby words) in the enumeration of concepts, and it also clearly proves that these stylistic devices enhance the effectiveness of the message: *Together, we can keep proving that America is still a country that believes in **d**ecency, **d**ignity, **h**onesty, **h**onor...* [92].

Another illustrative example of how alliteration makes a message memorable is the following statement, taken from Biden's speech on the Safer America Plan: *This will help **p**revent crime and get young **p**eople to **p**ick up **p**aychecks instead of a **p**istol* [124]. Alliteration contributes to the imagery and tone of the sentence: the repeated "p" sound evokes images of positive actions (picking up paychecks)

contrasted with negative ones (using a pistol for violence), reinforcing the message of the sentence.

In conclusion, the analysis of Joe Biden's political discourse reveals a rich array of rhetorical devices employed to convey his messages effectively. From metaphorical expressions to syntactic parallelism, anaphora to antithesis, Biden's speeches are characterized by their eloquence, persuasion, and ability to inspire action. Whether condemning acts of insurrection, advocating for democracy, or addressing international conflicts, the speeches reveal rhetorical prowess that leaves a lasting impression on the audience and shapes the narrative of presidency.

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 2

At the lexical level, the language portrait of Joe Biden is characterized by the extensive use of socio-political, economic, military, medical and legal terms. By employing specialized terminology from various fields, Joe Biden ensures the effectiveness of communication and seeks to demonstrate his understanding of key issues and his ability to address them effectively.

The political narrative of the US President contains a number of evaluative lexical units with positive and negative connotations. The politician's assessment of the objective world is shaped by their subjective perspective and the value they attribute to the objects under consideration. The lexical units with positive connotation prevail which indicates Joe Biden's desire to create a positive image of himself.

There is a common tendency in Biden's political discourse to use clichés that reflect the general linguistic picture. Also, Joe Biden occasionally uses colloquialisms, which helps create an informal, friendly atmosphere.

In this study, the grammatical aspect of the politician's language profile is analyzed through the lens of modality. The employment of modal verbs allows Joe Biden to communicate willingness, capability and commitment. Notably, modal verbs are predominantly used in their positive forms to maintain positive image.

Metaphor stands out as a highly influential stylistic device in Joe Biden's political communication, primarily employed for the purposes of labeling and assessing individuals, nations, or events either positively or negatively. Furthermore, Biden uses other stylistic techniques such as rhetorical questions, syntactic parallelism, and anaphora to enhance the expressiveness of his speeches and to ensure the retention of key information by the audience. Also, Biden uses paronomasia, epizeuxis, asyndeton, antithesis and alliteration to bolster persuasive efforts.

3. REALIZATION OF COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES IN THE SPEECHES OF JOE BIDEN

3.1. Communicative strategies and tactics in political discourse

Within any society, political culture fulfills a multitude of essential social functions, including the expression and realization of social interests, educational endeavors, normative guidance, and fostering integration. Language, whether spoken or written, serves as the primary medium through which political activity is conveyed. Moreover, language itself perpetuates structures of dominance and resistance, reflecting power imbalances and opportunities for empowerment.

The behavior of individuals and the actions of various organizations, along with societal perceptions of both domestic and international political phenomena, are profoundly shaped by political influences, whether overtly or covertly. This pervasive impact underscores the intricate interplay between politics and the broader fabric of society, illustrating the multifaceted ways in which political culture permeates various aspects of human interaction and societal dynamics.

The study of linguistic influence traces its origins to the era of ancient Greek rhetoric. While the study of oratory in this period did involve aspects of linguistic persuasion on the audience, its scope extended beyond mere rhetoric. However, in the latter half of the 20th century, there was a resurgence of interest in the realm of effective communication, which influenced the development of pragmatic theories of speech, overarching communication theories, and linguistic theories of argumentation. The imperative for such inquiries is driven by the globalized nature of our world, the expansion of public communication domains, and the evolving conception of the individual within society.

Some scholars argue that the primary goal of persuasion is to change the opinions of others. To effectively persuade, the speaker must possess a deep understanding of the group's needs, beliefs, and desires in order for the persuasive effort to be impactful. Additionally, persuasion entails shifting individuals' mental states, often as a precursor to inducing behavioral changes. It is viewed as a process

aimed at influencing a person's behavior, which may involve altering the valence (positive or negative) of their evaluation or adjusting the extremity of their attitude, such as shifting from a highly negative viewpoint to a mildly negative one [50, p. 32].

According to H. Vusyk and O. Antoniuk, linguistic influence involves crafting a message that resonates with both rational thought and emotional response, while also stimulating the imagination [5, p. 8]. In this view, language emerges as a potent instrument for conveying ideas and exerting influence over an audience, particularly when employed subtly and implicitly.

Linguistic mechanisms of influence encompass both communicative strategies and communicative tactics. A communicative strategy involves a cognitive process wherein the speaker evaluates their communicative objective in relation to specific linguistic expressions, operating at a global level of awareness. On the other hand, communicative tactics refer to the specific speech actions employed to achieve influence at various stages of strategic interaction [15, p. 176].

T. van Dijk emphasize the dynamic nature of communicative strategy, highlighting its adaptability to different situational contexts and local constraints. They underscore the importance of considering both the broader situational factors and the specific contextual limitations that shape the direction and organization of influence within communication. This recognition of flexibility underscores the nuanced interplay between strategy, context, and the overarching goal of communication [86, p. 274].

A strategy within communication comprises a series of deliberate actions aimed at achieving the intended goals of the communicators. It is characterized by the necessity to make choices based on the unique features of the communicative situation, particularly the unpredictability of the partner's reaction, their communicative behavior, and subsequent actions. Moreover, the direction in which the dialogue progresses after the listener's response is often uncertain [32, p. 2]. Given this uncertainty, politicians must exhibit a high degree of adaptability to effectively navigate various communicative situations. This entails the ability to

modify strategies and make informed decisions regarding the implementation of alternative communicative tactics. The capacity for flexibility and adept decision-making is crucial for politicians to maintain effectiveness in their communication efforts amidst evolving circumstances.

Communicative tactics encompass a collection of practical ways employed to actualize communicative intentions during the course of real-time communication [20, p. 19]. In essence, tactics represent specific communicative moves or actions undertaken within a given communicative context. This distinction between tactics and strategy lies in their respective scopes: tactics consist of discrete communicative stages, whereas communicative strategy pertains to the overarching direction or intention guiding language behavior. Thus, while tactics focus on the immediate actions within a communicative situation, strategy concerns the broader orientation or purpose behind these actions.

Within the realm of communicative strategies, scholars have proposed various classifications, yet there is a consensus on three primary strategies that encapsulate the major social processes driving communication actions. These include presentation (or self-presentation), manipulation, and convention. Each of these strategies is facilitated through distinct means: notice, message, and dialogue, respectively [65, p. 1].

In the domain of political discourse, O. V. Yashenkova delves into the intricacies of language communication and identifies a range of fundamental strategies. These encompass self-presentation, agitation, emotional control, information interpretation, argumentative manipulation, discredit, attack, self-defense, and more [34, p. 168].

The classification of communicative strategies and tactics proposed by C. Coons and M. Weber stands out as one of the most comprehensive. Within oral political discourse, they define various communicative strategies and tactics, providing a thorough framework for analysis:

1. *Strategy of self-presentation* (aimed at shaping the political image), encompasses the following tactics:
 - identification tactics, which involve presenting oneself as belonging to a specific political or social group;
 - solidarity tactics, wherein the speaker seeks to convey shared views and beliefs with the audience;
 - opposition tactics, employing rhetoric that distinguishes between "us" and "others."
2. *Strategies aimed at fighting for power* include:
 - a) *the strategy of discredit and attack*:
 - insult and prosecution tactics, aimed at undermining the credibility or character of opponents, accusation or denunciation of adversaries;
 - b) *the manipulative strategy* (the aim is to dishonestly persuade the audience to adopt the speaker's viewpoint):
 - demagogic tricks (grandiose statements and empty promises);
 - manipulative tactics (employing intensified politeness or exaggeration to sway the audience's opinion).
 - c) *self-defense strategy*:
 - justification tactics (explanation of the speaker's decisions);
 - criticism tactics (addressing and responding to critiques or objections);
 - impingement tactics (counteracting attacks or accusations).
3. *Strategy for maintaining power*:
 - a) *information-interpretation strategy* (providing information about significant political or socio-economic events):
 - problem acknowledgment tactics;
 - clarification tactics (offering further explanations or details);
 - commentary tactics (providing analysis);
 - perspective-changing tactics (presenting the problem from a different angle);
 - problem-solving tactics.

b) *emotional mood formation strategy*:

- unity tactics (promoting the idea of “one nation” among citizens or a common national identity);
- tactics of emotional appeal (evoking emotional responses);
- tactics of addressing moral and spiritual values.

4. *Persuasion strategies* include:

a) *argumentative strategy*:

- argumentative evaluation tactics (providing objective assessments of situations);
- contrastive analysis tactics (comparing facts or events);
- future-oriented tactics (predicting future developments or expressing strategic goals);
- illustration tactics (supporting arguments with factual examples).

b) *propaganda strategy*:

- promise tactics (making pledges or commitments to the audience) [40, p. 36].

Political discourse provides a rich array of examples illustrating the usage of communicative strategies and tactics, making it a focal point in current research endeavors.

3.2. Strategy of image creation

Among the strategies that best characterize the politician’s speech behavior is the strategy of self-presentation. In political speeches, specific ideas are shared and various concepts and events are portrayed. Politicians use some tactics to present these ideas in either a favorable or unfavorable light. As a result, ordinary people can be influenced, leading to the formation of positive or negative perceptions in their minds.

Analysis of illustrative material containing political speeches by Joe Biden confirms the assumption of scholar O. Yashenkova regarding the dominance of the *self-presentation strategy* in the discursive space of the American president, while the most common tactic that implements this strategy is the *tactic of an explicit positive assessment of one's work*, which is implemented by vocabulary with positive semantics (in particular, glittering generalities) to provoke recipients' positive attitude, as demonstrated by the following example: *And I'm proud to announce that tomorrow, 58 days into our administration, we will have met my goal of administering 100 million shots to our fellow Americans* [123].

In addition, a positive assessment of one's work is achieved by using numerals. Thus, in the following example, a comparison of statistical data demonstrates the scale of work done to develop a vaccine against coronavirus and vaccinate the population: *Just three weeks ago, the weekly delivery was 8.6 million doses. Today, we announced that we're increasing the weekly vaccine doses going to states, tribes, and territories to 11 million* [100].

It is a well-known fact that tackling the COVID-19 problem was crucial for Biden as it aligned with his administration's priorities of protecting public health, promoting economic recovery, restoring trust in government, and demonstrating compassionate leadership in the face of a humanitarian crisis. In the speech dedicated to the incredible pace of vaccination, the presentation of clear figures and facts convinced many of the effectiveness of the presidential administration: *So here is where we are today: Eight weeks ago, only 8 percent of seniors, those most vulnerable to COVID-19, had received a vaccination. Today, 65 percent of people aged 65 or older have received at least one shot, and 36 percent are fully vaccinated. And that's key — because this is a population that represents 80 percent of the well over 500,000 COVID-19 deaths that have occurred in America* [123]. More than that, by providing specific data on vaccination progress, Biden demonstrates transparency and accountability in his administration's handling of the COVID-19 pandemic. This fosters trust among the public, showing that the government is open about its actions and their outcomes.

The tactic of explicit positive assessment is also realized by the grammatical means of the language. Using the Present Perfect tense form allows to focus on the results of the work done: *We've aimed at the heart of Russia's economy by stopping the imports of Russian energy to the United States. To date, the United States has sanctioned 140 Russian oligarchs and their family members... We've sanctioned more than 400 Russian government officials...* [111].

Further, the self-presentation strategy is realized through the tactic of identification. For example: *We're not perfect. But at our best, we face on — we face head on the good, the bad, the truth of who we are. We look in the mirror and ultimately never pretend we're something we're not. That's what great nations do. And we're a great nation. We're the greatest nation on the face of the Earth. We really are...* [92].

This tactic is also called the tactic of solidarity. By using the inclusive pronouns *we/our* as well as lexical units *people, together, democracy, unity*, etc., Biden identifies himself with the country and its people, creating a sense of unity and shared identity and establishing a personal connection with the audience by presenting himself as one of them [77, p. 182]. By asserting that *we're a great nation and the greatest nation on the face of the Earth*, Biden seeks to inspire pride and confidence in the audience, implying that these feelings will be in the heart of every American if Joe Biden holds the presidency.

The following discourse fragment illustrates Joseph Biden's identification with the government doing everything possible to warn the world about the threat of war looming over Ukraine in 2022: *I know not all of you believed me and us when we kept saying, "They are going to cross the border. They are going to attack* [111]. Biden identifies himself with the government to emphasize his personal involvement and commitment to the actions taken by the government. By using the pronoun "us," Biden emphasizes that the warning was a collective effort by the government, suggesting solidarity and unity in the messaging. This can help bolster trust and credibility in his actions as well as the action of the government.

In another example, a statement from Joe Biden's speech on the united efforts of the free world to support the people of Ukraine given on March, 26 in Warsaw, Biden positions himself as one with all the democratic forces of the world, expressing his hope for the triumph of light, freedom and opportunity in the future: *My message to the people of Ukraine is the message I delivered today to Ukraine's Foreign Minister and Defense Minister, who I believe are here tonight: **We stand with you. Period*** [ibid.].

Another tactic frequently used in Joe Biden's speeches is known as *tactic of reference to authority*. This tactic involves presenting the opinions of people in positions of influence to create a manipulative effect [37, p. 29]. On March 18, 2021, Biden dedicated one of his speeches to reaching 100 million vaccinated Americans. He noted that many doubted that he would succeed: *When I announced in early December that I had goal that I set of administering 100 million shots for the virus in the first 100 days of our office — 100 million shots in 100 days — it was considered **ambitious**. Some even suggested it was somewhat **audacious**. **Experts** said that it was a — the **plan was**, quote, **“definitely aggressive,”** and **distribution would have to be “seamless” for us to be successful**. One headline simply put it, quote: **“It won't be easy.”** End of quote. Well, it wasn't [123].* By highlighting the initial skepticism from various experts regarding his ambitious goal of administering 100 million shots within the first 100 days of his presidency, Biden showcased his determination and leadership. This colossal success in surpassing expectations reassured the audience and inspired confidence in Biden's administration's ability to address pressing issues effectively.

Delivering a speech in Uvalde, Joe Biden noted that he is a supporter of restricting of gun permits because bearing weapons requires training. To give his words weight, he appeals to the authority of a respected legal figure. He quotes an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States: *And I support the Second Amendment. But the Second Amendment, as one of the most — **one of the most conservative justices in history, Justice Scalia, once wrote, “Like...”** — quote, **“Like most rights, the rights granted by the Second Amendment are not***

unlimited.” *They’re not unlimited. Right now, you can’t go on and buy an automatic weapon. You can’t go out and buy a cannon* [124]. It is important to note that according to the Second Amendment “the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed” [78]. However, the statement by Justice Scalia reinforces Biden’s position by providing authoritative support for the idea that Second Amendment rights are not unlimited. The use of the quotation emphasizes that even staunch defenders of gun rights recognize that reasonable restrictions, such as training requirements for gun permits, are consistent with the Constitution.

Also, we would like to spotlight that quite often Joseph Biden draws on his personal experience, for example, he sometimes mentions his parents, his departed son Beau, and his family in general in order to demonstrate that he is well aware of the problems of ordinary people: *But look, when I ran for President, I said I looked at the world the way I looked at it growing up in Scranton, and that wasn’t hyperbole. I meant that... when I was growing up — and my mom and dad and my granddad — was as basic, basic, basic as it is today: a decent job, the opportunity to be treated with dignity...* [124]. Biden uses personal information, such as mentioning his parents’ basic lives, his upbringing in Scranton to establish a personal connection with the audience and to demonstrate empathy and relatability. By sharing his personal experience, Biden implies that he is determined to frame his policies and priorities in a way that resonates with the everyday experiences of individuals, emphasizing themes such as economic opportunity, dignity, and family values.

In one of his speeches Joe Biden shared a personal story about his late son Beau to illustrate that other members of his family are ordinary people who live among and who are committed to public service: *...my deceased son, Beau, he was the Attorney General of the State of Delaware. And what he used to do is go down, in the east side, the — called the “Bucket” — highest crime rate in the country... And he’d go down and hang out and sit on a bench with my — my grandson... And the police used to be in the car — the local city police. And he’d walk up and bang on the window and say, “Get out of the car, damn it, and meet these people. Let them see you. Let them know you. Let them know who you are”* [115]. Sharing this

story serves multiple purposes. Firstly, it honors Beau's memory and legacy, showcasing his determination and compassion for others. This shows that Joe Biden is a responsible father who was able to instill in his children the traits and skills that are essential to effectively serve their country: empathy, community engagement, and effective leadership in addressing challenges faced by communities. We also understand that Biden is as a father who deeply cares about his family.

It should be mentioned that the current president of the USA frequently resorts to the tactic of opposition which relies on highlighting the contrast between "us" and "them." Employing manipulative tactics of inclusiveness and distancing speakers make something or someone seem either positive or negative. Through manipulation of pronouns, particularly "we" and "they," speakers can effortlessly achieve maximum effect [48, p. 838]. For example, during one of his campaign speeches, Joe Biden puts himself in a favorable light by emphasizing that while he was engaged in matters of national importance, his main opponent, Donald Trump, met with the pro-Russian president of Hungary: *While I was down in Georgia working on healthcare and making sure that we had the support of all the minority organizations in the country that we support so strongly, he was with Viktor Orbán, who talked about democracy being a problem, and telling him how much he understood him and agreed with him. Come on* [112]. Biden clearly highlights the contrast between "us" (Joe Biden and his supporters) and "them" (Donald Trump and his allies). The speaker describes his activities in Georgia, focusing on working on healthcare and garnering support from minority organizations, which are presented as positive endeavors. In contrast, Trump's actions are depicted negatively. By associating Trump with Orbán, who is portrayed as anti-democratic, Biden distances Trump from himself and the audience. Biden implies that Trump's actions are detrimental to democracy and the values Biden and his supporters uphold.

In January 2024, Biden delivered a speech marking the third anniversary of the January 6th attack. He highlighted the differences between his campaign and Trump's: *Whether democracy is still America's sacred cause is the most urgent*

question of our time, and it's what the 2024 election is all about. The choice is clear. Donald Trump's campaign is about **him, not America, not you**. Donald Trump's campaign is obsessed with **the past, not the future**. He's willing to **sacrifice our democracy, put himself in power**. **Our campaign is different**. **For me and Kamala, our campaign is about America**. It's about you. It's about every age and background that occupy this country [92]. By framing Trump's campaign as being about *him*, Biden implies that Trump is self-centered and not focused on the concerns of the American people. Biden contrasts Trump's campaign as being *obsessed with the past* while positioning his own campaign as focused on the future. This creates a dichotomy where Trump is associated with backward-looking attitudes while Biden presents himself as forward-thinking and progressive. Further, Biden accuses Trump of *being willing to sacrifice our democracy* for his own gain, while positioning his own campaign as dedicated to protecting and upholding democracy.

3.3. Strategy of persuasion

The strategy of persuasion involves employing various techniques to influence someone's actions or decisions through convincing arguments or appealing to their beliefs, emotions, or interests. The process of persuasion entails exerting pressure or influence on the individual, often by presenting information or arguments in a compelling manner. While persuasion aims to persuade individuals to act in a certain way, it should be distinguished from manipulation, which involves deceptive or coercive tactics to control or exploit others [76, p. 415]. Within the framework of persuasion, various tactics may be used to effectively convey messages or influence behavior, in particular: tactic of argumentative evaluations, tactic of pointing to the future (predicting the development of events, the expression of strategic goals, etc.), promise tactic and call to action tactic.

Tactic of argumentative evaluations involve presenting compelling arguments and evidence to support a particular viewpoint or position. These tactics aim to

persuade others by appealing to their reasoning and logic, rather than relying solely on emotional appeals. In the remarks on the United States' response to Hamas's terrorist attacks and Russia's ongoing war against Ukraine, Joe Biden presents persuasive arguments for providing military assistance to Ukraine: *All Ukraine is asking for is help — for the weapons, munitions, the capacity, the capability to push invading Russian forces off their land... And let me be clear about something: we send Ukraine equipment sitting in our stockpiles. And when we use the money allocated by Congress, we use it to replenish our own stores — our own stockpiles with new equipment that defends America and is made in America: Patriot missiles for air defense batteries made in Arizona; artillery shells manufactured in 12 states across the country — in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas; and so much more* [98]. The passage is based on logical reasoning by emphasizing the importance of providing military aid to Ukraine for the defense of their land and cities. It argues that by helping Ukraine defend itself, the United States is also enhancing its own defense capabilities, since America supplies Ukraine with weapons that are no longer the most modern in the world, replacing them with weapons manufactured using the latest technologies. Moreover, Biden provides specific examples of the types of military equipment that the United States manufacture to effectively defend itself, such as Patriot missiles and artillery shells. By listing these examples, the speaker aims to demonstrate the feasibility and effectiveness of providing such assistance as well as make Americans proud of their country's defense capabilities.

The shooting at a school in Uvalde, where more than 20 people were killed, reminded American society of one of the most scandalous and controversial topics – a permit to carry weapons. Speaking about the terrible consequences of the shooting, Biden noted that the country's service members undergo multi-level training and testing before they are receiving weapons: *We equip our service members with the most lethal weapons on Earth to protect all of us, protect Americans. But we require them to receive significant training, extensive background checks, mental health assessments. They have to learn how to lock up and store their weapons responsibly or they get kicked out* [124]. Biden's point

is that only a person who is physically and mentally prepared can carry a weapon. The speaker supports his argument by highlighting the rigorous training, background checks, and mental health assessments that service members undergo before being equipped with lethal weapons. This information is presented to demonstrate the responsibility and accountability that accompanies the possession of such weapons.

It is important to note that in the next passage Biden uses the tactic of contrastive analysis that involves analysis and comparison of facts, events, results. This tactic is used to emphasize the superiority or desirability of one option over another by demonstrating the advantages or disadvantages of each. After Biden described the process of training of service members to receive weapons, he stated: *That's why, back in 1994, I took on the NRA and passed the assault weapons ban. For 10 years, mass shootings were down — 10 years in a row since I passed that legislation in 1994 as a senator. But in 2004, Republicans let that ban expire. And what happened? Mass shootings in America tripled. Tripled* [ibid.]. In this passage, President Biden contrasts two sets of events to emphasize the effectiveness of implementing an assault weapons ban. During the period when the assault weapons ban was in effect there was a decline in mass shootings. Biden contrasts this with the subsequent increase in mass shootings, stating that after the ban expired, mass shootings in America tripled. The tactic of contrastive analysis underscores the advantages of reinstating such a ban by highlighting the consequences of allowing it to expire.

The next tactic that is quite common in Biden's political communications is tactic of pointing to the future. The tactic of pointing to the future in political discourse involves predicting the development of events and emphasizing future goals, aspirations, or policy outcomes to rally support or persuade the audience. Politicians often use this tactic to inspire hope, instill confidence, and garner support for their vision or agenda. In one of his speeches, Biden says that after the collapse of the Soviet Union, some post-Soviet republics received long-awaited independence and freedom, but the US President emphasized that the struggle of other countries continues: *But we emerged anew in the great battle for freedom: a*

battle between democracy and autocracy, between liberty and repression... This battle will not be won in days or months either. We need to steel ourselves for the long fight ahead [98]. Biden emphasizes the importance of preparing for a long fight ahead in the battle for freedom. This indicates his focus on future goals and aspirations, urging the audience to remain vigilant and committed to the cause.

As part of the election campaign, Biden gave a speech on March 13, 2024 in Milwaukee. He used the manipulative device of predicting the future to convince the audience that America's future is uncertain unless they make the right choices today: *And, by the way, history is watching. History is watching. This young man is going to be reading about what we do and don't do. Now, I don't mean me personally — what we do as a generation now* [113]. The use of future tense and the idea of being judged by future generations creates a sense of urgency and responsibility. This tactic leverages the fear of negative judgment from future generations as a means of influencing current behavior and decision-making. By framing the future as uncertain unless the right choices are made today, Biden is appealing to the audience's sense of duty and the desire to leave a positive legacy for their children. Biden creates a powerful rhetorical image by referring to a small boy from the crowd and projecting him into the future as a representative figure for all future generations.

Addressing the people of Puerto Rico affected by Hurricane Fiona, Biden also resorted to the tactic of pointing to the future by expressing his immediate goals regarding disaster management. He laid out a clear plan to restore devastated territories and provide financial assistance to people: *That means the federal government will cover 100 percent of the cost to clear debris and carry out search and rescue and continue to shelter people. It also means homeowners, renters, business owners are eligible to apply for federal help to recover damage, losses caused by Hurricane Fiona. The federal government is going to provide individual assistance for up to \$37,900 for essential home repairs and another \$37,900 for lost property, as the law calls for, like a car or a refrigerator...* [104].

While delivering a campaign speech in Manchester, Biden shared with the audience his plans: *And one of the main things I try to do — and I'm going to*

continue to do, God willing, if we get reelected — is finish the job by continuing to focus on the middle class, because when the middle class does well, the poor have a way up, and the wealthy still do very well [112]. Biden is outlining his current focus on supporting the middle class and expressing his intention to continue doing so if he is re-elected. By emphasizing the importance of supporting the middle class and how it can benefit both the poor and the wealthy, Biden is laying out his immediate goals while also hinting at his broader future plans should he win re-election.

Tactic of pointing to future is also realized by modeling a positive scenario, which allows the US President to create the image of a politician leading the country to a bright future. This tactic is characterized by the use of vocabulary with positive semantics and lexical units containing the seme of light (“brighter”, “light” etc.), as shown in the following example: *In 2021, we’re going to build a **brighter future**. Together, we shall write an American story of **hope**, not fear. Of **unity**, not division. Of **light**, not darkness* [114]. The use of the stylistic device of contrast emphasizes the role of the current leader in creating a bright future for citizens and the country as a whole.

Closely related to tactic of pointing to the future is the tactic of promise. To reassure the people of Puerto Rico that their president and their country will not leave them without help Joe Biden operates with lexical language means, such as *promise, give you my word, know*. The lexical unit *promise* creates an image of a person who is true to his word and intuitively inspires confidence in the speaker: *And you deserve every bit of help your country can give you. That’s what **I’m determined to do**, and that’s what I **promise** you* [104]. Additionally, to add credibility to his promises, Biden uses the construction *I’m determined to* followed by a verb: *And **I’m determined to help** Puerto Rico build faster than in the past and stronger and better prepared for the future* [ibid.].

In the following example, confidence is expressed through the lexical unit *know*, as well as the modal verb *can*: *With unity we **can** do great things. Important things... We **can** teach our children in safe schools. We **can** overcome this deadly virus. We **can** reward work, rebuild the middle class, and make health care secure*

*for all. We **can** make America, once again, the leading force for good in the world. I **know** speaking of unity can sound to some like a foolish fantasy. I **know** the forces that divide us are deep and they are real. But I also **know** they are not new [114].* The repetition of *we can* throughout the passage emphasizes the speaker's confidence in the collective ability to accomplish these goals. Additionally, by acknowledging the challenges and potential skepticism with phrases like *I know speaking of unity can sound to some like a foolish fantasy*, Joe Biden attempts to address potential doubts while still maintaining an optimistic tone and commitment to the promises being made.

Another tactic inherent in Joe Biden's language portrait as part of the persuasion strategy is the tactic of calling for action. This tactic is based on the politician's intention to convince the audience that his position is true, and to encourage the people to support the president with actions. In the following discursive episode, the politician uses the tactic of call to action in addressing his compatriots with a plan for reviving the country after the Covid-19 pandemic: *So that's my plan. It will grow the economy and lower costs for families. So what are we waiting for? **Let's get this done.** Lower your costs, not your wages. Make more cars and semiconductors in America. More infrastructure and innovation in America... And instead of relying on foreign supply chains, **let's make** it in America [121].* This tactic is realized by the verb *let us* which means an offer, an invitation to do something.

The US President's address to the government and citizens of Poland reflects the politician's extraordinary concern about Russia's war of aggression with Ukraine. Biden calls on the audience to remember the evocative page of the fall of the Berlin Wall, which symbolized the desire of people to be free, which is what the Ukrainian people are striving for now: ***Let's remember:** The hammer blow that brought down the Berlin Wall, the might that lifted the Iron Curtain were not the words of a single leader; it was the people of Europe who, for decades, fought to free themselves [111].*

Joe Biden considers the need to know the historical past in order to construct the course of the future as no less important. In a speech in Detroit to students and the nation's young leaders, the politician uses the tactic of appealing to historical values to encourage his audience to remember the American people's two-century struggle for democracy: *Let's remember our history to motivate the leadership that our country needs and relies on, which is all of you; Let's remember young leaders who joined the labor movement to fight for fair wages and hours... Let's remember our history to motivate the leadership that our country needs and relies on, which is all of you* [ibid.].

3.4. Strategy of formation of emotional mood

The strategy of formation of emotional mood of the audience is defined by tactics of appealing to the emotions and tactics of taking into account a set of moral values of the addressee. Joseph Biden has a deep understanding of the emotions of the Americans, thereby effectively tapping into their emotions to resonate with them.

The tactic of appealing to feelings is characterized by the use of emotionally charged vocabulary: *I ran for President because I believed we were in a battle for the soul of this nation. I still believe that to be true. I believe the soul is the breath, the life, and the essence of who we are. The soul is what makes us us* [94]. Joseph Biden uses the concept "soul" to evoke deeper emotional resonance and significance. By framing his presidential campaign as a battle for the soul of the nation, he taps into a sense of moral and existential importance. The word "soul" carries connotations of identity, morality, and fundamental values, all of which can evoke strong emotional responses in the audience.

Also, the strategy of forming the emotional mood is implemented through the use of descriptive language and lexical units with the semantics of grief (*pain, cry, tears, grieves, etc.*) as part of the tactic of accounting moral and spiritual values. Descriptive language in Joe Biden's speeches includes vivid and detailed imagery,

that paint a picture of the scene and conveys the emotional atmosphere. During a visit to Poland in March 2022, Biden visited various places where Ukrainian refugees were temporarily housed. Those poignant moments left an indelible mark on his memory, as he said during a speech at the Royal Castle in Warsaw: *And earlier today, I visited your National Stadium, where thousands of Ukrainian refugees are now trying to answer the toughest questions a human can ask: “My God, what’s going to happen to me? What’s going to happen to my family?” I saw tears in many of the mothers’ eyes as I embraced them; their young children not sure whether to smile or cry. One little girl said, “Mr. President” — she spoke a little English — “is my brother and my daddy — are they going to be okay? Will I see them again?..” I didn’t have to speak the language or understand the language to feel the emotion in their eyes, the way they gripped my hand, and little kids hung on to my leg, praying with a desperate hope that all this is temporary; apprehension that they may be perhaps forever away from their homes...[111].* Joe Biden describes encountering Ukrainian refugees grappling with profound uncertainty and fear for their future. By narrating the emotional distress of the refugees, particularly the mothers and their children, Biden aims to evoke empathy from the audience towards their plight. Biden describes tears in mothers’ eyes, children unsure whether to smile or cry, and the desperate hope and apprehension palpable in their gestures and expressions. These descriptions immerse the audience in the emotional reality of the refugees’ experiences, fostering a deeper emotional connection. Biden highlights universal themes of family, uncertainty, and hope amidst adversity, resonating with the audience's own emotions and experiences. In addition, the lexical units with the semantics of grief carry strong emotional connotations and vividly evoke feelings of sorrow, urgency, and distress.

In one of the next passages of this speech, Biden addresses the people of Russia, reminding them of the suffering of their ancestors during the Second World War, describing terrible scenes: *Of all people, you, the Russian people, as well as all people across Europe, still have the memory of being in a similar situation in the late thirties and forties — the situation of World War Two... — train stations*

overflowing with terrified families fleeing their homes; nights sheltering in basements and cellars; mornings sitting through the rubble in your homes — these are not memories of the past. Not anymore. Because it's exactly what the Russian army is doing in Ukraine right now [ibid.]. Joe Biden paints a picture of the horrors of war, evoking strong emotions of fear, displacement, and devastation. His aim is to instill a feeling of sympathy for the Ukrainian people, to bring the Russian people to the realization that despite the bleeding wounds on the body of our planet after the atrocities of the Second World War, Russia is writing these terrible pages of war again.

Biden also uses the strategy of emotionalization when talking about the horrors of the Uvalde school shooting, in particular, he uses vivid imagery to convince people that gun permits pose a mortal danger to innocent citizens: *When I was recently in Uvalde... you know what some of the parents had to do? Supply DNA. Supply DNA. Because AR-15s just rips the body apart. Could not identify — could not identify the body. And a 20-year-old kid can walk in and buy one? DNA to say, "That's my baby." What the hell is the matter with us?* [96]. The speaker uses words and phrases that are emotionally charged to convey the horror and tragedy of the situation. For example, the phrase *AR-15s just rips the body apart* evokes a strong sense of fear through the horrible description of the destructive power of the weapon. In addition, by referring to specific members of the families that lost a child in the shooting (*my baby, parents*), the speaker makes the issue more relatable and personal, tapping into the audience's empathy. To further emphasise the message, Biden poses a rhetorical question *What the hell is the matter with us?*, prompting the audience to reflect on the broader societal implications of the issue of gun control and eliciting a sense of frustration or disbelief. The speaker uses vivid imagery to paint a disturbing picture of the consequences of gun violence, such as the need for DNA to identify victims.

Another illustrative example of emotionalization was taken from Joe Biden's speech on hurricane Fiona: *And so, Puerto Ricans have lost loved ones in the storm and in the perilous disasters... We read the obituaries and remembrances, and they*

all feel like people we knew: doting grandparents, devoted parents, cherished children, longtime neighbors — people who cared about their community and made a difference. And they will not be forgotten [104]. As in the previous case, the use of descriptive language such as *doting grandparents, cherished children*, etc. paints a vivid picture of the diverse range of individuals impacted by the disaster. This makes the message very personal for the audience, because the concept of family is universal for all people, and thus Biden takes the level of emotional intensity to the extreme. In addition, emotional response is achieved by using lexical units with both negative (*lost, perilous disasters, obituaries*) and positive connotations (*loved, devoted, cherished, cared*) in one passage.

3.5. Strategy of discrediting

In the modern world, more than ever, the activity of a politician is associated primarily with his verbal activity. Mastery of language, the ability to turn a word into a weapon is one of the key qualities of a professional politician. Nowadays an aggressive type of behavior is actively represented in public communication, where the speaker does everything possible to “seize the floor” and more fully express and prove his own position, using all possible linguistic means. It should be noted that many political media speeches contain negative emotions, feelings, and intentions. The speeches of politicians are often characterized by excessive expressiveness, familiarity, elements of aggression, the use of jargon, and invective vocabulary, which is an integral part of colloquial speech and unacceptable for public speaking. The speech behavior of the addresser reveals a desire to seize the communicative initiative, to oust the other speaker from the communicative space by discrediting his statements or actions.

As a rule, a politician who uses this strategy openly opposes himself to his competitors. By creating a negative background for another, he does everything possible to perceive his person as a positive figure. Under the influence of the

“presence of warring parties” factor, the speaker is forced to choose such a plan for the optimal implementation of speech intentions, as a result of which it is possible to minimize the significance of the status of the interlocutor, that is, to expand the position of his political opponent and to maximize the significance of his status, that is, to elevate himself [38, p. 163]. Language strives to make the process of communication more spectacular, to evoke emotional responses and thereby attract the addressee – an observer who perceives “political events as some kind of action being played out for him” [72, p. 398], during the game, make him an accomplice.

The strategy of discrediting in English-language political discourse is implemented by the tactics of accusation, mentioning in a negative light, “all-encompassing truth,” exposure, impersonal accusation, threat, order, condemnation, insult.

During a speech in Poland to mark the anniversary of the start of a full-scale war in Ukraine, Biden strongly condemned the actions of the Putin regime using various tactics to discredit the Russian dictator. In one of the passages, Joe Biden used the tactic of insult. The tactic of insult realizes the intention to “sarcastically prick” the image of the object of discrediting, containing a shade of the politician’s personal attitude towards the addressee, which consists in mentioning the object of discrediting, his actions in a dismissive tone, with ridicule or irony. This presupposes a directly negative characterization of the object of discrediting or their negative assessment. This tactic is implemented using lexical means with negative semantics, for example: *Instead of an easy victory he perceived and predicted, Putin left with **burnt-out** tanks and Russia’s forces in **disarray**. He thought he’d get the... Finlandization of NATO. Instead, he got the NATOization of Finland — and Sweden. He thought NATO would **fracture** and **divide**. Instead, NATO is more united and more unified than ever — than ever before. He thought he could **weaponize** energy to crack your resolve — Europe’s resolve. Instead, we’re working together to end Europe’s **dependence** on Russian fossil fuels. He thought **autocrats** like himself were **tough** and leaders of democracies were soft...* [94]. Putin is depicted as someone whose perceived expectations and predictions have failed

miserably, with phrases such as *he perceived* and *predicted* implying overconfidence or arrogance on his part. The speaker uses irony to highlight the contrast between what Putin expected and what actually happened. For instance, the phrase *He thought he'd get the Finlandization of NATO. Instead, he got the NATOization of Finland — and Sweden* is sarcastic and implies that Putin's ambitions were turned against him. There is also a degree of irony when Biden mentions the images of *burnt-out tanks* and *Russia's forces in disarray*. This statement implies that Putin's perceived expectations of an easy victory or successful military campaign were shattered. In the example, several lexical units with negative semantics are used to discredit Putin and his regime: *burn-out*, *disarray*, *fracture*, *divide* (suggest a negative expectation on Putin's part, indicating that he anticipated NATO to weaken or disintegrate, which did not happen), *tough*, etc.

Biden also used the tactic of “name calling”. This is a rhetorical technique where individuals or groups use derogatory or emotionally charged labels to characterize someone or something. It aims to evoke a negative emotional response from the audience towards the object of discrediting by associating them with the negative connotations of the label. Biden labeled Putin an *autocrat*. The term “autocrat” typically carries negative connotations, suggesting that the individual holds authoritarian power and exercises it without accountability or regard for democratic principles.

Within the same passage, the tactic of opposition was also identified. This tactic serves to contrast the values and actions of democratic nations with those of autocratic regimes, portraying the former in a positive light and the latter in a negative light: *And then, he met the iron will of America and the nations everywhere that refused to accept a world governed by fear and force...* [ibid.]. This statement serves to discredit Putin and his regime by positioning them as proponents of fear and force, in contrast to the values championed by America and other democratic nations. It emphasizes the strength and determination of these democratic nations in resisting and opposing autocratic world order.

Describing the global fallout of Putin's aggression in Ukraine, Biden mentions the problem of hunger. Biden argues that Putin is constantly exacerbating the problem while democracies do their best to stop the food crisis: *Putin tried to starve the world, blocking the ports in the Black Sea to stop Ukraine from exporting its grain, exacerbating the global food crisis that hit developing nations in Africa especially hard. Instead, the United States and the G7 and partners around the world answered the call with historic commitments to address the crisis and to bolster global food supplies* [94]. Biden emphasizes that the Russian blockade not only affects Ukraine's economy but also has ripple effects that exacerbate food crises in developing nations. By juxtaposing Putin's actions with the response of democracies, Biden aims to portray a striking contrast between Putin's aggression and the humanitarian efforts of responsive democratic nations committed to addressing global crises, such as hunger and food insecurity.

The tactic of impersonal accusation involves making accusations against the object of discrediting, but the speaker does not name the object; it is implemented by direct assertive statements: *A **dictator** bent on rebuilding an empire will never be able to erase the people's love of liberty. **Brutality** will never grind down the will of the free* [ibid.]. Biden blames Putin's dictatorial regime, but does not name him. Instead of directly naming Putin, Biden labeled him a *dictator* and used one more word with negative connotation *brutality*.

In the following example, a combination of several discrediting tactics can be observed as well: *Extraordinary brutality from Russian forces and mercenaries. They have committed depravities, crimes against humanity, without shame or compunction. They've targeted civilians with death and destruction. Used rape as a weapon of war. Stolen Ukrainian children in an attempt to — in an attempt to steal Ukraine's future. Bombed train stations, maternity hospitals, schools, and orphanages* [ibid.]. The first two statements realize the tactic of accusation because it directly assigns blame and responsibility to Russian forces and mercenaries for committing atrocities against the people of Ukraine. Phrases such as *extraordinary brutality*, *depravities*, and *crimes against humanity* carry strong negative

connotations and imply serious wrongdoing on the part of the accused. Further, Joe Biden uses the tactic of exposure revealing the negative actions of the object of discrediting (Russian forces) by presenting facts. Factual information include the facts of targeting civilians with death, rape of civilians, stealing Ukrainian children, and bombing civilian infrastructure. By presenting these facts, Biden aims to draw attention to the egregious behavior of Russian troops. This tactic aims to sway public opinion against the Russian forces and raise support for measures to hold them accountable for their actions.

In addition, Joe Biden uses the tactic of threat that is aimed at controlling the further actions of the addressee, which leads to the strengthening of the speaker's status. He threatens, informing about his future actions, which will potentially have negative consequences for the object of discrediting: *Meanwhile, together we have made sure that Russia is paying the price for its abuses... And we're going to announce more sanctions this week together with our partners* [ibid.]. The statements send a clear message to Russia that there will be continued consequences for its aggression, indicating a firm stance from the United States and its allies. Biden's aim is to deter Russia from further aggressive actions by highlighting the potential economic and diplomatic repercussions. What is more, Biden reassures allies and partners that the United States is committed to seeking justice for the crimes Russia committed during the conflict: *We'll hold accountable those who are responsible for this war. And we will seek justice for the war crimes and crimes against humanity continuing to be committed by the Russians* [ibid.]. In these example, the tactic of threat is realized using the modal verb *will* and the construction *going to*.

Joe Biden also strongly condemned the murder of Russian political prisoner Alexei Navalny. Many people considered Navalny as a potential president of Russia, so Biden used opposition tactic, comparing the murdered man to Putin, presenting the image of a hypothetic democratic Russia for which Navalny fought: *And as people across Russia and around the world are mourning Navalny today because*

he was so many things that Putin was not: He was brave. He was principled. He was dedicated to building a Russia where the rule of law existed and of — where it applied to everybody. Navalny believed in that Russia — that Russia [110]. By highlighting Navalny's qualities using the lexical units with positive connotation such as *bravery, principled, and dedicated*, while implicitly contrasting them with deficiencies in Putin's leadership, Joe Biden is framing Navalny as a symbol of a different vision for Russia – one that embraces democratic principles and human rights. This tactic aims to raise support for Navalny's cause and to draw attention to the discrepancies between his vision for Russia and the current state under Putin's rule.

A number of accusations in the political discursive space are also directed against Biden's other opponent, Donald Trump, and those who support him: *For the first time on our history, insurrectionists had come to stop the peaceful transfer — transfer of power in America — first time — smashing windows, shattering doors, attacking the police. Outside, gallows were erected as the MAGA crowd chanted, “Hang Mike Pence.” Inside, they hunted for Speaker Pelosi of the House, chanting, as they marched through and smashed windows, “Where's Nancy?” Over 140 police officers were injured. Jill and I attended the funeral of police officers who died as a result of the events of that day* [92]. At the beginning of the passage, Joe Biden uses the tactic of accusation, saying that pro-Republican insurrectionists wanted to prevent the peaceful transfer of power in America after the 2021 election, which resulted in Biden's victory. Then the President resorted to the tactic of exposure: the insurrectionists committed criminal acts, such as threatening to execute Mike Pence and Nancy Pelosi, and caused serious injuries to police officers, one of whom even died.

Joe Biden continues with the tactic of insult: *He promised it would be “wild,” and it was. He told the crowd to “fight like hell,” and all hell was unleashed. He promised he would right them. Everything they did, he would be side by side with them. Then, as usual, he left the dirty work to others* [ibid.]. The speaker employs sarcasm and mockery to criticize Trump's behavior. Phrases like *He told the crowd*

to “fight like hell”, and all hell was unleashed and Then, as usual, he left the dirty work to others suggest that Trump's words and actions were criminal and hypocritical.

Biden uses the tactic of condemnation to emphasize that Trump cynically did nothing while seeing other people suffering and begging him for help to stop what was happening: *As America was attacked from within, Donald Trump watched on TV in the private small dining room off the Oval Office. The entire nation watched in horror. The whole world watched in disbelief. And Trump did nothing. Members of his staff, members of his family, Republican leaders who were under attack for the — at that very moment pled with him: “Act. Call off the mob”* [ibid.].

Further, Joe Biden raises the issue of Trump’s persecution of election workers who supported the election results: *But in desperation and weakness, Trump and his MAGA followers went after election officials who ensured your power as a citizen would be heard. These public servants had their lives forever upended by attacks and death threats for simply doing their jobs. In Atlanta, Georgia, a brave Black mother and her daughter, Ruby Freeman and Shaye Moss, were doing their jobs as elected workers until Donald Trump and his MAGA followers targeted and threatened them, forcing them from their homes and unleashing racist vitriol on them... Other state and local elected officials across the country faced similar personal attacks* [92]. In the first two statements, Joe Biden uses the tactic of accusation, he accuses Trump and his followers of criminally persecuting those election workers who performed their duties according to the law. Biden claims that Trumpists defamed these people and also made death threats. The next statements realize the tactic of exposure with the facts of crimes against a specific family of election workers. Markers of these tactics are the use of lexical units with negative meanings, for example *attacks, threats, vitriol, cruelty, inflicted*.

One of the following statements by Joe Biden is another illustrative example of the insult tactic: *Let’s be clear about the 2020 election. Trump exhausted every legal avenue available to him to overturn the election — every one. But the legal path just took Trump back to the truth that I had won the election and he was a*

loser [ibid.]. Joe Biden, who won the election, contrasts himself with Trump, asserting his own superiority. Biden makes strong emphasis on Trump's defeat by stating that *Trump exhausted every legal avenue to overturn the election* but ultimately failed, the speaker reinforces the insult. Moreover, Biden labels Trump as a *loser*, which is a derogatory term. The speaker is personally attacking the object of discrediting, questioning his competence or worthiness.

With the following statement, Biden uses the tactic of all-encompassing truth to discredit Donald Trump: *In trying to rewrite the facts of January 6th, Trump is trying to steal history the same way he tried to steal the election. But he — we knew the truth because we saw it with our own eyes. It wasn't like something — a story being told. It was on television repeatedly. We saw it with our own eyes* [ibid]. Joe Biden presents negative information about Trump's activities as a well-known fact that everyone knows about, because many people saw it with their own eyes. To do this, he uses lingual markers *we knew the truth, we saw it with our own eyes, it was on television*. This technique effectively manipulates the consciousness of the audience, since if the mentioned fact is generally known, there is no point in doubting it.

To further emphasize the negativity and danger of the situation, Biden further uses the tactic of opposition, comparing the real criminal actions of the insurrectionists who violently attacked the Capitol and the actions of the hypothetical "normal" protesters who express their indignation without breaking the law: *Trump's mob wasn't a peaceful protest. It was a violent assault. They were insurrectionists, not patriots. They weren't there to uphold the Constitution; they were there to destroy the Constitution* [ibid.].

This attack on Donald Trump continued with condemnation of Donald Trump's inhuman behavior when he laughed at a man who threatened to smash the skull of Paul Pelosi, the husband of Nancy Pelosi, the speaker of the United States House of Representatives, with a hammer. Earlier, an attacker, William DePape, broke into Pelosi's house and inflicted severe traumatic brain injuries on Paul Pelosi: *You know, Trump and his MAGA supporters not only embrace political violence,*

but they laugh about it. At his rally, he jokes about an intruder, whipped up by the Big Trump Lie, taking a hammer to Paul Pelosi's skull and echoing the very same words used on January 6th: "Where's Nancy?" And he thinks that's funny. He laughed about it. What a sick... My God. I think it's despicable, seriously — not just for a president, for any person to say that. But to say it to the whole world listening... [ibid]. Biden expresses a sharply negative assessment of the actions of Donald Trump and notes that such behavior is unacceptable under any circumstances for anyone, and especially for the president, who is the face of the country in the international arena.

Joe Biden resorts to the tactic of impersonal accusation warning the nation about the dangers of supporting Trump without mentioning him by name: *And yet history tells us that blind loyalty to a single leader and a willingness to engage in political violence is fatal to democracy* [97]. The markers of the tactic of impersonal accusation are the lexical units with negative connotation (*blind, violence, fatal*).

In his speech on the occasion of the murder of Alexei Navalny, Biden again noted the connection between the former American president and the Russian dictator. Biden exposes Trump's shocking remarks about some NATO countries: *All of us should reject the dangerous statements made by the previous president that invited Russia to invade our NATO Allies if they weren't paying up. He said if an Ally did not pay their dues, he'd encourage Russia to, quote, "Do whatever the hell they want"* [110]. Through the tactic of exposure, Biden reveals Trump's radical plan to abandon, if attacked, those NATO countries that do not make a fair share of contributions to the benefit of the alliance. Biden also quotes one of Trump's most scandalous phrases regarding this problem *Do whatever the hell they want*, which strengthens the audience's confidence in the stated facts. In the following statements, Biden condemns such actions as unacceptable for a president: *But let me be clear: This is an outrageous thing for a president to say. I can't fathom. I can't fathom* [ibid]. The lingual marker of the tactic of condemnation is the phrase *This is an outrageous thing...*

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 3

The analysis of Joe Biden's speeches has helped to uncover the communicative strategies and tactics that are employed to manipulate the audience.

In the aspect of pragmalinguistics, Joe Biden's political discourse is characterized by the dominance of the image creation strategy which is used by speakers to create a positive image of themselves as devoted, fair and determined leaders. Within this strategy Biden applies the tactic of explicit positive assessment of his work and his administration, which constitutes the majority in the framework of this tactic, tactic of identification or solidarity, tactic of reference to authority, tactic of presenting personal experience and the tactic of group identification.

The strategy of persuasion involves employing various techniques to influence audience's actions or decisions through convincing arguments. This strategy is realized through the tactic of argumentative evaluations, tactic of pointing to the future (predicting the development of events, the expression of strategic goals, etc.), promise tactic and the tactic of call to action.

Biden frequently resorts to the strategy of formation the emotional mood that is realized by tactics of appealing to the emotions and tactics of taking into account a set of moral values of the addressee. They help to establish a connection with the listeners on a personal level as well as to influence public opinion by framing issues in a way that resonates emotionally with the audience.

The strategy of discrediting is employed by the President to undermine the credibility or legitimacy of opponents or opposing viewpoints. To effectively weaken his adversaries' positions and bolster his own, Biden uses the tactics of accusation, "all-encompassing truth," tactic of exposure, impersonal accusation, threat, order, condemnation and insult.

CONCLUSIONS

The pivotal role of language as an ever-evolving tool of communication has gained immense significance over time, particularly in an increasingly interconnected global landscape where national boundaries are gradually blurring.

In this research, we examined the views of foreign and Ukrainian scholars on the concept of discourse. In linguistics, discourse is a connected speech or writing within specific contexts, emphasizing its cohesion and continuum from brief remarks to extensive texts. It is important to stress the social significance of discourse, it cannot be divorced from society, culture, and politics, as it reflects the socio-cultural environment.

In the 21st century, the political arena stands out as one of the most influential domains. Political discourse is characterized as a multifaceted communicative phenomenon with a pragmatic dimension, aiming to shape public opinion and assert power through verbalized texts and sociocultural contexts. In today's globalized world, political discourse plays a crucial role in shaping both internal and external perceptions of countries, with politicians' language personality being a significant factor. While some scholars view political discourse primarily as communication by political figures, others like Ruth Wodak expand its scope to include citizens, demonstrators, and voters, reflecting a broader participatory approach.

In the process of this research, scientific literature covering language portraiture was studied, on the basis of which the concept "language portrait" was studied, and this concept was distinguished from a related concept "language personality". Scholars have proposed diverse interpretations of language personality, ranging from O. Selivanova's focus on linguistic and communicative competence to S. Avramenko's emphasis on linguistic thinking and practical activity. Additionally, F. Batsevych highlights the role of individual abilities and characteristics in text creation and interpretation, while L. Struganets underscores the significance of linguistic knowledge and responsibility in language use. In contrast to the language personality, which is realized in dynamics, the language

portrait is a reflection of features in a certain time period. This research covers the years 2021-2024.

Creating of the language portraits of politicians involves analysis of their speech patterns on lexical, grammatical, stylistic, and pragmatic levels. The selection of words, sentence structures and stylistic devices is primarily driven by communicative objectives and goals. Moreover, in political discourse, the personality of a leader manifests through various communicative strategies and tactics employed to achieve desired outcomes.

Based on the research, we can conclude that Joe Biden tries to create a socially approved image of an active public figure, positioning himself as a reputable professional capable of solving large-scale problems both within the country and abroad. At the lexical level, this aim is realized through the use of terminology from socio-political, economic, military, medical and legal domains. The representation of terminology in the language portrait of Joseph Biden contributes to a better understanding of the essence of the issue under discussion, reduces losses in the perception.

The language portrait of Joe Biden is represented by a number of evaluative lexical units, and there is a dominant tendency for the politician to use positive evaluative vocabulary. In our opinion, it is due to the desire to project a hopeful and optimistic image to inspire confidence and trust among the public. Positive words convey a sense of progress and unity aligning with Biden's overarching strategy renewal.

Joe Biden positions himself as an equal to ordinary Americans and empathetic to the nation. To do this, the politician uses the technique of simulating dialogue as well informal expressions when addressing the audience to create the atmosphere of a friendly conversation. Moreover, an important feature characterizing the language portrait of the US President is colloquialization, represented by lexical units used to designate persons and their qualitative characteristics, lexical intensifiers, phrasal verbs, abbreviations and exclamations. These linguistic means contribute to connecting with electorate on a personal level.

At the same time, Biden makes communication mistakes represented by slips of the tongue and speech errors, which negatively affects his image and language portrait, formed in the perception of the audience. This is due to the negative impact of the aging process on cognitive functions, in particular a decrease in the speed of information processing and a decrease in the amount of working memory.

Joe Biden's communicative style is aimed at motivating and rallying support while projecting strength and resolve. In grammatical aspect, this is achieved through the use of modal verbs of epistemic and deontic modality. Biden frequently employs modal verbs "will," "can," and "would" to express intentions, promises, abilities, and obligations. Biden strategically combines epistemic and deontic modal verbs to emphasize both capability and obligation, urging action and fostering a sense of unity and purpose.

At the stylistic level, the language portrait of Joe Biden is represented primarily by metaphors. By drawing parallels between abstract political ideas and concrete, relatable imagery, Biden can ensure that his message resonates with people from diverse backgrounds and levels of political engagement.

We described various typologies of communication strategies and tactics in American political discourse. It was found that the language portrait of Joe Biden is characterized by the dominance of the strategy of image creation that includes the tactic of explicit positive assessment of his work and administration (in particular, this is realized through the use of vocabulary with positive semantics, numerals and the Present Perfect Tense); tactic of solidarity is realized through the use of the inclusive personal pronouns to create a sense of unity with the country, Biden's administration and democratic countries; tactic of reference to authority is used to form a positive image evoking respect and confidence; tactic of presenting of personal experience is employed in order to dispel perceptions of being insincere, thereby fostering a stronger bond with the audience; the tactic of group identification is based on the opposition "I/we" versus "they" and helps to form a positive attitude towards the members of Biden's group and negative attitude towards his opponents.

The strategy of persuasion is realized through the tactic of argumentative evaluations, tactic of pointing to the future, tactic of contrastive analysis, tactic of promise and tactic of calling for action. These tactics work together in the speeches of Joe Biden to present compelling arguments, evoke emotional responses, and motivate individuals to align with the persuader's objectives.

Joe Biden often activates a wide range of emotional responses among the audience through the tactics of appealing to emotions and tactics of taking into account a set of moral values of the addressee which represent the strategy of forming the emotional mood. Biden skillfully uses descriptive language and presents emotional scenes to the audience which makes his speeches more memorable.

The analysis revealed that the speaker implements the strategy of discrediting in English-language political discourse through the following tactics: the tactic of accusation, impersonal accusation, exposure, "all-encompassing truth," condemnation, threat, order, insults and opposition. Discrediting as one of the powerful conflict strategies is used by the American president, since the theme of aggression/violence on the part of the Russian Federation as well as Donald Trump and his supporters in speeches should give grounds for counteraction, in particular verbal, on the part of the United States.

To sum up, in modern fast-paced political arena, attaining and maintaining power demands ever greater efforts. Public speaking emerges as key instrument for manipulating public opinion. Hence, the selection of linguistic means forms the distinctive language profile of political figures, reflecting the individual style in their speech. Each politician selects and uses the communicative strategies and tactics that align with his/her preferences and goals.

The study does not cover all aspects of the topic under investigation. Further work involves conducting a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic features of contemporary American politicians in order to create comprehensive language portraits of various politicians in the US.

ABSTRACT

In the contemporary world, where political discourse shapes societal norms and influences public opinion, understanding the intricate relationship between language and politics becomes paramount. This master's thesis delves into the language personality and political discourse of Joseph Biden, the 46th President of the United States, aiming to construct a comprehensive language portrait of the politician and decipher the strategies and tactics employed in his political communication.

The research is grounded in the theoretical frameworks of political discourse analysis and linguistic personality studies. By examining Biden's speeches, totaling 117,546 tokens, this study employs observational and descriptive methods alongside content and intent analyses.

Findings indicate Biden's preference for positive lexical units and use of modal verbs to convey commitment to his work. The President employ sophisticated stylistic devices including metaphor, rhetorical questions, parallelism, paronomasia, epizeuxis, antithesis to enhance the persuasiveness of his discourse.

Additionally, the research elucidates the communicative strategies and tactics employed by Biden. The study reveals his adeptness at image creation through positive assessment and solidarity tactics, alongside persuasive techniques like argumentative evaluations and emotional appeals. Biden's diplomatic approach to criticism and conflict resolution is also analyzed.

Overall, the research underscores Joe Biden's strategic approach to communication, emphasizing consensus-building and emotional connection with the audience. The findings contribute to the understanding of political discourse and can inform future studies.

Keywords: political discourse, language personality, language portrait, language preferences, political communication, communication strategies, rhetorical devices, Joe Biden, United States of America.

АНОТАЦІЯ

У сучасному світі, де політичний дискурс формує соціальні норми та впливає на громадську думку, розуміння складного взаємозв'язку між мовою та політикою набуває першорядної необхідності. Ця магістерська дисертація присвячена мовній особистості та політичному дискурсу Джозефа Байдена, 46-го президента Сполучених Штатів, з метою створити комплексний мовний портрет політика та проаналізувати стратегії та тактики, які використовуються у його політичному спілкуванні.

Дослідження ґрунтується на теоретичних засадах аналізу політичного дискурсу та дослідження мовної особистості. Матеріалом для дослідження виступили промови Байдена, що налічують загалом 117 546 слів. У цій роботі використовуються метод спостереження, описовий метод, а також контент-аналіз та інтент-аналіз.

Результати показують, що Байден надає перевагу позитивним лексичним одиницям і використовує модальні дієслова для вираження відданості роботі. У промовах використовуються складні стилістичні прийоми, такі як метафора, риторичні питання, паралелізм, параномазія, епізексис, антитеза, щоб підвищити переконливість дискурсу.

Крім того, дослідження проливає світло на комунікативні стратегії та тактики, які використовуються у промовах Джо Байдена. Дослідження виявляє його здатність створювати імідж з допомогою позитивної оцінки власних досягнень та тактики солідарності, а також таких методів переконання, як аргументовані оцінки та емоційні заклики. Також аналізується дипломатичний підхід Байдена до критики та вирішення конфліктів.

Загалом дослідження наголошує на стратегічному підході Джо Байдена до спілкування, що підкреслює досягнення консенсусу та встановлення емоційного зв'язку з аудиторією. Отримані результати сприяють розумінню політичного дискурсу, зокрема американського, та можуть стати основою для майбутніх досліджень.

Ключові слова: політичний дискурс, мовна особистість, мовний портрет, мовні уподобання, політична комунікація, комунікативні стратегії, риторичні прийоми, Джо Байден, Сполучені Штати Америки.

LIST OF LITERATURE

1. Авраменко С. М. Мовленнєва особистість майбутнього вчителя в аспекті толерантності / С. М. Авраменко // Проблеми підготовки сучасного вчителя. — 2010. — № 2. — С. 138—143.
2. Акінчиць Н. Г. Політичний дискурс як об'єкт наукового аналізу [Електронний ресурс] / Н. Г. Акінчиць // Культура народів Причорномор'я. — 2007. — С. 72–76. — Режим доступу до ресурсу: <http://dspace.nbuiv.gov.ua/handle/123456789/54472>.
3. Бацевич Ф. С. Основи комунікативної лінгвістики : [підручник] / Ф. С. Бацевич. — К. : Академія, 2004. — 344 с.
4. Ващук Т. М. Політичний дискурс як об'єкт лінгвістичного дослідження / Т. М. Ващук // Вісник Житомирського державного університету ім. Івана Франка. — 2007. — № 33. — С. 182—185.
5. Вусик Г. М., Антонюк О. В. Сучасний політичний дискурс як об'єкт лінгвістичних досліджень / Г. М. Вусик, О. В. Антонюк // Вісник студентського наукового товариства ДонНУ імені Василя Стуса. — 2020. — Том 2, № 1. — С. 213—217.
6. Гайдулін О. О. Політичний дискурс як практиологічна складова політологічного навчання / О. О. Гайдулін // Матеріали Всеукр. наради завідуючих каф. соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін [«Соціально-гуманітарна освіта України та шляхи її розбудови»]. — Київ : Генеза, 1997. — С. 23-25.
7. Голубовська І. О., Орлова Т. В. Політичний дискурс як інструмент маніпулювання свідомістю електорату / І. О. Голубовська, Т. В. Орлова // *Studia Linguistica*. — 2017. — № 11. — С. 9—28.
8. Деренчук Н. В. Мовний портрет сучасного українського політика : дис. ... кандидата філол. наук: 10.02.01 – Українська мова. – Східноєвропейський національний університет ім. Лесі Українки. – Луцьк, 2018. – 228 с.

9. Деренчук Н. В. Мовний портрет сучасного українського політика: дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01. / Деренчук Наталія Вікторівна. – Луцьк, 2018. – 228 с.
10. Діденко М. О. Політичний виступ як тип тексту (на матеріалі виступів німецьких політичних діячів кінця 20 століття) : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. / М. О. Діденко. — О., 2001. — 19 с.
11. Єрмоленко С. Я. Нариси з української словесності: стилістика та культура мови / С. Я. Єрмоленко. – К. : Довіра, 1999. – 431 с.
12. Ішмуратов А. Т. Термін. Філософський енциклопедичний словник / А. Т. Ішмуратов, В. І. Шинкарук. Київ : Абрис, 2002. — 742 с.
13. Клименко І.В. Теоретичні засади лінгвістичного аналізу політичного дискурсу / І. В. Клименко // Лінгвістичні студії : зб. наук. праць. — Донецьк : ДонНУ, 2009. — № 19. — С. 182—186.
14. Кондратенко Н.В. Український політичний дискурс: текстуалізація реальності : [монографія] / Н. В. Кондратенко. Одеса : Чорномор'я, 2007. – 156 с.
15. Косенко Ю. В. Основи теорії мовної комунікації : [навч. посіб.] / Ю. В. Косенко. – Суми: Сумський державний університет, 2011. – 187 с.
16. Костюк Ю.М. Українська суспільно-політична лексика в інтернет-виданнях 2012–2017 рр. Лексика на перетині наукових парадигм : [монографія] / Ю. М. Костюк. – Тернопіль: ФОП Ю. В. Осадца, 2018. – 212 с.
17. Мацько Л. І. Мовна особистість Тараса Шевченка як чинник формування національної ідентичності / Л. І. Мацько // Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія» Серія «Філологічна». — 2014. — № 50. — С. 8—15.
18. Петлюченко К. В. Харизматика мови і дискурсу: мовна особистість і політичний дискурс: [монографія] / К. В. Петлюченко. – Тернопіль, 2008. – 124 с.

19. Петренко І. І. Політичний дискурс: зміст, особливості, функції / І. І. Петренко // Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. Філософія. Політологія. — 2010. — №100. — С. 54—57.
20. Прокопенко Б. В. Передвиборчий американський дискурс: головні особливості та семантично-структурні та прагматично-комунікаційні характеристики / Б. В. Прокопенко. — Харків, 2008. — 72 с.
21. Романченко А. П. Лінгвістична персонологія: об'єкт та історія формування / А. П. Романченко / [«Tradiție și inovare în cercetarea științifică»], (29 вересня 2016 р.). — Бельці : Бельцький державний університет імені Алеку Руссо, 2017. — С. 68-73.
22. Селиванова Е. А. Основы лингвистической теории текста и коммуникации : [монографическое учебное пособие] / Е. А. Селиванова. — Киев : Брама, 2004. — 336 с.
23. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми : [підручник] / О. О. Селіванова. — Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2006. — 716 с.
24. Серажим К.С. Дискурс як соціолінгвальне явище: методологія, архітектоніка, варіативність (на матеріалах сучасної газетної публіцистики) : [монографія] / К. С. Серажим. Київ : Інститут журналістики КНУ ім. Т. Шевченка, 2002. — 392 с.
25. Славова Л.Л. Мовна особистість політика: когнітивно-дискурсивний аспект: [монографія] / Л. Л. Славова. — Житомир : ЖДУ ім. І. Франка, 2010. — 358 с.
26. Словник основних термінів когнітивно-дискурсивної лінгвістики [уклад. А. Мартинюк]. — Х. : ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна, 2011. — 196 с.
27. Ставицька Л. О. Про термін ідіолект / Л. О. Ставицька // Українська мова. — Київ, 2009. — № 4. — С. 3–17.
28. Струганець Л. В. Культура мови. Словник термінів / Л. В. Струганець. — Тернопіль : Навчальна книга, 2000. — 88 с.

29. Сюта Г. М. Мовний портрет у контексті сучасних лінгвостилістичних досліджень / Г. М. Сюта // У вимірах слова : збірник наукових статей. — Харків, 2009. — С. 32—39.
30. Сюта Г. М. Мовні портрети політиків і журналістів / Г. М. Сюта // Культура слова. — 2015. — № 82. — С. 139—141.
31. Харитоновна Д. Д. Український політичний дискурс: когнітивно-семантичні та прагмакомунікативні виміри: дис. ... канд. філол. н. : 10.02.01 / Харитоновна Дар'я Дмитрівна. — Київ, 2018. — 212 с.
32. Чорна В. А. Створення образу соціального лідера політичного руху інструментами стратегій комунікації / В. А. Чорна. — Київ, 2009. — № 7. — С. 55—86 с.
33. Шевчук З. С. Понятійно-термінологічне поле дослідження ієрархії “мовна особистість – мовний портрет” / З. С. Шевчук // Одеський лінгвістичний вісник. — 2014. — С. 305—308.
34. Яшенкова О. В. Основи теорії мовної комунікації : [навчальний посібник] / О. В. Яшенкова. — Київ : Видавничий центр «Академія», 2010. — 312 с.
35. Baldick Ch. The concise Oxford dictionary of literary terms [Electronic source] / Ch. Baldick. — Oxford University Press, 1996. — Access mode: [http://armytage.net/pdsdata/%5BChris_Baldick%5D_The_Concise_Oxford_Dictionary_of_L\(BookFi.org\).pdf](http://armytage.net/pdsdata/%5BChris_Baldick%5D_The_Concise_Oxford_Dictionary_of_L(BookFi.org).pdf)
36. Blommaert J., Bulcaen C. Critical Discourse Analysis / J. Blommaert, C. Bulcaen // Annual Review of Anthropology. — 2000. — Vol. 29. — P. 447—466.
37. Boller, P.F. Presidential Campaigns. From George Washington to George W. Bush / P. F. Boller. — Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2004. — 496 p.
38. Caesar, J. W. The Rise of Rhetorical Presidency [Electronic source] / J. W. Caesar, G. E. Thurow, J. Tulis, J. M. Bessette // Presidential Studies Quarterly. — 1981. — № 11(2). — P. 158–171. — Access mode: <https://nationalecurity.gmu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Rhetorical-Presidency.pdf>

39. Chilton P. A., Schäffner C. *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* / P. A. Chilton, C. Schäffner. — Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2002. — 246 p.
40. Coons, C. *Manipulation: Theory and practice* [Electronic source] / C. Coons, M. Weber. — New York : Oxford University Press, 2014. — 270 p. — Access mode: <https://dokumen.pub/manipulation-theory-and-practice-1nbsped-0199338205-9780199338207.html>
41. Crump, J. What happened to Joe Biden's father? President references his dad's unemployment in inaugural address [Electronic source] / J. Crump. — 2021. — Access mode: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-election-2020/joe-biden-dad-father-inauguration-speech-b1790296.html>
42. *Deuxième Cours de linguistique générale* / [F. de Saussure, E. Komatsu, A. Riedlinger, Ch. Patois]. — Oxford, New York, Tokyo : Pergamon, 1909. — 192 p.
43. Dictionary.com. [Electronic source]. — Access mode: <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/discourse>
44. Duignan B. Joe Biden: President of the United States [Electronic source] / B. Duignan // Britannica. — Access mode: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Joe-Biden>
45. Ealy S. *Communication, Speech and Politics* / S. Ealy. — Washington, D.C. : University Press of America, 1981. — 244 p.
46. Entous A. The Untold History of the Biden Family [Electronic source] / A. Entous. — 2022. — Access mode: <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2022/08/22/the-untold-history-of-the-biden-family>
47. Farmer, D. Portraits de jeunes migrants dans une école internationale au Canada / D. Farmer // *La revue internationale de l'éducation familiale*. — 2012. — № 31(1). № P. 73—94.

48. Bligh, M. Finding Her Voice: Hillary Clinton Rhetoric in the 2008 Presidential Campaign [Electronic source] / M. Bligh, J. Merolla, J. R. Schroedel, R. Gonzalez // *Woman's Studies*. – 2010. — № 39 (8). – P. 823–850. – Access mode: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254295892_Finding_Her_Voice_Hillary_Clinton's_Rhetoric_in_the_2008_Presidential_Campaign
49. Foucault M. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* / M. Foucault. — London, New York : Psychology Press, 1961. — 282 p.
50. Fowler F. *Language in the News. Discourse and Ideology in the Press* / F. Fowler. — London : Routledge, 1991. — 254 p.
51. Gass, R. *Aggressive Communication in Political Contexts* / R. Gass // *Arguments, Aggression, and Conflict: New Directions in Theory and Research*. — 2010. — P. 217—240.
52. Graber D. *Handbook of Political Communication* / D. Graber, 1981.
53. Graber D. *Political Languages : Handbook of Political Communication* / D. Graber. — Beverly Hills, London : Sage Publications, 1981. — 320 p.
54. Harris Z. *Discourse analysis* / Z. Harris // *Language*. — 1952. — Vol. 28. — № 1. — P. 1—30.
55. Hart, R. P. *Political Tone. How Leaders Talk and Why* / R. P. Hart, J. P. Childers, C. J. Lind. — Chicago, IL : The University of Chicago Press, 2013. — 304 p.
56. Hauser G. A. *Introduction to Rhetorical Theory* [Electronic source] / G. A. Hauser. — Illinois : Waveland Press, 2002. — 320 p. – Access mode: https://www.academia.edu/88806754/Introduction_to_rhetorical_theory
57. Howarth, D. *Discourse* / D. Howarth. — Philadelphia : Open University Press, 2000. — 176 p.
58. Igoe, K. J. *Who Was Joe Biden's Mom Catherine "Jean" Biden Who Profoundly Influenced His Life?* [Electronic source] / K. J. Igoe. – 2020. – Access mode:

<https://www.marieclaire.com/politics/a33793001/joe-biden-mother-catherine-jean-biden/>

59. Immelman A. The personality profile and leadership style of U.S. president Donald J. Trump in office [Electronic source] / A. Immelman, A. Griebie. – Berlin, 2020. – 71 p. – Access mode: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343400256_The_Personality_Profile_and_Leadership_Style_of_US_President_Donald_J_Trump_in_Office
60. Italic, K. Biden and Irish poets: “Hope and history,” a lifelong love [Electronic source] / H. Italic. – Access mode: <https://apnews.com/article/biden-ireland-seamus-heaney-poetry-yeats-d87aa6c0b3e9a53464faaf8d5fda1c7b>
61. Joe Biden. The President [Electronic source]. – Access mode: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/president-biden/>
62. Khalid, A. How Joe Biden’s Faith Shapes His Politics [Electronic source] / A. Khalid. – 2020. – Access mode: <https://www.npr.org/2020/09/20/913667325/how-joe-bidens-faith-shapes-his-politics>
63. Körner, R. How the Linguistic Styles of Donald Trump and Joe Biden Reflect Different Forms of Power [Electronic source] / R. Körner, J. R. Overbeck, E. Körner, A. Schütz // Journal of Language and Social Psychology. – 2022. – № 41(6). – P. 631—658. – Access mode: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359908015_How_the_Linguistic_Styles_of_Donald_Trump_and_Joe_Biden_Reflect_Different_Forms_of_Power
64. Levingston S. Joe Biden: Life Before The Presidency [Electronic source] / S. Levingston. – Access mode: <https://millercenter.org/president/biden/life-before-the-presidency>
65. Martel M. Political campaign debates / M. Martel. — New York, London : Longman Publishing Group, 1989. — 193 p.
66. Metcalf A. Presidential voices: speaking styles from George Washington to George W. Bush / A. Metcalf. — Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 2004. — 352 p.

67. Mithun, M. On the Relativity of Irreality [Electronic source] / M. Mithun // Modality in Grammar and Discourse. – 1995. – P. 367. – Access mode: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284574739_On_the_Relativity_of_Irreality
68. Ngwoke R. I. Pronouns and Metaphors in Obama's and Trump's Inaugural Speeches: A Comparative Analysis through Critical Discourse Analysis. [Electronic source] / R. I. Ngwoke, O. ThankGod Igiri, J. Onyekachi Awa, M. Chukwuemeka Ogayi. – Awka, 2020. – Vol. 21. № 2. – Access mode: https://www.academia.edu/104429091/Pronouns_and_Metaphors_in_Obama_s_and_Trump_s_Inaugural_Speeches_A_Comparative_Analysis_through_Critical_Discourse_Analysis?uc-g-sw=4371020
69. Norman, K. What Are President Joe Biden's Favorite Books? [Electronic source] / K. Norman. – Access mode: <https://earlybirdbooks.com/joe-biden-favorite-books>
70. Olson, M. The logic of collective action: Public goods and the theory of groups / M. Olson. — Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press, 1971. — 186 p.
71. Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/folk_1
72. Pillai, R. Does leadership matter in the political arena? Voter perceptions of candidates' transformational and charismatic leadership and the 1996 U.S. presidential vote / R. Pillai, E. A. Williams // The Leadership Quarterly. — 1998. — № 9. — P. 397—416.
73. Portner, P. Modality / P. Portner. — Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2009. — 304 p.
74. Putnem M. Modern Public Address / M. Putnem. – Arlington, Texas : UTA Press, 2008. – 182 p.
75. Quinn A. Figures of Speech / A. Quinn. — Salt Lake City, Utah : Gibbs M. Smith, Inc., 1982. — 103 p.

76. Rubenzer, S. J. Assessing the U.S. presidents using the revised NEO Personality Inventory / S. J. Rubenzer, T. R. Faschingbauer, D. S. Ones // *Assessment*. — 2000. — № 7. — P. 403—420.
77. Savoy J. Trump's and Clinton's style and rhetoric during the 2016 presidential election [Electronic source] / J. Savoy // *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*. — 2016. — № 25(2). — P. 168—189. — Access mode: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311588853_Trump's_and_Clinton's_Style_and_Rhetoric_During_the_2016_Presidential_Election
78. Second amendment [Electronic source] / Wex Definitions Team // Legal Information Institute. — Access mode: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/second_amendment
79. Simonton, D. K. Presidential style: Personality, biography, and performance / D. Simonton // *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. — 1988. — № 55. P. 928—936.
80. Slatcher R. B. Winning words: Individual differences in linguistic style among U.S. presidential and vice presidential candidates / R. B. Slatcher, C. K. Chung, J. W. Pennebaker, L. D. Stone // *Journal of Research in Personality*. — 2007. — № 41. — P. 63—75.
81. Stubbs M. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language* / M. Stubbs. — Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1983. — 272 p.
82. ten Brinke L. Theories of power: perceived strategies for gaining and maintaining power [Electronic source] / L. ten Brinke, D. Keltner // *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. — 2022. — № 122 (1). — P. 53—72. — Access mode: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344302136_Theories
83. van Dijk T. A. *Discourse and Manipulation* / T. A. van Dijk // *Discourse and Society*. — 2006. — № 17. — P. 359—383.
84. van Dijk T. A. *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* / T. A. van Dijk. — London : Sage, 2011. — 432 p.

85. van Dijk T. A. What is political discourse analysis [Electronic source] / T. A. Van Dijk. — 1997. — 43 p. — Access mode: https://el.unifi.it/pluginfile.php/909651/mod_resource/content/1/Van%20Dijk%20Waht%20is%20political%20discourse%20analysis.pdf.
86. van Dijk, T. A. News as Discourse [Electronic source] / T. A. van Dijk. — Hillsdale : Lawrence Erlbaum, 1988. — 200 p. — Access mode: <https://discourses.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Teun-A.-van-Dijk-1988-News-As-Discourse.pdf>
87. Wales K. A Dictionary of Stylistics / K. Wales. — 3rd ed. — New York : Routledge, 2011. — 478 p.
88. Wei, N. Exploring Semantic Preference and Semantic Prosody across English and Chinese: Their Roles for Cross-Linguistic Equivalence [Electronic source] / N. Wei, X. Li // Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory. — 2014. — № 10 (1). — P. 103—138.
89. Wenman, M. Agonistic Democracy: Constituent Power in the Era of Globalisation / M. Wenman. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2013. — 334 p.
90. Winter, D. G. Leader appeal, leader performance, and the motive profiles of leaders and followers: A study of American presidents and elections / D. G. Winter // Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. — 1987. — № 52. — P. 196—202.
91. Wodak R. Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology / R. Wodak; M. Meyer // Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis. London : Sage, 2009. — P. 1—33.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIALS

92. Remarks by President Biden on the Third Anniversary of the January 6th Attack and Defending the Sacred Cause of American Democracy, 5 January, 2024.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2024/01/05/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-third-anniversary-of-the-january-6th-attack-and-defending-the-sacred-cause-of-american-democracy-blue-bell-pa/>

93. Remarks by President Biden and President Zelenskyy of Ukraine in Joint Press Conference, December 13, 2023. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2023/12/13/remarks-by-president-biden-and-president-zelenskyy-of-ukraine-in-joint-press-conference-2/>
94. Remarks by President Biden Ahead of the One-Year Anniversary of Russia's Brutal and Unprovoked Invasion of Ukraine, February 21, 2023. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2023/02/21/remarks-by-president-biden-ahead-of-the-one-year-anniversary-of-russias-brutal-and-unprovoked-invasion-of-ukraine/>
95. Remarks by President Biden on Fighting the COVID-19 Pandemic, September 9, 2021. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/09/09/remarks-by-president-biden-on-fighting-the-covid-19-pandemic-3/>
96. Remarks by President Biden on the School Shooting in Uvalde, Texas, May 24, 2022. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/05/24/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-school-shooting-in-uvalde-texas/>
97. Remarks by President Biden on the Continued Battle for the Soul of the Nation, September 1, 2022. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/09/01/remarks-by-president-bidenon-the-continued-battle-for-the-soul-of-the-nation/>
98. Remarks by President Biden on the United States' Response to Hamas's Terrorist Attacks Against Israel and Russia's Ongoing Brutal War Against Ukraine, October 20, 2023. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2023/10/20/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-unites-states-response->

to-hamass-terrorist-attacks-against-israel-and-russias-ongoing-brutal-war-against-ukraine/

99. Remarks by President Biden in Meeting with the Supply Chain Disruptions Task Force, December 22, 2021. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/12/22/remarks-by-president-biden-in-meeting-with-the-supply-chain-disruptions-task-force/>
100. Transcript: Joe Biden's DNC speech. <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/08/20/politics/biden-dnc-speech-transcript/index.html>
101. Remarks by President Biden at the Summit on Fire Prevention and Control, October 11, 2022. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/10/11/remarks-by-president-biden-at-the-summit-on-fire-prevention-and-control/>
102. Biden spells out what's at stake in Ukraine as conflict marks 1 year (ABC News), February 25, 2023. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ohO9aUlvies>
103. Remarks by President Biden at the Inaugural Ceremony of the Ninth Summit of the Americas, June 8, 2022. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/06/08/remarks-by-president-biden-at-the-inaugural-ceremony-of-the-ninth-summit-of-the-americas/>
104. Remarks by President Biden on Hurricane Fiona Response and Recovery Efforts, October 3, 2022. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/10/03/remarks-by-president-biden-on-hurricane-fiona-response-and-recovery-efforts/>
105. President Biden Delivers Remarks on International Women's Day. – March 08, 2021. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TYqKwcquxz8>
106. Remarks by President Biden at South Carolina State University's 2021 Fall Commencement Ceremony, December, 17, 2021. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/12/17/remarks-by-president-biden-at-south-carolina-state-universitys-2021-fall-commencement-ceremony/>

107. Remarks by President Biden at the Annual U.S.-ASEAN Summit. – November 12, 2022. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speechesremarks/2022/11/12/remarks-by-president-biden-at-the-annual-u-s-asean-summit2/>
108. Remarks by President Biden at a Pennsylvania Democratic Party Reception. – October 28, 2022. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speechesremarks/2022/10/28/remarks-by-president-biden-at-a-pennsylvania-democraticparty-reception/>
109. Remarks by President Biden at the Third Meeting of the White House Competition Council. – September 26, 2022. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speechesremarks/2022/09/26/remarks-by-president-biden-at-the-third-meeting-of-thewhite-house-competition-council/>
110. Remarks by President Biden on the Reported Death of Aleksey Navalny, February 16, 2024. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2024/02/16/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-reported-death-of-aleksey-navalny/>
111. Remarks by President Biden on the United Efforts of the Free World to Support the People of Ukraine, March 26, 2022. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/03/26/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-united-efforts-of-the-free-world-to-support-the-people-of-ukraine/>
112. Remarks by President Biden at a Campaign Event | Manchester, NH, March 12, 2024. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2024/03/12/remarks-by-president-biden-at-a-campaign-event-manchester-nh/>
113. Remarks by President Biden at a Campaign Event | Milwaukee, Wi, March 14, 2024. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2024/03/14/remarks-by-president-biden-at-a-campaign-event-milwaukee-wi-march-13-2024/>

114. Inaugural Address by President Joseph R. Biden, Jr, January 20, 2021.
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/01/20/inaugural-address-by-president-joseph-r-biden-jr/>
115. Remarks by President Biden on Gun Violence Prevention, April 8, 2021.
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/04/08/remarks-by-president-biden-on-gun-violence-prevention/>
116. White House COVID-19 Response Team, February 9, 2021.
<https://twitter.com/WHCOVIDResponse/status/1359195682888945665>
117. Remarks by President Biden in Press Conference. – June 13, 2021.
[https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefingroom/speeches-remarks/2021/06/13/remarks-by-president-biden-in-pressconference-2 /](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefingroom/speeches-remarks/2021/06/13/remarks-by-president-biden-in-pressconference-2/)
118. Joe Biden Holds a Press Conference in Geneva. – June 16, 2021.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WUgiD04O0Xg>
119. Interview with George Stephanopoulos of ABC News, August 9, 2021.
<https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/interview-with-george-stephanopoulos-abc-news-2>
Statement on Terror Attacks in Afghanistan. August 26, 2021.
<https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/august-26-2021-statement-terror-attacks-afghanistan>
120. Statement on Terror Attacks in Afghanistan. August 26, 2021.
<https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/august-26-2021-statement-terror-attacks-afghanistan>
121. State of the Union Address. March 1, 2022.
<https://millercenter.org/thepresidency/presidential-speeches/march-1-2022-state-union-address>
122. Remarks in Support of the People of Ukraine. March 26, 2022.
<https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/march-26-2022-remarks-support-people-ukraine>

123. Remarks by President Biden on the 100 Million Shot Goal, March 18, 2021.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/03/18/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-100-million-shot-goal/>

124. Remarks by President Biden on the Safer America Plan, August, 30. 2022.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/08/30/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-safer-america-plan/>

CAMERI

Магістерську дисертацію присвячено дослідженню лінгвістичного профілю 46-го президента США Джозефа Байдена. У роботі аналізуються різні вербальні засоби (лексичні, граматичні й синтаксичні), які формують лінгвістичний профіль американського політика, а також висвітлюються особливості реалізації комунікативних стратегій й тактик в політичному наративі президента.

Останніми роками, зі зростанням значення політики у суспільстві, у лінгвістичних дослідженнях дедалі більше уваги надається політичному дискурсу. Зараз мовознавці активно досліджують поняття «мовна особистість» й зокрема те, як політичні лідери формують норми спілкування та впливають на ширші етичні, соціальні та культурні стандарти.

Актуальність дослідження зумовлена тим, що проаналізований матеріал являє собою сучасну англійську мову, що використовується американським президентом у його виступах, а також необхідністю проведення комплексного дослідження мовного портрета Джозефа Байдена, що включає лінгвістичні особливості та використання маніпулятивних стратегій та тактик. Ретельне вивчення тенденцій, що формують політичний дискурс Джо Байдена, має вирішальне значення для опису його лінгвістичного профілю.

Мета дослідження – схарактеризувати лінгвістичний профіль сучасного американського політика Джо Байдена: виявити особливості його мовного стилю та методів впливу на дії та рішення аудиторії.

Завдання дослідження:

- дослідити теоретичні засади вивчення політичного дискурсу;
- вивчити специфіку понять «мовна особистість» та «мовний портрет», провести розмежування цих понять; розглянути конкретні засади створення мовного портрета політика;

- виявити і проаналізувати фактори формування мовної особистості Джо Байдена;
- проаналізувати лексичні, граматичні та стилістичні особливості індивідуального стилю Джо Байдена;
- дослідити маніпулятивні стратегії й тактики у політичному дискурсі;
- проаналізувати маніпулятивні стратегії й тактики у промовах Джо Байдена, виявити вербальні засоби їх реалізації.

Перший розділ присвячено вивченню складного поняття «політичний дискурс». Політичний дискурс має багатогранний характер і глибоко впливає на суспільство. Політичний дискурс характеризується своєю комунікативною природою, інституційністю та орієнтацією на динаміку влади. Він є інструментом утвердження влади, формування громадської думки та просування ідеологічних програм. Агонізм, агресія, театральність та орієнтація на майбутнє – одні з його визначальних рис.

Вивчення поняття «мовної особистості» включає дослідження зв'язку між мовою, культурою та поведінкою людини, того, як особистості формуються під впливом мов, які вони використовують і як вони самі їх формують. Мова не може існувати незалежно від культури, вони глибоко переплетені і впливають одне на одного.

У сфері політики аналіз мовної особистості здійснюється шляхом вивчення мовних характеристик, риторичних стилів і комунікативних стратегій політиків. Від консервативної до ліберальної риторики політики використовують мовні засоби для передачі повідомлень і впливу на громадську думку. Однак на сприйняття політичної риторики часто впливають зовнішні чинники, такі як висвітлення у ЗМІ та індивідуальні упередження, що підкреслює складність інтерпретації мовної особистості громадських діячів.

Також було проаналізовано чинники, що вплинули формування мовної особистості Джо Байдена. Майбутній президент зростав у родині, де панувала атмосфера підтримки і взаємної допомоги, завдяки чому Джо Байден отримав навички командної роботи, а також такі риси як товарииськість і співчуття.

Згідно з чисельними джерелами, Байден цінує думку усіх людей і прагне досягти консенсусу за допомогою відкритого діалогу.

Другий розділ присвячено дослідженню лінгвістичних особливостей лінгвістичного профілю Джо Байдена. На лексичному рівні він характеризується насамперед широкою представленістю суспільно-політичних, економічних, військових, медичних і правових термінів, що забезпечує ефективність спілкування, та низки оцінних лексичних одиниць із позитивною та негативною конотацією. Переважають лексичні одиниці з позитивною конотацією, що свідчить про бажання адміністрації Джо Байдена конструювати позитивний образ їхньої роботи.

У цьому дослідженні граматичний аспект лінгвістичного профілю політика аналізується через призму модальності. Використання модальних дієслів дозволяє Джо Байдену виразити готовність, відданість і здатність до дій. Примітно, що модальні дієслова переважно використовуються в позитивних формах для підтримки позитивного іміджу. Деонтичні модальні дієслова, такі як «will», часто використовуються для передачі намірів, бажання та зобов'язань президента щодо запланованих дій у його промовах.

Метафору слід виділити як один з найефективніших стилістичних засобів у політичній комунікації Джо Байдена, який в основному використовується для позитивного чи негативного навішування ярликів і оцінки окремих осіб, націй або подій як позитивно, так і негативно. Також, у промовах Байдена представлені інші стилістичні прийоми, такі як риторичні запитання, синтаксичний паралелізм і анафора, щоб посилити виразність своїх промов і забезпечити закарбування у пам'яті аудиторії ключової інформації. Крім того, у промовах Байдена було виявлено параномазію, епізевкис, алітерацію, які надають промовам ритмічності, допомагають акцентувати певну інформацію, що робить їх більш переконливими. Антитеза використовується для створення відчуття напруги чи терміновості.

У **третьому розділі** проаналізовано комунікативні стратегії й тактики в політичному дискурсі Джо Байдена. Виявлено, що домінує стратегія

створення іміджу. У рамках цієї стратегії застосовується тактика прямої позитивної оцінки роботи адміністрації Байдена, що реалізується з допомогою оцінної лексики з позитивною конотацією, зокрема так званих «блискучих загальностей», числівників, а також використання часу Present Perfect. Тактика солідарності, яка здебільшого реалізується з допомогою займенників *я/ми/наше (I/we/our)*, допомагає передати відчуття єднання і спільної мети, зміцнюючи зв'язок президента з народом. Тактика посилення на авторитети підсилює довіру до заяв та ініціатив Байдена. Застосовуючи тактику викладу особистого досвіду президент наближає себе до народу, викликаючи співчуття і довіру в аудиторії.

Політичні промови Джо Байдена також ґрунтуються на стратегії переконання. Аргументативні оцінки у виступах Джо Байдена служать для подання переконливих аргументів та доказів, що підтверджують його позицію. Вказівка на майбутнє і обіцянки передбачають формулювання бачення або прогнозу потенційних результатів роботи адміністрації Байдена з метою формування позитивного відношення аудиторії до стратегічних цілей та планів адміністрації. Тактика заклику до дії стимулює негайну реакцію аудиторії, спонукаючи її прийняти конкретні рішення. Ми схильні вважати, що промови Джо Байдена відображають комплексний підхід до реалізації цієї комунікативної стратегії. У політичних виступах Джо Байдена не лише викладаються докладні плани щодо вирішення кризових ситуацій усередині та за межами країни, але також підкреслюється постійна підтримка всіх верств американського суспільства, включаючи різноманітні меншини.

Також у промовах Байдена часто фігурує стратегія емоційного впливу, що реалізується тактикою апелювання до емоцій і тактикою звернення до комплексу моральних цінностей. Вони допомагають налагодити зв'язок зі слухачами на особистісному рівні, а також впливати на громадську думку, формулюючи повідомлення таким чином, щоб викликати сильну емоційну реакцію.

Байден час від часу вдається до стратегії дискредитації, щоб ефективно послабити позиції опонентів і зміцнити свої. Конфліктна тактика звинувачення використовується для публічного повідомлення про факт вчинення певних негативних дій, вказівки на відповідальність адресата за вчинення цієї. Звинувачення додатково посилюється тактикою викриття нерозкритої інформації або тактикою «всеохопної правди» для зміцнення довіри до Байдена й закріплення негативного ставлення до об'єкта дискредитації. Незважаючи на те, що Байден час від часу вдається до тактик образи й погрози, тактика безособового звинувачення також нерідко використовується з метою критики певних дій без прямого згадування конкретних осіб чи організацій, що свідчить про дипломатичний підхід до вирішення спірних питань.

Загалом Джо Байдена можна охарактеризувати як лідера зі стратегічним підходом до спілкування, що пріоритизує досягнення консенсусу й активне налагодження зв'язку з народом як на інтелектуальному, так і на емоційному рівні. Джо Байден намагається зосереджувати всі свої зусилля на тому, щоб американське суспільство усвідомило існуючі проблеми та розуміло які конкретні дії необхідні для їх негайного вирішення.

Це дослідження не охоплює всіх аспектів опису лінгвістичного профілю американського політика. На основі цієї роботи можна провести подальшу розробку мовних портретів різних політиків США. Наприклад, результати нашого дослідження можуть бути використані для порівняння стилю спілкування Джо Байдена із стилями інших політичних діячів або попередніх президентів США.