



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2024.1.6>

UDC 811.111:32  
LBC 81.432.1-55



Submitted: 30.06.2023  
Accepted: 01.12.2023

## DYNAMICS OF AMERICAN POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF THE 20<sup>th</sup> – EARLY 21<sup>st</sup> CENTURIES <sup>1</sup>

**Olga L. Bessonova**

Donetsk State University, Donetsk, Russia

**Irina V. Fatianova**

Donetsk State University, Donetsk, Russia

**Abstract.** The article addresses dynamics of conceptual space and communicative organization of the American political discourse in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. The research objective is to identify transformations in the content of universal and nationally-marked concepts, as well as verbal modification of communicative strategies and tactics in the American political discourse of the periods under study. The main research methods applied are discourse, conceptual, semantic, and contextual analysis. The sampling corpus incorporates 662 public speeches of American presidents. The speeches under analysis belong to the ritual, orientational, and agonal genres of the political discourse. The main discourse-forming and nationally-marked concepts, features of the communicative structure of the American political discourse are established. The analysis of the metaphorical system as a way of realizing the intention in the American political discourse is carried out. The main types of conceptual metaphor, representing the discourse-forming concepts of the American political discourse are considered. The American political discourse conceptual space is more prone to transformations than its communicative structure in the studied timeframe. The nationally-marked concepts tend to be more dynamic than the universal discourse-forming concepts. The conceptual dynamism of the nationally-marked concepts manifests itself in the prevalence of the dominant features and the lacunarity at different stages of the American linguo-cultural community existence. The nationally-marked concepts components related to the historical and socio-cultural aspects of the speaking community life are brought into the open in the speeches of American presidents as transmitters of the national cultural values and role-status configurations in the political discourse of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries.

**Key words:** political discourse, discourse-forming concept, nationally-marked concept, conceptual metaphor, communicative strategy, communicative tactic, diachronic synchrony.

**Citation.** Bessonova O.L., Fatianova I.V. Dynamics of American Political Discourse of the 20<sup>th</sup> – Early 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], 2024, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 69-83. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2024.1.6>

УДК 811.111:32  
ББК 81.432.1-55

Дата поступления статьи: 30.06.2023  
Дата принятия статьи: 01.12.2023

## ДИНАМИКА АМЕРИКАНСКОГО ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА XX – НАЧАЛА XXI ВЕКА <sup>1</sup>

**Ольга Леонидовна Бессонова**

Донецкий государственный университет, г. Донецк, Россия

**Ирина Валерьевна Фатьянова**

Донецкий государственный университет, г. Донецк, Россия

**Аннотация.** Статья посвящена рассмотрению динамики лингвокогнитивной и коммуникативной организации американского политического дискурса XX – начала XXI века. Цель исследования – установить и

описать трансформации в структуре универсальных и национально-маркированных концептов, а также изменения в вербальной репрезентации коммуникативных стратегий и тактик в американском политическом дискурсе изучаемых периодов. Основными методами исследования послужили дискурсивный, концептуальный, семантический и контекстуальный анализ. Эмпирический корпус составили 662 публичных выступления американских президентов. Анализируемые речи относятся к ритуальному, ориентационному и агональному жанрам политического дискурса. Установлены дискурсообразующие и национально-маркированные концепты, особенности коммуникативной организации американского политического дискурса. Проведен анализ системы метафор как средств реализации интенции в американском политическом дискурсе. Концептосфера американского политического дискурса, представленная системой дискурсообразующих и национально-маркированных концептов, подвержена трансформациям по сравнению с коммуникативной организацией данного типа дискурса. Дискурсообразующие концепты регулярно актуализируются в текстах всех жанров публичных выступлений президентов США. Национально-маркированные концепты демонстрируют большую динамику, что проявляется в доминировании актуальных когнитивных признаков и лакуарности на определенных этапах развития американского лингвокультурного сообщества. В публичных выступлениях президентов США как носителей соответствующей культуры и статусно-ролевых отношений в XX – начале XXI в. приоритетны те компоненты национально-маркированных концептов, которые связаны с историческими и социокультурными аспектами жизни американского лингвокультурного сообщества.

**Ключевые слова:** политический дискурс, дискурсообразующий концепт, национально-маркированный концепт, концептуальная метафора, коммуникативная стратегия, коммуникативная тактика, диахроническая синхрония.

**Цитирование.** Бессонова О. Л., Фатьянова И. В. Динамика американского политического дискурса XX – начала XXI века // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 2, Языкознание. – 2024. – Т. 23, № 1. – С. 69–83. – (На англ. яз.). –DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2024.1.6>

## Introduction

A comprehensive study of transformations in the American political discourse (hereinafter – APD) in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries based on the American presidents' public speeches is one of the topical issues of political linguistics.

In the modern APD research the emphasis is made on the important role of various linguistic means, in particular, metaphors [Kalinin, 2021; Pisarenkov, 2021], euphemisms [Kondratenko, 2021], neologisms [Nazarova, 2021], ideologemes [Mikhaylovskaya, 2023], specialised terminology [Sokolova, 2021]. APD has been approached in terms of evaluative utterances that underlie certain political beliefs and convictions [Vlasova, 2021; Kolesnikova, Kozlova, 2023; Kononova, Melnichuk, 2021; Sokolova, 2021], politicians' personal discourse of [Margaryan, 2022; Trusova, 2022], etc. A significant number of linguistic insights into political discourse are aimed at identifying its manipulative features, manifesting themselves in the choice of certain communicative strategies and tactics [Volkova, Panchenko, 2022; D'yachenko, 2021; Ust'yantseva, 2022; Chepurnaya, 2022]. Exploring the APD functioning, linguists focus on its linguo-cognitive, linguo-cultural, and linguo-

pragmatic aspects and features [Makurova, 2021; Mukhamatshin, 2021; Rubtsov, 2021; Chanturidze, 2020; Yasakova, 2022]. It should be pointed out, that the majority of the researches of political discourse are text-centric, which means that the use of linguistic means in the discourse is brought into the open, with supporting extralinguistic factors being neglected.

Thus, it seems appropriate to consider APD as a systemic dynamic phenomenon that undergoes changes accounted for by the socio-political and linguo-cultural situation. The relevance of the work is determined by the profound integrated approach to the study of the correlation between cognitive, rhetorical, and axiological aspects of APD. Revealing the role of language mechanisms in the context of media war in the present-day turbulent world also makes the suggested approach topical.

APD is treated as a form of social interaction determined by specific values and social norms, conventions and social practices, limited and influenced by specific institutional structures in society and real historical processes. The inclusion of a historical and social perspective in the APD treatment makes it possible to better reflect the dynamics of the social nature of a linguistic sign

at any level and to consider it as a result of social processes motivated by the unity of form and meaning. The APD institutional facet determines the significance of the individual at power. The APD most important characteristic feature is its ethno-cultural specificity, which is embedded in the culturally relevant communicative behaviour and values worldview of the language community. The APD extralinguistic component, along with cognitive and communicative activity, includes the speakers' values. Communication in APD centers around specific value concepts, which are embedded in evaluative structures. It is determined by a specific type of mentality relevant for political discourse. The research addresses American presidents' public speeches. It should be pointed out that the speech genre in the political discourse is characterized by a great variety of forms, thus accurately providing information that reflects the linguo-cultural community mentality and values system, influenced by the time and dominant ideology. The integrated approach to the study of APD statics and dynamics in the period of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries makes it possible to reveal transformations in its conceptual space and communicative structure.

The research objective is to identify and describe the dynamics in the conceptual space and the communicative organization of the APD in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. To reach the objective, a number of tasks have been set, among which are to investigate the specifics of US presidents' political speeches at assorted historical stages and to compare the specific features with the established rules for public speeches of the US head of state, as well as to compare with the speech tradition of the American political rhetoric.

### Material and methods

The empirical corpus is constituted by the texts of official transcripts of US presidents' speeches presented on the website *Millercenter.org: Presidential speeches*. In total, 662 public speeches have been subjected to the analysis. The speeches under study belong to the ritual (80), orientational (469) and agonal (113) genres of political discourse.

The empirical corpus incorporates 509 public speeches by the 20<sup>th</sup> century US presidents

(Th. Roosevelt, W.H. Taft, Th.W. Wilson, W.G. Harding, J.C. Coolidge Jr., H.C. Hoover, F.D. Roosevelt, H.S. Truman, D.D. Eisenhower, J.F. Kennedy, L.B. Johnson, R.M. Nixon, G.F. Ford Jr., J.E. Carter Jr., R.W. Reagan, G.H.W. Bush, W.J. "Bill" Clinton). They are referred to the *ritual* (66), *orientational* (360) and *agonal* (83) APD genres, including: Inaugural Address (23), Traditional Presidential Address (12), Anniversary Speech (21), Farewell Address (7), Response to the Allegations (3), Address on Domestic Policy (103), Address on U.S. Foreign Policy (131), Presidents message to other countries (13), Presidents speech at conferences of various levels (12), State of the Union Address (70), Campaign Speech (11), Press Conference (30), Nominee Acceptance Speech (22), Presidential Debate (26), Special Message to the Congress on Urgent National Needs (2), Address to Joint Session of Congress (20), Address to the U.N. General Assembly (10), Address to Congress Requesting a Declaration of War (3).

The empirical corpus also includes 153 speeches by the early 21<sup>st</sup> century American presidents (G.W. Bush, B.H. Obama II, D.J. Trump). They are assigned to the following APD genres: *ritual* (14, including 5 transcripts of Inaugural Address, 6 Anniversary Speeches, 2 transcripts of Farewell Address и 1 Response to the Allegations); *orientational* (109, Address on Domestic Policy (48), Address on U.S. Foreign Policy (20), Presidents message to other countries (11), Presidents speech at conferences of various levels (3), State of the Union Address (17), Campaign Speech (2), Press Conference (8)); *agonal* (30, Nominee Acceptance Speech (4), Presidential Debate (16), Address to Joint Session of Congress (5), Address to the UN General Assembly (5)).

In both the 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, most of the presidential speeches deal with domestic and foreign policy. Particularly noteworthy are the ones focused on military operations on the territory of other states, in which the US military takes an active part. Along with the underlined topics, economic and migration problems, issues of reforming and improving the sphere of education and medicine are also coming to the fore in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century. The focus of politicians is the problems of state security, various types of terrorism and ways to

counter extremist activities, cyber security, environmental protection issues.

In order to achieve accurate results, we applied relevant quantitative and qualitative methods to the analysis of the selected political speeches, among them are componential, contextual, conceptual, compositional, linguo-stylistic, and discourse analysis. At the last stage of the analysis, the comparative method was employed to describe the results obtained. Quantitative analysis was used to determine the frequency value of means expressing discourse-forming and nationally-marked concepts, the correlation of communicative strategies and tactics of the APD in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, and to establish the frequency of means of their expression.

## Results and discussion

### *Conceptual space of the American political discourse in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries*

Within the framework of this study, the concept as a key notion of cognitive linguistics is viewed from linguo-cognitive and linguo-cultural points of view [Karasik, 2002]. The concept is treated as a complex, dynamic, structural and semantic, ethnically and culturally determined mental unit of consciousness, which acts as a method and result of knowledge categorization and which can be expressed by language means [Popova, Sternin, 2007].

In the speeches under study we have identified contexts with actualized discourse-forming and nationally-marked APD concepts. The APD conceptual space in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries is shaped by such universal discourse-forming concepts as POLITICS, STATE, PEOPLE, POWER, and also by nationally-marked concepts as AMERICA, FREEDOM, NATIONALISM / PATRIOTISM, DEMOCRACY, EQUALITY, REVOLUTION, THE GREAT DEPRESSION, WAR, COLD WAR, CRISIS, PRESIDENT, THE FIRST LADY, PROSPERITY, FEMINISM, SECURITY, TERRORISM. The nationally-marked concepts can acquire ethnically relevant content, reflect the features of the national mentality, thus revealing certain national specificity.

### *Universal discourse-forming concepts of APD in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries*

Discourse-forming concepts POLITICS, STATE, PEOPLE, POWER are the most significant in the conceptual sphere of the APD in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. These concepts are viewed as complex mental formations in the minds of representatives of a linguistic community. Their notional-evaluative and figurative-evaluative constituents can be verbalized by various language units. The semantic space of the concept POLITICS tends to be extended in the APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. The most frequent designations of this concept are *politics, policy, government, administration, organization, management*. In the early 21<sup>st</sup> century APD, the words *politics, government, administration, policy, authority* are characterized by the highest frequency value. Some designations expressing the concept POLITICS (for instance, *polity, realpolitik*) go out of use, and the new ones (for example, *campaign, black power, white power, soft power*) appear. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century APD, most concepts verbalize the segments POLITICAL VIEWS / BELIEFS and STATE OF POLITICAL AFFAIRS. In the early 21<sup>st</sup> century, the segments POWER IN PUBLIC LIFE and INFLUENCE are foregrounded. This observation reflects close connection of the concept POLITICS with the discourse-forming concepts POWER and STATE, as well as the nationally-marked concepts DEMOCRACY, FREEDOM, AMERICA.

In the APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries the concept POLITICS is expressed by various language units. The most frequent means are ideologemes, semantic repetition, syntactic parallelism, conceptual metaphor. American presidents, in their speeches on the country's foreign and domestic policy, the reconsideration of which entails the need to resolve a number of political, economic, social and moral-ethical issues, actively use ideologemes, the content of which varies depending on their contextual use:

(1) We must always be wary of those who with sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal preach the **ism of appeasement** (F.D. Roosevelt, Jan. 6, 1941).

Semantic repetition and syntactic parallelism are productive means of evoking an emotional response of the audience. Their use enhances the

influence on the addressee and helps to increase the statement illocutionary effect:

(2) **This isn't political grandstanding. This isn't class warfare. This is simple math. This is simple math. These are real choices. These are real choices** that we've got to make (B. Obama, Sept. 8, 2011).

Conceptual metaphor, and its structural type (see: [Lakoff, Johnson, 1980]) with source-domains POWER, WAR, THEATER, BUSINESS, PROFESSION and SPORT has turned out to be a productive way of representing the concept POLITICS in the APD in both the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. In both periods, the militaristic metaphor POLITICS is WAR prevails, which points out to the fierce competition not only among politicians, but also in a society as a whole. The political system is imbued with the spirit of militarism and is comprehended in terms of war with everyone and against everyone, which can be explained by the essence of the political discourse itself, i.e. the struggle for power:

(3) We will be ever vigilant and never vulnerable, and **we will fight our wars against** poverty, ignorance, and injustice – for those are the enemies against which our forces can be honorably marshaled (J. Carter, Jan. 20, 1977);

(4) I was proud to help **lead the fight** in Congress that led to the most sweeping ethics reform since Watergate (B. Obama, Sept. 26, 2008).

As a universal discourse-forming concept of the APD in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, the concept POLITICS intersects with such discourse-forming concepts as POWER, STATE, PEOPLE and such nationally-marked concepts as AMERICA, DEMOCRACY, FREEDOM, PRESIDENT.

The main semantic features in the invariant model of the concept STATE in English are *country, government, official ceremony, the US*. In the APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries the conceptual space of STATE gets extended at the expense of such semantic features as *territory, political and social organizations, bodies of power, functions, ideology, symbols, religion and permanent population*.

The most frequently used language means, verbalizing this concept are epithets and proper names, metonymy, metaphors, semantic repetitions, syntactic parallelism, anaphora.

Epithets and proper names are a powerful tool for creating the required background of the speech, and politicians refer to them as an evaluative means to attract the audience attention:

(5) Because of what **America** is and what **America** has done, **a firmer courage, a higher hope, inspires the heart of all humanity** (C. Coolidge, Mar. 4, 1925).

Metonymy and metaphor illustrate the peculiarities of the worldview of the American linguo-cultural community in both historical periods:

(6) **Our harvests** are bountiful, **our factories** flourish, **our homes** are safe, **our defenses** are secure (L.B. Johnson, Nov. 28, 1963);

(7) States like these and their terrorist allies constitute **an axis of evil**, arming to threaten the peace of the world (G.W. Bush, Jan. 29, 2002).

The combination of semantic repetition, syntactic parallelism, anaphora is an emotional figurative device, having definite specificity and certain parameters of impact, which makes it possible to determine the discourse-forming (PEOPLE and STATE) and the nationally-marked (AMERICA, NATIONALISM / PATRIOTISM, PROSPERITY) concepts, as well as strategies (of manipulation) and tactics (of cooperation and promising), characteristic of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries APD:

(8) **Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams**, will define our American destiny. And **your courage and goodness and love** will forever guide us along the way. Together, **We Will Make America Strong Again. We Will Make America Wealthy Again** (D. Trump, Jan. 20, 2017).

The analysis of the verbalizers of the concept STATE enables to state its close connection with both the discourse-forming concepts POLITICS, POWER, PEOPLE, and with the nationally-marked concepts DEMOCRACY and NATION. Thus, the concept STATE in the APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries is distinguished by its cognitive features dynamic and a variety of linguistic descriptions and interpretation. The features *large family, traditional family, extended family* of the concept STATE, which prevail in the 20<sup>th</sup> century APD, become irrelevant in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century APD. The conceptual features *prestigious profession / occupation / jobs*,

*residence, sexual orientation* come to the fore in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century APD.

The prevalent number of contexts, that verbalize the concept PEOPLE in the 20<sup>th</sup> century APD, actualize the segments of INDIVIDUALS and FAMILY. In the early 21<sup>st</sup> century APD, the segments POLITICAL SUBJECT / OBJECT and RELATIONS are dominant, which is due to a number of factors, among which the worldview of the speaking community, transformations in the way of life, revision of traditional values, as well as the opposition of power and people, personality and mass (crowds), which manifests itself in close connection of the concept PEOPLE with the concepts POLITICS, POWER and STATE.

The peculiarities in verbalizing the figurative-evaluative constituent of the concept PEOPLE are observed in the choice and frequency of linguistic means. It is important to highlight that the most productive means are phraseological units, proverbs and sayings, proper names, metonymy, epithets, euphemisms, combination of anaphora, semantic repetition and syntactic parallelism.

American presidents quite often resort to metaphors, as well as to phraseological units in their speeches. Consequently, at first glance, the vocabulary is saturated with political, legal, economic terms, however, at the same time, it is expressive. Since most political speeches are targeted to the public at large, expressive means help to build up a special emotional atmosphere and mood, and demonstrate the speaker's eloquence. In the long run, it adds up to achieving the APD main goal, i.e. manipulation, persuasion, and winning the addressee.

It can be noted that new or modified phraseological units have constantly appeared and are appearing in the APD, with political realia being the most productive source of new phraseological units. Among them, the communicative type of phraseological units can be distinguished:

(9) **America is not anything if it consists of each of us. It is something only if it consists of all of us** (W. Wilson, Jan. 29, 1916).

The use of proper names of outstanding political leaders of the past and present adds up symbolism to the concept PEOPLE. Such anthroponyms cause the addressee's strong associations and corresponding emotions, which

means that proper names can perform a regulatory-influencing function.

For example, it is typical of American presidents to use the names of their predecessors in order to express tribute, evaluate successes, achievements, inspire citizens with the high example of national heroes, or, conversely, criticize the actions of a politician:

(10) We are the party of **Roosevelt**. We are the party of **Kennedy**. So, don't tell me that Democrats won't defend this country... (B. Obama, Aug. 28, 2008).

In the example (10), Barack Obama uses the names of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John Fitzgerald Kennedy, identifying himself with prominent leaders, which enables positive evaluation of the capabilities of the newly elected president by the recipient, as Barack Obama points to his belonging to the same political party.

Another language means that represents the figurative-evaluative constituent of the concept PEOPLE is metonymy. At the conceptual level, the basis for such a trope is the activation of abstract concepts such as PART-WHOLE, CAUSE-RESULT, which serve to model the fundamental perceptual invariants of cognition and act as those topological constants that organize human interaction with the environment.

(11) I would fain believe that I am speaking for the silent mass of mankind everywhere who have as yet had no place or opportunity to speak their **real hearts** out concerning the death and ruin they see... (W. Wilson, Apr. 19, 1916).

The function of an epithet, which verbalizes figurative-evaluative constituent of the concept PEOPLE, is performed by adjectives. This trope makes the speech expressive. Resorting to epithets, the president can present the object in a favourable light. The analysis of the research material shows that in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries APD, the American people are presented as a brave, peace-loving, noble, invincible, prosperous and most powerful nation on Earth:

(12) **These gallant men** in blue and gray sit all about us here (W. Wilson, May 30, 1914).

Another device of figurative interpretation of the concept PEOPLE is euphemism. This trope is a figurative means that in natural speech serves

to replace straightforward, rude or unacceptable for any reasons names of phenomenon with a softer form of the denotation of this phenomenon. As political correctness is an integral component of the ideology of modern American society and political culture, euphemisms, being a universal linguistic phenomenon, are usually determined by socio-historical, moral and ethical norms, national and linguistic traditions of the linguistic community:

(13) Our nation is at war against a far-reaching **network of violence and hatred** (B. Obama, Jan. 20, 2009).

To update the concept PEOPLE at the syntactic level, combination of anaphora, semantic repetition and syntactic parallelism are used. Repetition fulfills the function of intensifying, increasing the emotional background of the speech. Repeating words helps to mount tension, which, in turn, reflects the emotional dynamic:

(14) **Washington flourished, but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered, but the jobs left and the factories closed.** <...> The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country. <...> **Their victories** have not been **your victories**. **Their triumphs** have not been **your triumphs** (D. Trump, Jan. 20, 2017).

These language means are aimed at forming the addresser-addressee configuration and the image of a citizen in the socio-political system as reflected in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries APD.

The most productive means of expressing the universal discourse-forming concept PEOPLE is cognitive metaphor of different types. It is important to highlight prevalence of structural and ontological metaphors. The productive metaphorical patterns are as follows: PEOPLE are UNITY, PEOPLE are FEELINGS and EMOTIONS, PEOPLE are DEMOCRACY, PEOPLE are FORCE.

The following example demonstrates one of the most productive pattern, which is PEOPLE are UNITY:

(15) **We are bound together** by the most powerful of all ties, our fervent love for freedom and independence, which knows no homeland but the human heart (G. Ford, Aug. 1, 1975).

In the APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, the invariant model of the concept POWER in

English is associated with the semantic features **control, ability, authority, country, influence**. The segments CONTROL and AUTHORITY in the structure of the concept POWER are more prominent in the APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, while in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century APD the verbalizers of the segments COUNTRY and INFLUENCE come to the fore. This observation can be explained by new challenges of time, among which is the changing role of the state on the world arena, the development of mass media, as well as the emergence of a number of controversial issues, in which the interests of world powers may collide.

The most productive means of expressing the concept POWER in the APD are metonymy, phraseological units, and epithets. The above-mentioned language means in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries APD add up to the expressiveness and imagery in presenting the information:

(16) It is the story of a new world that became a friend and liberator of the old, a story of a slave-holding society that became a servant of freedom, **the story of a power** that went into the world to protect but not possess, to defend but not to conquer (G.W. Bush, Jan. 20, 2001);

(17) **No evil force** on Earth can match **the noble power** and **righteous glory** of the American warrior (D. Trump, June 13, 2020).

The analysis of the metaphorical actualization of the figurative-evaluative constituent in the concept POWER shows that the most numerous in the APD of both periods are ontological metaphors with such source domains as an unspecified object (an object of desire, a trophy), a material object / phenomenon / artifact (mechanism, vehicle, building, tool), container, destination, living being. Another frequently used type of conceptual metaphors in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries APD is the structural one. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century APD the metaphorical pattern POWER is DEMOCRACY prevails. In the APD of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century there appears a new pattern, which is POWER is STRUGGLE:

(18) These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into chaos and retreat. But they have failed. **Our country is strong.** <...> **Today, our nation saw evil – the very worst of human nature – and we responded with the best of America** (G.W. Bush, Sept. 12, 2002).

*Nationally-marked concepts in APD  
of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries*

Universal discourse-forming and nationally-marked concepts play an important role in the formation and understanding of the surrounding reality, which is modelled through interpretation of expressions used by the heads of state in their speeches. The conceptual space of the APD in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries can be represented as a multi-level construct with a complex structure, containing the concepts, notions and associations of the cultural community about the surrounding world at different levels of categorization, including universal and nationally-marked ones. The latter reflect the features of the linguo-cultural worldview and are the reason of conceptual and linguistic lacunarity. Certain universal concepts, for example, FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY, AMERICA, can acquire ethnically relevant content, reflect the features of the national mentality, thus acquiring a certain national specificity:

(19) **Our democracy** must be not only the envy of the world but the engine of our own renewal. **To renew America**, we must revitalize our democracy (B. Clinton, Jan. 20, 1993).

The APD nationally-marked concepts can be treated as micro conceptual sphere within the

framework of the political conceptual sphere. In public speeches of US presidents, the most frequent concept is AMERICA and its derivatives, since the presidential speech is characterized by a high degree of influence, persuasion, and is often friendly and promising. In it, the president addresses the most understandable and traditional values of the speaking community. The classification of nationally-marked concepts according to their frequency value in the assorted historical stages is presented in Table 1.

Socio-political and cultural information is stored in the social memory of the speaking community. At each historical stage, as components of the national worldview concepts do not have the same degree of relevance in speech-mental activity (see Table 1). Each stage in the life of the nation is characterized by changes in the political and sociocultural situation, and, consequently, the national and conceptual linguistic worldviews are updated. Thus, certain concepts are communicatively foregrounded by the nation. In Table 1, such concepts are marked with (+) as collectively conscious and reflecting extralinguistic realia of public interest. The concepts marked with (-), though being part of the national conceptual sphere, at a certain cultural and historical period are not accepted collectively. They are not social in demand due to the irrelevance of the phenomena of reality that they reflect.

**Table 1. Nationally-marked concepts in the American political discourse of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries**

Concept	1900–1940	1940–1970	1970–2000	2000–2019
AMERICA	+	+	+	+
AMERICAN PROMISE	–	+	+	+
AMERICAN SPIRIT	+	+	+	+
AMERICAN DREAM	+	+	+	+
REVOLUTION	+	–	–	+
THE GREAT DEPRESSION	+	+	–	–
FREEDOM	+	+	+	+
DEMOCRACY	+	+	+	+
EQUALITY	+	+	+	+
NATIONALISM / PATRIOTISM	+	+	+	+
WAR	+	+	+	+
COLD WAR	–	+	+	–
CRISIS	–	+	+	+
PRESIDENT	+	+	+	+
THE FIRST LADY	–	+	+	–
PROSPERITY	+	+	+	+
FEMINISM	–	+	+	+
SECURITY	+	+	+	+
TERRORISM	–	–	+	+



Nationally-marked concepts are in high demand in the political discourse of the United States, as they simplify the electorate mental subjective evaluation of the government bodies' activities, and, on the other hand, make it easier for politicians to influence their target audience. Nationally-marked concepts form the basis of socio-political institutions and have a great generative force due to their wide-scope semantics. As the main mental units, they establish the political worldview of the American community.

### *Communicative organization of APD in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries*

The analysis of the APD in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries as a cognitive-communicative system addresses its cognitive and socio-pragmatic aspects. The former deals with the transfer of ideas and beliefs as reflected in the language use. The latter focuses on the interaction of communicants in certain socio-cultural contexts and situations. The socio-pragmatic aspect is implemented through a combination of strategies and tactics that organize the perception and interpretation of the text by the addressee. It brings into the open the intentionality of speech, reflected in the goals of the communicants. Politicians actualize their systems of values, assessments of information presented and in some cases imposed on the target audience. The factors mentioned above determine the ideological orientation of the political discourse.

In the APD of the periods under study the interaction between the addresser and the addressee can be represented with configuration models. These models determine the nature of communication and are the main factors in choosing the forms and strategies of communication:

- 1) addresser (president) – addressee (US citizens);
- 2) addresser (president) – addressee (world community);
- 3) addresser (president) – addressee (political supporters);
- 4) addresser (president) – addressee (political opponents);
- 5) addresser (president) – addressee (Congress).

In these models, the addresser plays a corrective role in the selection of strategies and means of argumentation. A type of linguistic personality, striving for persuasion, conquest, coercion and demonstrating dominance is realized:

(20) In Hawaii **our aim** must be to develop the Territory **on the traditional American lines. We do not wish** a region of large estates tilled by cheap labor; **we wish** a healthy American community of men who themselves till the farms they own. <...> **The land policy should as nearly as possible be modeled on our homestead system** (Th. Roosevelt, Dec. 3, 1901);

(21) **We were united by our conviction that America was the world's most exceptional country, blessed with the most incredible heroes, and that this was a land worth defending with our very last breath** (D. Trump, Sept. 11, 2020).

The strategic use of linguistic means in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries APD is aimed at creating and forming a special type of consciousness, i.e. mass consciousness, which absorbs individual consciousness and results in the use of manipulation as a strategy that has an indirect, but very significant impact on the mentality of people.

In the APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, this strategy is implemented in 19 tactics: *“analysis-plus”, “analysis-minus”, accusation, impersonal accusation, denunciation, threat, presentation, self-presentation, rejection of criticism, self-justification, motivation, cooperation, disengagement, informing, promising, prediction, warning, ironization, provocation* (see Table 2). The minimum frequency of implementation of tactics is marked with (+), the average is marked with (++) , the maximum frequency is represented with (+++). The absence of tactics for implementing a strategy at a certain historical stage is marked with (–).

The *“analysis-plus”, inducement, promise, and warning tactics* are prevalent in the 20<sup>th</sup> century APD. In the early 21<sup>st</sup> century APD, the set of tactics that implement the manipulative strategy has extended. The *tactics of “analysis-minus”, accusation, threat, disengagement, promising, prediction, warning, and provocation* come to the fore. The manipulative strategy is mainly expressed by conceptual metaphors, as well as appellatives, syntactically simple sentences, inversion. It is aimed at

Table 2. Communicative tactics realizing the strategy of manipulation in APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries

№	Tactic	20 <sup>th</sup> century	Early 21 <sup>st</sup> century
1	“analysis-plus”	+	++
2	“analysis-minus”	+	–
3	accusation	+	–
4	impersonal accusation	+	–
5	denunciation	+	++
6	threat	++	+++
7	presentation	+	+
8	self-presentation	+	++
9	rejection of criticism	+	+
10	self-justification	+	+
11	motivation	+	++
12	cooperation	+	++
13	disengagement	+	++
14	informing	+	+
15	promising	+	++
16	prediction	+	++
17	warning	+	++
18	ironization	+	+
19	provocation	+	++

increasing the influence on the mass listener subconscious attitude.

Manipulation is revealed in a high density of words representing the key nationally-marked concepts AMERICA, FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY and the discourse-forming concept PEOPLE:

(22) Through much of the last century, **America’s faith in freedom and democracy was a rock in a raging sea. Now it is a seed upon the wind, taking root in many nations. Our democratic faith is more than the creed of our country**, it is the **inborn hope of our humanity**, an ideal we carry but do not own, a trust we bear and pass along. And even after nearly 225 years, we have a long way yet to travel (G.W. Bush, Jan. 20, 2001).

Another strategy that manifests itself in the APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries is the

strategy of pressure. It is viewed as communicative influence aimed at forcing the addressee to take actions, which are necessary for the addresser, but undesirable for the addressee. The strategy of pressure is approached as a goal-oriented destructive communicative behaviour. It is implemented in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries APD by means of 10 tactics: *denunciation, order, threat, accusation, inducement, “creating the image of the enemy”, insult, distancing, demarcation, emotional impact* (Table 3).

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century APD, the main tactics for implementing the strategy of pressure are those of *threat, accusation*, and *“creating the image of the enemy”*. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century APD, the above-mentioned tactics are relevant, too,

Table 3. Communicative tactics realizing the strategy of pressure in APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries

№	Tactic	20 <sup>th</sup> century	Early 21 <sup>st</sup> century
1	denunciation	+	++
2	order	+	+++
3	threat	++	++
4	accusation	++	++
5	inducement	+	+
6	“creating the image of the enemy”	+++	+++
7	insult	–	+
8	distancing	+	+
9	demarcation	–	+
10	emotional impact	+	+++

as well as the new tactic of *demarcation, of accusation, order, inducement, and emotional impact*, which turn out to be the most frequent.

These tactics are realized within the framework of complex sentences by means of syntactic parallelism, modal verbs, and semantic repetition. This is a popular technique of speech manipulation and pressure, and political pressure in particular. It seems to be an effective way of achieving the desirable effect, influencing the tonality and melody of the text space in a special way, subconsciously affecting the opinion and choice of the addressee:

(23) **If the Iraqi regime wishes peace**, it will immediately and unconditionally forswear, disclose, and remove or destroy all weapons of mass destruction, long-range missiles, and all related material. **If the Iraqi regime wishes peace**, it will immediately end all support for terrorism and act to suppress it, as all states are required to do by U.N. Security Council resolutions (G.W. Bush, Sept. 12, 2002).

Communicative strategies of manipulation and pressure prove to be universal for the APD of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. The difference manifests itself in the choice of speech techniques, which depend on the characteristics of historical development, foreign policy, socio-economic situation, linguo-cultural specificity of the speaking community worldview, as well as behavioural stereotypes, the president's social status as guarantor of the US Constitution.

As compared to the strategy of pressure, manipulation appears to be more frequent in the communicative organization of the APD in both the 20<sup>th</sup> and in early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century APD, the addresser (i.e. the president) positions himself more clearly as a subject of power, but not the official performing a nominal function. It is revealed in the presidential speech through demonstration of the politician's inner world, his religion and worldview, material and spiritual values, as well as his communicative intentions. Thus, the presidential rhetoric reflects the political and speech culture of the American society, and represents different opinions, social views of certain social groups and strata, as well as individuals in power.

## Conclusions

A comprehensive study of the APD dynamic in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, updated in the presidents' public speeches, made it possible to establish the transformations in its conceptual space and communicative organization, accounted for by the relevant political and socio-cultural context. The synchronous – diachronic perspective in the APD analysis reflects its dynamic nature, caused by discourse functioning in a particular society and by the pragmatic and genre specificity of the communicative context. The APD conceptual space, incorporating a system of discourse-forming and nationally-marked concepts, is more prone to transformations than the communicative organization of this type of discourse.

The basis of the APD semantic space in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries is a set of the universal discourse-forming concepts POLITICS, STATE, POWER, and PEOPLE, and the nationally-marked concepts AMERICA, FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY, COLD WAR, PRESIDENT, THE FIRST LADY, CRISIS, SECURITY, TERRORISM.

Discourse-forming concepts are regularly verbalized in all genres of public speeches of US presidents in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. Nationally-marked concepts demonstrate more dynamic, which is manifested in the dominance of some actual cognitive features and lacunarity of the other ones at certain stages in the development of the American linguo-cultural community.

In the APD the dynamic of the core and peripheral conceptual features, as well as their key words is traced. The most important trends and characteristic features in the American presidential speech are identified, caused by alterations in the landmarks of the present-day American society. It is directly reflected in the selection of lexical, syntactic, and stylistic means of expressing discourse-forming and nationally-marked concepts.

The trend towards an increase in the number of conceptual features of discourse-forming and nationally-marked concepts is reflected in language changes. It is an indicator of the language development and results in the language national and cultural determination caused by socio-political

processes. In their public speeches, the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries US presidents, as transmitters of the corresponding culture and status-role relations, prioritize the cognitive components of the nationally-marked concepts that are associated with historical and socio-cultural aspects in the life of the American linguo-cultural community.

Universal discourse-forming and nationally-marked concepts in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries APD are verbalized by various language units, among which the most productive are phraseological units, terminological units, mythologemes, ideologemes, epithets, metonymy, euphemisms, anaphora, semantic repetitions, syntactic parallelism.

Conceptual metaphor is the most productive way of representing universal discourse-forming and nationally-marked concept in both periods under study. The prevalent type are structural metaphors with such source-domains as POWER, WAR, THEATER, BUSINESS, PROFESSION, and SPORT. The dominance of the military metaphor POLITICS IS WAR in both periods indicates that the political system is imbued with the spirit of militarism, and is understood in terms of war with and against everyone, which can be explained by the essence of political discourse itself, i.e. the struggle for power.

Presidential rhetoric reflects the political and speech culture of the American society, represents different opinions, social views of certain social groups and strata or individuals. The addressers' imposing their own opinion on the addressee as if the existing reality, its interpretation in the text of a public speech, is directly related to the adoption by the mass recipient of certain decisions, the development of socially significant positions, and the implementation of specific practical steps, which is reflected in addresser – addressee configurations.

In the communicative organization of the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries APD, metaphors manifest themselves as powerful emotional stimulants and as a means of pragmatic influence in order to categorize the world of politics, and change the citizens' worldview. The interaction of trends of stability and variability in the American presidential metaphorical system is revealed in the fact that, despite the shaped and clearly structured metaphorical patterns, the development of culture, science, technology, changes in the way of life,

the socio-political situation in the world, the dominant ideology in the state affects the set of metaphors and the emergence of new variants of the established metaphorical pattern, the deepening of the metaphor allusive potential, which exposes fundamentally new directions of metaphorical meanings.

Communicative strategies of manipulation and pressure are universal for the APD in the 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. The differences lie in the choice of speech techniques, which depend on the characteristics of historical development, foreign policy, the socio-economic situation, the linguo-cultural originality of the communicants' worldview, as well as behavioural stereotypes, the president's social status as guarantor of the US Constitution. The manipulation strategy is more productive both periods under study when compared to the strategy of pressure. The dominance of the manipulative strategy in the APD of both periods is determined by a number of factors. The most significant of them is the worldview of the people in the historical era under consideration, which is determined to a greater extent by the dominant ideology and the socio-political situation that has developed in the world and that dictates the conditions of living and survival, both in their native country and in the constantly changing world.

#### NOTE

<sup>1</sup> Исследование проводилось по теме государственного задания «Декодирование и интерпретация аксиологической семантики в славянских, германских, романских и кавказских лингвокультурах» (№ государственной регистрации 124012400351-9).

The research was carried out within the framework of the state budget theme “Decoding and interpretation of axiological semantics in Slavic, Germanic, Romance, and Caucasian linguistic cultures” (state registration number 124012400351-9).

#### REFERENCES

Chanturidze Yu.M., 2020. Diachronicheskie osobennosti aktualizatsii lingvokulturnogo kontsepta “borba” (na materiale amerikanskogo politicheskogo diskursa XIX – XXI vekov) [Diachronic Features of the Actualization of the Linguocultural Concept “Struggle”

- (Based on the American Political Discourse of the 19<sup>th</sup> – 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries)]. *Vestnik Pyatigorskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* [Bulletin of Pyatigorsk State University], no. 3, pp. 103-109.
- Chepurnaya A.I., 2022. Nekooperativnye strategii v amerikanskom politicheskom dialogicheskom diskurse (na primere zhanra press-brifinga) [Non-Cooperative Strategies in American Political Dialogic Discourse (On the Example of the Press Briefing Genre)]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filologiya* [Bulletin of Tomsk State University], no. 79, pp. 155-166. DOI: 10.17223/19986645/79/8
- D'yachenko I.A., 2021. Kommunikativnaya strategiya formirovaniya emotsionalnogo nastroya adresata v anglo-amerikanskom politicheskom diskurse [Communicative Strategy for Forming the Emotional Mood of the Addressee in the Anglo-American Political Discourse]. *Vestnik Khakasskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. N. F. Katanova* [Bulletin of the Khakass State University Named After N.F. Katanov], no. 2 (36), pp. 43-48.
- Kalinin O.I., 2021. Kognitivnaya metafora i diskurs: napravleniya i metody sovremennykh issledovaniy [Cognitive Metaphor and Discourse: Research Methods and Paradigms]. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 108-121. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2021.5.9>
- Karasik V.I., 2002. *Jazykovej krug: lichnost, koncepty, diskurs* [Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse]. Volgograd, Peremena Publ. 477 p.
- Kolesnikova O.I., Kozlova E.A., 2023. Diskursivnaya lichnost lidera i ee tsennosti v emotsiogennoy reprezentatsii [The Discursive Personality of the Leader and Its Values in the Emotiogenic Representation]. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 162-172. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2023.1.13>
- Kondratenko E.N., 2021. Funktsionirovanie evfemizmov v amerikanskom politicheskom diskurse [Functioning of Euphemisms in American Political Discourse]. *Teoriya yazyka i mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya* [Theory of Language and Intercultural Communication], no. 3 (42), pp. 88-97.
- Kononova I.V., Melnichuk T.A., 2021. Aksiologicheskaya sostavlyayushchaya amerikanskogo predvybornogo diskursa v dinamicheskom aspekte [Dynamics of Values in American Election Discourse]. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 113-125. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2021.4.9>
- Lakoff G., Johnson M., 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. 242 p.
- Makurova D.A., 2021. Aktualizatsiya yazykovoy lichnosti dezinformatora v amerikanskom politicheskom diskurse [Actualization of the Linguistic Personality of the Disinformer in American Political Discourse]. *Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka* [Cognitive Language Studies], no. 3 (46), pp. 727-730.
- Margaryan A.A., 2022. Antonimicheskaya oppozitsiya "voyna" – "mir" kak priem rechevogo vozdeystviya na soznanie adresata v amerikanskom politicheskom diskurse (na materiale vystupleniy D. Dzh. Trampa) [Antonymic Opposition "War" – "Peace" as a Method of Speech Impact on the Addressee's Consciousness in the American Political Discourse (Based on D. J. Trump's Speeches)]. *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki* [Philological Sciences. Questions of Theory and Practice], vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 1491-1496. DOI: 10.30853/phil20220224
- Mikhaylovskaya M.V., 2023. Vybor strategii pri peredache ideologem v sinkhronnom perevode amerikanskogo politicheskogo diskursa [Choosing a Strategy for the Transfer of Ideologemes in Simultaneous Translation of American Political Discourse]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 19. Lingvistika i mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya* [Moscow State University Bulletin. Series 19. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication], no. 2, pp. 190-200. DOI: 10.55959/MSU-2074-1588-19-2023-2-01-15
- Mukhamatshin A.R., 2021. Historical, Ideological, Social Aspects in the Formation of the American Political Discourse and Its Manipulative Potential. *Kazan Linguistic Journal*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 537-549. DOI: 10.26907/2658-3321.2021.4.4.537-549
- Nazarova N.E., 2021. Mekhanizmy vozniknoveniya neologizmov v sovremennom amerikanskom voenno-politicheskom diskurse [Mechanisms of the Emergence of Neologisms in Modern American Military-Political Discourse]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo lingvisticheskogo universiteta. Gumanitarnye nauki* [Bulletin of the Moscow State Linguistic University. Humanitarian Sciences], no. 9 (851), pp. 162-173. DOI: 10.52070/2542-2197\_2021\_9\_851\_162
- Pisarenkov A.A., 2021. Sindrom «posttrampa» v amerikanskom liberalnom politicheskom

- diskurse: simvol, metafori i allyuzii [The Post-Trump Syndrome in American Liberal Political Discourse: Symbols, Metaphors, and Allusions]. *Kazanskaya nauka* [Kazan Science], no. 4, pp. 139-141.
- Popova Z.D., Sterin I.A., 2007. *Kognitivnaya lingvistika* [Cognitive Linguistics]. Moscow, AST Publ. URL: [http://sterninia.ru/files/757/4\\_Izbrannye\\_nauchnye\\_publicakii/Kognitivnaja\\_lingvistika/Kognitivnaja\\_lingvistika\\_2007.pdf](http://sterninia.ru/files/757/4_Izbrannye_nauchnye_publicakii/Kognitivnaja_lingvistika/Kognitivnaja_lingvistika_2007.pdf)
- Rubtsov I.N., 2021. Mestoimenie we kak sredstvo reprezentatsii kontsepta "soyuznik" v amerikanskom politicheskom diskurse [The Pronoun We as a Means of Representing the Concept "Ally" in American Political Discourse]. *Izvestiya Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta* [Science Journal of Volgograd State Pedagogical University], no. 10 (163), pp. 203-207.
- Sokolova M.A., 2021. Stay woke: terminologizatsiya snizhennoy leksiki v amerikanskom politicheskom diskurse [Stay Woke: Terminology of Reduced Vocabulary in American Political Discourse]. *Politicheskaya lingvistika* [Political Linguistics], no. 5 (89), pp. 79-85. DOI: 10.26170/1999-2629\_2021\_05\_09
- Trusova A.Yu., 2022. K voprosu o lingvisticheskikh sposobakh vyrazheniya kontsepta "Amerikanskiy politicheskiy diskurs" na osnove inauguratsionnoy rechi Dzhо Baydena [On the Question of Linguistic Ways of Expressing the Concept "American Political Discourse" Based on Joe Biden's Inaugural Speech]. *Nauchnyy almanakh* [Scientific Almanac], no. 3-3 (89), pp. 81-86.
- Ust'yantseva A. E., 2022. Nepryamoy razgovor kak neotyemlemaya kommunikativnaya strategiya amerikanskogo politicheskogo diskursa [Indirect Conversation as an Integral Communication Strategy of American Political Discourse]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo lingvisticheskogo universiteta. Gumanitarnye nauki* [Bulletin of the Moscow State Linguistic University. Humanitarian Sciences], no. 3 (858), pp. 104-110. DOI: 10.52070/2542-2197\_2022\_3\_858\_104
- Vlasova E.V., 2021. Pereocenka v politicheskom diskurse (na materiale britanskikh i amerikanskikh gazetnykh statej) [Reappraisal in Political Discourse (On the Material of British and American Newspaper Articles)]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta. Seriya: Lingvistika* [Bulletin of the Moscow State Regional University. Series: Linguistics], no. 6, pp. 20-28. DOI: 10.18384/2310-712X-2021-6-20-28
- Volkova Ya.A., Panchenko N.N., 2022. Destruktivnaya kommunikativnaya lichnost: popytka klassifikatsii [Destructive Communicative Personalities: A Classification Attempt]. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 143-154. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2022.5.13>
- Yasakova Yu.S., 2022. Fenomen yazykovoy igry v amerikanskom predvybornom politicheskom diskurse [The Phenomenon of the Language Game in the American Pre-Election Political Discourse]. *Kazanskaya nauka* [Kazan Science], no. 3, pp. 144-146.

## SOURCES

- Bush G.W. *First Inaugural Address*, 20 January 2001. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/january-20-2001-first-inaugural-address>
- Bush G.W. *State of the Union Address*, 29 January 2002. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/january-29-2002-state-union-address>
- Bush G.W. *Remarks at the UN General Assembly*, 12 September 2002. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/september-12-2002-remarks-un-general-assembly>
- Carter J. *Inaugural Address*, 20 January 1977. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/january-20-1977-inaugural-address>
- Clinton B. *First Inaugural*, 20 January 1993. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/january-20-1993-first-inaugural>
- Coolidge C. *Inaugural Address*, 4 March 1925. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/march-4-1925-inaugural-address>
- Ford G. *Remarks in Helsinki*, 1 August 1975. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/august-1-1975-remarks-helsinki>
- Johnson L.B. *Thanksgiving Message*, 28 November 1963. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/november-28-1963-thanksgiving-message>
- Obama B. *Debate Transcript*, 26 September 2008. URL: <https://www.debates.org/voter-education/debate-transcripts/2008-debate-transcript/>
- Obama B. *Acceptance Speech at the Democratic National Convention*, 28 August 2008. URL:

- <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/august-28-2008-acceptance-speech-democratic-national>
- Obama B. *Inaugural Address*, 20 January 2009. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/january-20-2009-inaugural-address>
- Obama B. *Address to Congress on the American Jobs Act*, 8 September 2011. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/september-8-2011-address-congress-american-jobs-act>
- Roosevelt F.D. *State of the Union (Four Freedoms)*, 6 January 1941. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/january-6-1941-state-union-four-freedoms>
- Roosevelt Th. *First Annual Message*, 3 December 1901. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/december-3-1901-first-annual-message>
- Trump D. *Inaugural Address*, 20 January 2017. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/january-20-2017-inaugural-address>
- Trump D. *Address at West Point Graduation*, 13 June 2020. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/june-13-2020-address-west-point-graduation>
- Trump D. *9/11 Memorial Speech*, 11 September 2020. URL: <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-2020-9-11-memorial-speech-transcript>
- Wilson W. *Memorial Day Address*, 30 May 1914. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/may-30-1914-memorial-day-address>
- Wilson W. *An Address in Pittsburgh on Preparedness*, 29 January 1916. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/address-soldiers-memorial-hall-pittsburgh-pennsylvania>
- Wilson W. *Message Regarding German Actions*, 19 April 1916. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/april-19-1916-message-regarding-german-actions>

### Information About the Authors

**Olga L. Bessonova**, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of English Philology, Donetsk State University, Universitetskaya St, 24, 283001 Donetsk, Russia, [olgabessonova@mail.ru](mailto:olgabessonova@mail.ru), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5171-9790>

**Irina V. Fatianova**, Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Associate Professor, Department of English Philology, Donetsk State University, Universitetskaya St, 24, 283001 Donetsk, Russia, [irafatianova@mail.ru](mailto:irafatianova@mail.ru), <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2870-1275>

### Информация об авторах

**Ольга Леонидовна Бессонова**, доктор филологических наук, профессор, заведующая кафедрой английской филологии, Донецкий государственный университет, ул. Университетская, 24, 283001 г. Донецк, Россия, [olgabessonova@mail.ru](mailto:olgabessonova@mail.ru), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5171-9790>

**Ирина Валерьевна Фатянова**, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры английской филологии, Донецкий государственный университет, ул. Университетская, 24, 283001 г. Донецк, Россия, [irafatianova@mail.ru](mailto:irafatianova@mail.ru), <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2870-1275>