

UDC 81'42

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32837/2312-3192-2018-11-29-36>

AMERICAN POLITICAL LINGUOCULTURE IN THE MIRROR OF NATIONAL VALUES (ON THE MATERIAL OF INAUGURAL SPEECH OF DONALD TRUMP)

Iryna Golubovska¹

Abstract

The article describes the political institutional discourse as an instrument for influencing the masses and manipulating their consciousness, moods, behavior in the interests of a small group of people who call themselves the political elite of society. Political discourse is considered in a narrow sense—as a discourse of a specific politician (in our case, D. Trump), who represent the Republican Party of the United States. On the material of the inaugural speech of Donald Trump, delivered on January 20, 2017, such communicative tactics as: argumentation; identification; intimidation; positive self-presentation; accusation; sacral symbolization; social efforts' integration and encouragement to cooperate with the authorities; positive forecasting—have been highlighted. All of them are realized with the help of verbalizations of various communicative moves. Such traditional stylistic figures as anaphora, epiphora, antithesis, tricolon and others are widely used in the processes of final verbalizations of manipulative intentions of the sender. Moreover, anaphora concentrates the listeners' attention on the original author's settings; vice versa, epiphora focuses addressee's attention on the consequences of actions, on their sought result. Ethical and spiritual values of the American people (such as: "Future Orientation/Optimism", "Equality/Equalitarianism", "Action and Work Orientation", "Directness, Openness, Honesty"; "Change") serve as the implicit basis for the discursive actualization of communicative tactics used by the politician for reaching communicative purposes which are in getting a power over thoughts and emotions of the target audience. Evidently, the structure of the manipulative influence embodied in the political text of inaugural genre on the verbal-semantic and deep-cognitive levels of its analysis would have the same character. In prospective it must be proved on the basis of a study of political speeches of other politicians belonging to different political cultures.

Keywords

Political Discourse, Manipulation, Communicative Tactics, Communicative Move, Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis, Iteration, Anaphora, Epiphora, Implicit Semantics, American Values

1. Introduction. In the frames of modern anthropologically oriented linguistics the essence, nature and functions of political discourse are being researched on the crossroads of the diverse areas of scientific knowledge. In addition to traditional rhetoric and stylistics, such branches of philology as linguo-semiotics (Yu.S. Stepanov, R. Bart), pragmatic linguistics (N. Arutyunova, F. Batsevich, T. Van Dijk, V. Demyankov, O. Issers, K. Serazhym, R. Vodak), linguocultural studies and intercultural communication (V. Maslova, I. Sternin, S. Ter-Minasova), theory of communication (G. Pocheptsov, J.G. Mead, J. Walter, W. Fisher, M. McCombbs, D. Shaw) entered the circle of subject areas, within which political discourse is being studied. Scholars try to analyze the form, content, illocutions and perlocutions of political discourse, parameters of its effectiveness in the context of of manipulative persuasive effect on the target audience. After all, any political discourse actualizes certain ideological views, establishes cer-

tain ideological constants which act as a markers of this or that particular ideological space².

According to the concept of the well-known scholar of political reality, Jakob Torfing, political discourse represents the third phase in theory of discourse realization and might be defined as a relational system of meaning implementation determined by certain historical, technological and economical factors, which has the exclusive right to root any social order within which "the Sooth" is institutionalized (R. Bart, J. Derrida, J. Kristeva, J. Lacan, E. Lacro, S. Muff)³. According to such discourse understanding the main task for discourse analysis lies not in finding out how phenomena of the real world are reflected in language, but in tracking out **how language constructs the phenomena**: "discourse is the result of hegemonic articulations directed at the establishment of both political and moral leadership in a society"⁴. Actually, "hegemonic articulations" have no ability for self-implementation: they are introduced in the result of manipulations with the sphere of subconsciousness of people. So we define manipulation as the hidden influence on the subconscious sphere of the addressee made by the sender of the message in order to control the consciousness and behaviour of the object of manipulative influence, which might be implemented in both verbalized or nonverbal way⁵.

Thus, the purpose of political discourse could be defined in the terms of conquest and retention of power with the help of expanding a certain system of ideological views which might be implement-

¹ Prof. Dr. Golubovska Iryna, Head of General Linguistics, Classic Philology and Hellenistics Department, Kyiv Taras Shevchenko National University; room 114, Bulvar Shevchenka, 14, Kyiv, 01601, Ukraine; e-mail: igolubovska777@gmail.com

² Tsutsiyeva 2012, 105

³ Torfing 2005, 5-13

⁴ Levchenko 2012, 105

⁵ Kara-Murza 2005

ed into the cognitive sphere of the target audience (electorate) through the explicit and implicit communicative influence. At the moment, two approaches to the meaning of the term “political discourse” are being outlined: a narrow and a broad ones. According to the first one, the notion of political institutional discourse is supposed to comprise the speeches of politicians, government documents, party programs, texts of parliamentary and pre-election debates, propaganda materials⁶. A broad understanding of political discourse implies the involvement of “discourse of reaction” into the body of the above mentioned corpus, i.e. analytical articles of journalists, political scientists, public activists, bloggers presented in social networks and dealing with this or that particular event of the political life of society⁷. In the frames of this article we’ll turn to the genre of “primary communication”⁸, to the analysis of “political narrative”, in which a politician becomes the key figure of political communication in the sense of spreading certain ideological views, which provide this or those meanings to the political events in order to form the needed public opinion and, accordingly, influence on the distribution and usage of power in the taken ethno-social community. Within this article, we will be interested just in **political institutional discourse** created by the politician as a representative of a certain institution (the party, administration, parliament, etc., or made by one of the speechwriters belonging to his “team”) in the genre of the inaugural speech. This is **the object** of our investigation; **the subject** is the study of lingual peculiarities of tactics and communicative moves which implement a general manipulative strategy of politician’s speech aimed to obtain and maintain the political power in the society.

2. Methodology. Such meta-language terms as “communicative strategy”, “communicative tactics”, “communicative move” will be used as those which have a long history of institutionalization in the frames of linguistic pragmatics⁹. The “working content” of these terms in this article is: a communicative strategy is understood as the general plan of communication, subordinated to the practical goals of the speaker; communicative tactics then is a way of implementing a communicative strategy; communicative move implies the content of verbal / non-verbal actions of the speaker aimed at achieving the communicative goal. Thus, these three terms are in generic-species relationship.

Basing on the approaches to manipulative strategies and tactics distinction which have already been developed in the modern political linguistics¹⁰, we propose our own vision, according to which a manipulative strategy implies the evolution of such tactics as: 1) argumentation; 2) identification; 3) intimidation; 5) positive self-presentation; 6) accusation; 7) sacred symbolization; 8) social efforts’ integration and encouragement to cooperate with the authorities; 9) positive forecasting.

The inaugural speech of President Donald Trump, 45th President of the United States of America, who, on the 20-th of January 2017, swore allegiance to the American people would serve as an empirical stuff for this article. Such methods of linguistic analysis are being used: descriptive method, method of contextual and component analysis, discours-analysis, conceptual analysis, method of presuppositions, method of language data cultural interpretation.

3. Results and Discussion. At the beginning of his speech, Donald Trump addressed the words of gratitude not only to the American people, but for the first time in the history of this genre of public speaking in USA, appealed **to all the people of the world**: “*Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans and people of the world, thank you*”¹¹. We see here an implicitly implemented **tactic of social efforts’ integration and encouragement to cooperate with the authorities**, addressed not only to American citizens but also to all of the inhabitants of the planet Earth: it is implemented with the help of **communicative move of thanksgiving**.

The next line reveals the presupposition of the destruction in material and spiritual ways of US citizens’ lives (apparently destructed during the two previous cadences of Barack Obama), therefore America must unite efforts not only “*to rebuild our country*”, but also “*to restore its promise for all of our people*”: “*We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and restore its promise for all of our people*”. Thus, on the one hand, the tactics of accusation of the previous administration in the country’s collapse and destruction of promises given to the people is being implemented,—on the other hand, the tactic of intimidation is actualized with the help of communicative move of the president’s self-presentation as a part of the whole nation: “*We, the citizens of America...*”. The communicative move is realized by the syntagmatic supposition of the personal pronoun (the first person plural) *we* and the collective noun *citizens*.

Further, the president, discursively developing such an American value, as “**Future Orientation /**

⁶ T. Van Dijk 1989, 26

⁷ Shaigal 2004, 23

⁸ Bakhtin 1986, 279

⁹ Batsevich 2004, Issers 2008, Snitko 2003

¹⁰ Dmitruk 2006, Dotsenko 1997, Kondratenko 2009, Mikhaleva 2004, Pirogova 2001

¹¹ <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/20/politics/trump-inaugural-address/index.html>; <https://zbruc.eu/node/61279>

Optimism¹², expresses a positive belief that the course of his administration, being coherent to the hopes of the American people and again! to the hopes of the “peoples of the world”, will overcome all challenges and be a success: *“Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for many, many years to come. We will face challenges. We will confront hardships. But we will get the job done”*. The affirmative character of this statement is supported by a fourfold parallel repetition of a single syntactic structure with grammatical semantics of future, such as: **Pron + aux.verb will + main verb + noun, S – P – DO**: *“We will determine the course of America...; “We will face challenges”, “We will confront hardships”; “We will get the job done”*. The tactic of intimidation is here effectively combined with the tactics of **positive forecasting**. Actually, in this place of the studied inaugural speech we are coming across the well-known logical structure of tricolon: “thesis–antithesis–synthesis”, which had been widely used since times of antiquity in the speeches of Cicero, Demosthenes, Socrates (the most famous example is “Veni, vidi, vici”). Within this syntactic iterance, verbal phrases of negative / ambivalent semantics: “antithetical” *face challenges, confront hardships* are opposed to the “synthetical” verbal phrase with positive evaluative coloring: *get the job done*. All this stuff creates a rhythmic-semantic balance necessary for inducing of the suggestive effect within the studied paragraph.

In accordance with the postulates of the courtesy formulated by Leech-Grays¹³, Trump thanked President Barack Obama and his wife Michel for their support and assistance in the transition of power: *“Every four years we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power. And we are grateful to President Obama and first lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent. Thank you”*. While thanking, he uses words and phrases of positive rational axiology: *the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, grateful, gracious help, magnificent*. Of course, we are not regarding politeness as those which belongs to the values of American lingual culture, but it might be qualified as a very important distinctive feature of American speech behavior (let's recall the

famous *American smile*, without which it's really hard to imagine interpersonal communicative process in American way). Nevertheless tactics of politeness was not implemented here in view of the specifics of the discursively-evaluative deployment of the next paragraph, which appears to be in the sharp contrast with the previous one: *“Today's ceremony, however, has a very special meaning because today we are not merely transferring power from one administration to another or from one party to another, but we are transferring power from Washington, D.C., and giving it back to you, the people”*. This paragraph nullifies all the figures of courtesy that are characteristic for the preceding paragraph and realize at the textual level a kind of mega-syntactic antithetical construction. In fact, D. Trump, discursively actualizing such American value as **“Directness, Openness, Honesty”**, publicly acknowledges that during the cadences of many previous presidents of America power belonged not to the people but to the narrow elite political circles, to the American establishment, which defended exclusively their own political and economical interests: *“For too long, a small group in our nation's capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the cost. 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. And while they celebrated in our nation's capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land”*.

Manipulative influence is carried out here due to the verbalization of the antithetic opposition between the political elite of American society and ordinary Americans, in other words the archaic opposition “own” – “alien” serves as a basis for gaining people's benevolence: *“a small group in our nation's capital has reaped the rewards of government”* – *“the people have borne the cost”*, *“Washington flourished”* – *“people did not share in its wealth”*, *“Politicians prospered”* – *“the jobs left and the factories closed”*, *“The establishment protected itself”* – *“not the citizens of our country”*, *“while they celebrated in our nation's capital”* – *“there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land”*. Thus, “aliens” for ordinary Americans and, as it comes, for Trump himself! (which identifies himself and common people with the help of intimidation tactic embodied verbally by the personal pronoun in plural - *we*) receive nominations *a small group, Washington, politicians, the establishment, they*. The category of “own” is verbalized by nomens and phrases *the people, the citizens, struggling families all over our land*. The rhetorical effect of the antithesis is realized not only on the lexical, but also on the microsyntactic and macrosyntactic levels with the help of itera-

¹² Kohls 1984. In our further research, we will refer to the value system of Americans proposed by Robert Kohls in his article “The Values Americans Live By” (1984). He highlights such values as: 1) change/mobility; 2) personal control over the environment; 3) time and its control; 4) equality/equalitarianism; 5) individualism, independence and privacy; 6) self-help; 7) competition and free enterprise; 8) future orientation/optimism; 9) action and work orientation; 10) informality; 11) directness, openness, honesty; 12) practicality/efficiency; 13) materialism/acquisitiveness and others.

¹³ Leech 1983, Grays 1985

tion for three times of the same model of complex sentence with the opposite conjunction *but* according to the model: **S – Pplus, but S – Pminus**, within which the subject of the first part of the sentence is characterized by verbal predicate with positive estimated value: *flourished, prospered, protected*, and the subject of the second part of the sentence, on the contrary, receives the predicate attribution of generally negative evaluation: *borne the cost, left (jobs), closed (the factories), not to protect (the citizens)*. Thus, the communicative move of antithesis embodies the communicative tactics of accusation and intimidation.

The following paragraph “exploits” such American value as “**Equality/Equalitarianism**”: *“That all changes starting right here and right now, because this moment is your moment. It belongs to you. It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America. This is your day. This is your celebration. And this, the United States of America, is your country. What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people. January 20th, 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again. The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer. Everyone is listening to you now. You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement, the likes of which the world has never seen before. At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction that a nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves. These are just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public”*.

It is a common knowledge that **equality** stands for one of the most fundamental values of American constitutionalism, alongside with freedom and democracy. Just at the moment of his inaugural speech Trump highlights “transferring” power to the American people: *this moment is your moment*, putting it in one row with positively marked notions like: *celebration, country, historic movement, righteous people, a righteous public*. Frequent repetition of the possessive pronoun of the second person plural *your* promotes the development of the semantics of “appropriation”: *your day, your celebration, your country*. In this way an emotionally marked communicative **tactics of intimidation** is realized, illusory reduction of distance between the authorities and the people is achieved. Thus, the necessary foundation for the implementation of **the tactics of positive self-presentation** is being created. However, according to Trump’s vision, before this historic mo-

ment, that is, during the two cadences of B. Obama, the forty-fourth president of the United States (January 20, 2009 – January 20, 2017), the USA was declining: *“But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists. Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities, rusted out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation. An education system flush with cash but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of all knowledge. And the crime and the gangs and the drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential. This American carnage stops right here and stops right now”*.

The idea of America's decline is verbalized with the help of words and phrases of general-negative semantics: *“mothers and children trapped in poverty”, “rusted out factories scattered like tombstones”, “students deprived of all knowledge”, “the crime, the gangs, the drugs”, “stolen lives”, “robbed country”, “unrealized potential”, “American carnage”*.

Tactic of accusation in unsuccessful domestic politics addressed to the administration of B. Obama is implicitly implemented here. The final phrase of this paragraph *“This American carnage stops right here and stops right now”* comes into structural resonance with the initial one *“... all changes starting right here and right now”*, fixing definite political labels: pejorative **“carnage”** – for “before-Trump” America, meliorative **“changes”** – as a key word for “Trump’s America”¹⁴.

The following paragraph implements the communicative **tactics of intimidation and appeal to cooperate with the authorities** on the basis of the common democratic values, which is carried out with the help of the communicative move identifying pain, dreams, the success of the people: *their pain, their dreams, their success* with pain, dreams, the success of country’s political elite: *our pain, our dreams, our success: We are one nation, and their pain is our pain. Their dreams are our dreams, and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny. The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans*. And here again, we see the implicit realization of the “old American value” **“Equality/Equalitarianism”**.

Further, in the next paragraph, the archetypal opposition “own-alien” is once again implicitly actualized with the help of opposing American industry, army, middle class, workers (suffering from ineffective domestic policy of the previous administration) – to the outside world (foreign industry, armies of the foreign countries): *“For many decades we’ve enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry, subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military. We’ve defended other nations’ borders while refusing to defend our own. And we’ve spent tril-*

¹⁴ “Change” stands for one of the most valid values of Americans and as a socially and politically determined concept of American mentality is still waiting for its researcher.

lions and trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay. We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has dissipated over the horizon. One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores with not even a thought about the millions and millions of American workers that were left behind. The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed all across the world". Such kind of politics contributed to the outflow of capital from the US leaving the ordinary citizens unprotected. In this paragraphs we again come across the an implicitly implemented **tactics of accusation**.

However, Trump promises to leave **in the past** the policy of "alien's" support: "*but that is the past*", and **in the future**, "*from this day forward*", a new concept of country's development will be proposed: "*a new vision will govern our land*", the essence of which might be formulated as "*America first, America first*". And again, just as in the beginning of his speech, Donald Trump emphasizes that he wants to be heard not only by Americans, but also by other peoples of the world and their authorities. To increase his speech's impact, the iteration of the pronoun *every* is used, every new time being combined with the word or phrase having more semantic significance in comparison with the previous one: "*to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power*". The communicative **tactics of positive forecasting** is implemented here.

The new state policy will lead to unprecedented victories of America which will be caused by the development of national economy and infrastructure, by the restitution of jobs, wealth, and, more importantly, dreams. AMERICAN DREAM is a concept of American mentality based on American ideals and values (democracy, freedom, equal opportunity) and is aimed at positive prediction of future material prosperity / success regardless of social origin and achieved only thanks to tense everyday work: "*America will start winning again, winning like never before. We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth, and we will bring back our dreams. We will build new roads and highways and bridges and airports and tunnels and railways all across our wonderful nation. We will get our people off of welfare and back to work, rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor. We will follow two simple rules: buy American and hire American. We will seek friendship and goodwill with the nations of the world, but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first. We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example. We will shine for everyone to follow. We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones and unite the civilized*

world against radical Islamic terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the earth".

Within the frames of this paragraph, **tactics of positive forecasting** is realized with the help of an anaphorical syntactic partial iteration aimed to increase the emotional impact. Anaphora usually draws the attention to the speaker's primary goal.

In the following presentation Trump turns to use a **communicative tactics of sacred symbolism** on the ground of identification of the biblical idea of accord of people and unity of the country, the solidarity of its citizens, linking it with the idea of protection, which in this case would be provided by the powers of heaven and earth: "*The Bible tells us how good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in unity. We must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity. When America is united, America is totally unstoppable. There should be no fear. We are protected and we will always be protected. We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement. And most importantly, we will be protected by God*". It is known, that want for protection is one of the most fundamental human needs¹⁴.

In the next paragraph in the frames of **communicative tactics of accusation**, such an American value as "**Action/ Work Orientation**" is being actualized, when the previous administration is implicitly blamed at lack of scale of thinking and dreams and absence of political will for radical action: "*Finally, we must think big and dream even bigger. In America, we understand that a nation is only living as long as it is striving. We will no longer accept politicians who are all talk and no action, constantly complaining but never doing anything about it. The time for empty talk is over. Now arrives the hour of action*".

In the end of his speech, Trump appeals to such fundamental for all of Americans psychological constants (which also refer to emotional and teleonomic national values) as **patriotism**: *national pride, spirit of America, our soldiers, red blood of patriots, glorious freedoms, great American flag*) and **trust in God**: *night sky, almighty Creator*). At the same time, the manipulative communicative tactics of identification and sacred symbolization are discursively developed: "*Do not allow anyone to tell you that it cannot be done. No challenge can match the heart and fight the spirit of America. We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again. We stand at the birth of a new millennium, ready to unlock the mysteries of space, to free the earth from the miseries of disease, and to harness the energies, industries, and technologies of tomorrow. A new national pride will stir ourselves, lift our sights, and heal our divisions. It's time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget, that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots. We all enjoy the same glorious freedoms and we all salute the same great American flag. And whether a*

child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the wind-swept plains of Nebraska, they look up at the same night sky, they fill their heart with the same dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by the same almighty Creator". Here, as we have already said, the **tactics of identification** (Trump identifies himself with voters, with changes, with the past and future of America) is gradually replaced by the **tactics of sacred symbolization**. It has been applied on the background of **comprehensive intimization** (personal pronouns *we, our*; determinator *the same*) with the help of a multistage **epiphoric iteration**¹⁵, within the framework of which marker of identification and association *the same* is used to raise the 45th President of America and the whole country to the level of the Absolute: "*We all bleed the same red blood of patriots. We all enjoy the same glorious freedoms and we all salute the same great American flag. And whether a child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the wind-swept plains of Nebraska, they look up at the same night sky, they fill their heart with the same dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by the same almighty Creator*". In this case, the syntagmatic chain is built up, within which the usage of attributive phrases: ***the same red blood of patriots > the same glorious freedoms > the same great American flag > the same night sky > the same dreams > the same almighty Creator*** is aimed to mark the glorious history of America beginning from the times of gaining independence, struggle for democratic freedoms, Declaration of Independence, American dream concept formation—up to this inaugural day, which was initiated (in Trump's interpretation) by the grace of the Creator. In a simple sentence *they* (children) *look up at the same night sky* the contours of the Kantian precedential text come to light: "Two things in the world fill my soul with sacred awe – the **starry sky** overhead and the moral law within us" (I. Kant).

And finally, D. Trump, referring only to American citizens (and not to people all over the world as at the beginning of his speech), applies in parallel the **tactics of accusation** and **tactics of positive forecasting**: "*So to all Americans in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, from ocean to ocean, hear these words: You will never be ignored again. 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, we will make America proud again, we will make America safe again. And, yes, together we will make America great again. Thank you. God bless you. And God bless America".

The **tactics of positive forecasting** is embodied in nouns and adjectives with semantics of positive evaluation, such as: *hopes, dreams, courage, goodness, love; strong, wealthy, proud, safe, great*. An **epiphoric iteration** with gradual increasing of the degree of abstraction (from a strong, rich, safe country to the Great America) developed on the background of the ultimate intimization (*you, your, we, together*) might be qualified as is a **key generalizing moment of the studied inaugural speech of the President D.Trump**.

4. Conclusions. Thus, the analysis of the inaugural speech of the 45th President of the United States, Donald Trump, demonstrated the use of certain communicative tactics within general manipulative strategy: 1) argumentation; 2) identification; 3) intimization; 5) positive self-presentation; 6) accusation; 7) sacred symbolization; 8) social efforts' integration and encouragement to cooperate with the authorities; 9) positive forecasting, –realized by means of this or those communicative move. As a rule, the verbalizations of communicative moves is realized with the help of such stylistic figures as anaphora and epiphora, which embody certain communicative intentions of the addressee. Our analysis discovered no logical or rational arguments, vice versa, the speaker tries to get the audience's support appealing mostly to its emotional sphere. All communicative tactics which implement a manipulative strategy of influence on the electorate implicitly rely on Americans' political, social, spiritual and ethical values, such as: "**Future Orientation/Optimism**", "**Equality/Equalitarianism**", "**Action and Work Orientation**", "**Directness, Openness, Honesty**"; "**Change**". Their energetic potential, when implicitly deployed in the discourse of the inaugural speech, is used by the President of the country solely to strengthen the gained power and to achieve the political goals –in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Архипова С.О. Використання маніпулятивної стратегії комунікації в інформаційному суспільстві [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: novuv.kpi.ua/2007-2-2/16_Arhipova.pdf
- Барт Р. Миф сегодня : Избранные работы / Ролан Барт [Пер. с фр.]. – М.: Прогресс, 1994. – С. 72–130.
- Бахтин М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества / Михаил Михайлович Бахтин. – М. : «Искусство», 1986. – 445 с.
- Бацевич Ф.С. Основы коммуникативной лингвистики / Ф.С. Бацевич. – К., 2004. – 342 с.
- Грайс Г. Логика и речевое общение / Г. Грайс // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике: Лингвистическая прагматика. – Вып. XVI. – М.: Прогресс, 1985. – С. 217–237.
- Даниленко О.С. Понятие и особенности политического дискурса [Електронний ресурс] / О.С. Даниленко // Наукові записки НДУ ім. М. Гоголя. Філологічні науки. – Кн. № 2, 2014. – С.62-66. Режим доступу: irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe
- Дейк Т. ван. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация / Т. ван Дейк [Пер. с англ. / Сост. В.В. Петрова; Под ред. В.И. Герасимова; Вступ. ст. Ю. Н. Караулова и В. В. Петрова]. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – 312 с.

Дмитрук О.В. Маніпулятивні стратегії в сучасній англомовній комунікації (на матеріалі текстів друкованих та Інтернет-видант 2000-2005 років): автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 / О. В. Дмитрук; КНУ ім. Т. Шевченка. – К., 2006. – 19 с.

Доценко Е. Л. Психология манипуляции: феномены, механизмы и защита. – М.: ЧеРо, МГУ, 1997. – 344 с.

Иссерс О.С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. Изд. 5-е. – М.: URSS, 2008. – 288 с.

Кондратенко Н.В. Комунікативні стратегії в українському політичному дискурсі: інтерактивна взаємодія учасників політичних ток-шоу / Н. В. Кондратенко // Діалог: Медіа-студії. – Вип. 8. – Одеса: Астропринт, 2009. – С. 48–58.

Кара-Мурза С.Г. Манипуляция сознанием. — М.: Изд-во: Эксмо, 2005. – 832 с.

Костюнина М.В. Лингвориторические особенности предвыборных речей Б. Обамы (2008 г.) // Политическая коммуникация: перспективы развития научного направления. – Екатеринбург, 2014. – С. 131–136.

Левшенко Ю.И. Политический дискурс: Аналитический обзор теоретико-методологических подходов [Электронный ресурс] / Ю.И. Левшенко // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. – Тамбов: Грамота 2012. – № 7. – С. 100–108. Режим доступа: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/politicheskiy-diskurs>.

Маслова В.А. Политический дискурс: Языковые игры или игры в слова? / В. А. Маслова // Политическая лингвистика. – Вып. 1(24). – Екатеринбург, 2008. – С. 43–48.

Михалева О.Л. Политический дискурс как сфера реализации манипулятивного воздействия: автореф. дисс. на соискание уч. степени канд. фил. наук: спец. 10.02.01 / О. Л. Михалева. – Кемерово, 2004. – 24 с.

Неориторика: генезис, проблемы, перспективы // Сборник научно-аналитических обзоров. – Москва: МГУ, 1987. – С. 46–79.

Перельгут Н.М., Сухоцкая Е.Б. О структуре понятия «политический дискурс» [Электронный ресурс] // Вестник Нижегородского государственного университета. – Вып. № 2, 2013. Режим доступа: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/o-strukture-ponyatiya-politicheskiy-diskursi>.

Пирогова Ю.К. Имплицитная информация как средство коммуникативного воздействия и манипулирования // Проблемы прикладной лингвистики. – М., 2001. – С. 209–227.

Почепцов Г. Г. Теорія комунікації / Г. Г. Почепцов. – 2-е вид. – К.: Вид. центр “Київський університет”, 1999. – 308 с.

Снитко О.С. Василенко Н.В. Русский язык как деятельность: современные направления научного описания. Текст лекций. – К.: Издательско-полиграфический центр «Киевский университет», 2013. – 159 с.

Цуциева М. Г. Языковая личность как субъект политического дискурса / М. Г. Цуциева // Вестник Балтийского федерального университета им. И. Канта. – 2012. – № 2. – С. 104–107.

Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса / Е.И. Шейгал. – М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2004. – 326 с.

Van Dijk T.A. What is Political Discourse Analysis / T.A. van Dijk. – Amsterdam, 1998. [Електронне видання].– Режим доступа: <http://www.discourse-in-society.org>

Van Dijk T.A. Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis // Discourse and Society / T.A. van Dijk. – Vol. 4 (2). – London, 1993.

Van Dijk T.A. Discourse and Manipulation // Discourse & Society / T.A. van Dijk. – Vol. 17. – 2006. – P. 359–383.

Fairclough N. Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research / N. Fairclough. – London: Routledge, 2003. – 270 p.

Kohls L.R. The Values Americans Live By, 1984. Access mode: http://www1.cmc.edu/pages/faculty/alee/extra/American_values.html.

Leech G. N. Principles of Pragmatics.–London: Longman, 1983. – 250 p.

Maslow A. H. Motivation and Personality. – New York: Harpaer & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1954. – 369 p.

Torfing J. Discourse Theory: Achievements, Arguments, and Challenges // Discourse Theory in European Politics. Identity, Policy and Governance / J. Torfing. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – 359 p.

Wodak R. Language, power and ideology / R. Wodak. – London: Academic Press, 1989. – 289 p.

REFERENCES

Arhipova E.O. (2007). Vykorystannia manipulyativnoji strategii komunikacii v informacijnomu suspil'stvi [Electronic resource, Використання маніпулятивної стратегії комунікації в інформаційному суспільстві]. Access mode: novyn.kpi.ua/2007-2-2/16_Arhipova.pdf.

Bart R. (1994). Mif segodnia: Izbrannyje raboty [Миф сегодня: Избранные работы]. Moscow: Progress.

Bakhtin M.M.(1986). Estetika slovesnogo tvorcestva [Эстетика словесного творчества]. Moscow: Iskusstvo.

Vacevich F.S. (2004). Osnovy komunikativnoji lingvistyky [Основы коммуникативной лингвистики]. Kyiv: Akademiya.

Grajs G. (1985). Logika i rechevoje obshhenije [Логика и речевое общение]. In: Novoje v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. Lingvisticheskaja pragmatika, Vyp. XVI, Moscow: Progress, s. 217–237.

Danilenko O.C. (2014). Poniatije i osobennosti politicheskogo diskursa [Electronic resource, Понятие и особенности политического дискурса]. In: Naukovi zapysky NDU im. M. Gogolia. Filologichni nauky, kn. № 2, s. 62–66. Access mode: irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe.

Dejk T. van (1989), Jazyk. Poznanije. Kommunikacija, V.I. Gerasimova (ed.) [Язык. Познание. Коммуникация]. Moscow: Progress.

Dmitruk O.V. (2006). Manipulyativni strategii v suchasnij anglo-movnij komunikacii [Маніпулятивні стратегії в сучасній англо-мовній комунікації (на матеріалі текстів друкованих та Інтернет-видань 2000-2005 років)]: Avtoreferat dys. na zdobuttia nauk. stup. kand.filol.nauk: spec. 10.02.04, Kyiv.

Docenko E. L. (1997). Psikhologija manipuliacii: fenomeny, mekhanizmy i zashita [Психология манипуляции: феномены, механизмы и защита]. Moscow: CheRo.

Issers O.C. (2008). Kommunikativnyje strategii i taktiki russkoj rechi [Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи]. Moscow: URSS.

- Kondratenko N.V. (2009). Komunikativni strategii v ukrajins'komu politychnomu dyskursi [Комунікативні стратегії в українському політичному дискурсі: інтерактивна взаємодія учасників політичних ток-шоу]. In: *Dialog: Media-studii*, Vyp. 8., Odesa: Astroprint, s. 48–58.
- Kara-Murza S.G. (2005). Manipulaciya soznaniem [Манипуляция сознанием]. Moskva: Eksmo.
- Levshenko Yu. I. (2012). Politicheskij diskurs: analiticheskij obzor teoretiko-metodologicheskikh podkhodov [Electronic resource, Политический дискурс: Аналитический обзор теоретико-методологических подходов]. In: *Istoricheskije, filosofskije, politicheskije i yuridicheskije nauki, kulturologiya i iskusstvovedeniye. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*. Tambov, Gramota, № 7, s. 100–108. Access mode: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/politicheskij-diskurs>.
- Maslova V.A. (2008). Politicheskij diskurs: yazykovye igry ili igry v slova [Политический дискурс: Языковые игры или игры в слова?]. In: *Politicheskaya lingvistika*, Vyp. 1 (24), Ekaterinburg, s. 43–48.
- Mikhaleva O.L. (2004). Politicheskij diskurs kak sfera realizacii manipulativnogo vozdejstviya [Политический дискурс как сфера реализации манипулятивного воздействия]: Avtoref. diss. na soiskanie uch. stepeni kand. filol. nauk: spec. 10.02.01, Kemerovo, 24 s.
- Neoritorika: genezis, problemy, perspektivy 1987 [Неориторика: генезис, проблемы, перспективы]. In: *Sbornik nauchno-analiticheskikh obzorov*, Moscow: MGU, s. 46–79.
- Perelgut N.M., Sukhockaya E.B. (2013). O strukture ponyatiya «politicheskij diskurs» [О структуре понятия «политический дискурс»]. In: *Vestnik nizhnevartovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, Vyp. № 2, Access mode: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/o-strukture-ponyatiya-politicheskij-diskursi>.
- Pirogova Yu.K. (2001). Implicitnaya informaciya kak sredstvo kommunikativnogo vozdejstviya i manipulirovaniya [Имплицитная информация как средство коммуникативного воздействия и манипулирования]. In: *Problemy prikladnoj lingvistiki*, Moscow, s. 209–227.
- Pochepcev G.G.(mol.). (1999). Teoriya komunikacii [Теория коммуникации]. 2 vyd, Kyiv: Vyd. centr “Kyjivskij universytet”.
- Snitko O.S., Vasilenko N.V. (2013). Russkij yazyk kak deyatelnost': sovremennye napravleniya nauchnogo opisaniya. Tekst lekcij [Русский язык как деятельность: современные направления научного описания. Текст лекций]. Kiev: Izdatel'sko-poligraficheskij centr «Kievskij universitet».
- Cucijeva M.G. (2012). Yazykovaya lichnost' kak subjekt politicheskogo diskursa [Языковая личность как субъект политического дискурса]. *Vestnik baltijskogo federal'nogo universiteta im. I. Kanta*, № 2, s. 104–107.
- Shejgal E.I. (2004). Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa [Семиотика политического дискурса], Moscow: «Gnozis».
- Van Dijk T.A. (1998). What is Political Discourse Analysis Access mode: <http://www.discourse-in-society.org>
- Van Dijk T.A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. In: *Discourse & Society*, Vol. 17, pp. 359–383.
- Fairclough N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Kohls L.R. (1984). The Values Americans Live By. Access mode: http://www1.cmc.edu/pages/faculty/alee/extra/American_values.html.
- Leech G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Maslow A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harpaer & Row Publishers, Inc.
- Torfin J. (2005). Discourse Theory: Achievements, Arguments, and Challenges. In: J. Torfin (ed.), *Discourse Theory in European Politics. Identity, Policy and Governance*. London: Palgrave Vacmillan, pp. 23–47.
- Wodak R. (1989). *Language, power and ideology*. London: Academic Press.

Анотація

У рамках статті характеризується політичний інституційний дискурс як інструмент впливу на маси і маніпулювання їх свідомістю, настроями, поведінкою в інтересах невеликої групи людей, які іменують себе політичною елітою суспільства. Політичний дискурс розглядається у вузькому значенні - як дискурс конкретного політика (у даному випадку Д. Трампа), що представляє республіканську партію США. На матеріалі інавгураційної промови Трампа, яку він виголосив 20 січня 2017 року, розглянуто комунікативні тактики: аргументації; ідентифікації; інтимізація; позитивної самопрезентації; звинувачення; сакральної символізації; об'єднання суспільних зусиль та спонування до кооперації з владою; позитивного прогнозування, котрі реалізуються за допомогою вербалізацій тих чи тих комунікативних ходів. Такі традиційні стилістичні фігури, як анафора, епіфора, антитеза, триколон та ін. широко задіяні в ролі кінцевих вербалізацій маніпулятивних інтенцій адресанта. Причому анафора концентрує увагу слухачів на вихідній авторській установці, а епіфора - фокусує увагу реципієнта на наслідках дій, на їх бажаному результаті. Імплицитною основою дискурсивного розгортання комунікативних тактик слугують етико-духовні цінності американського народу (“Future Orientation/Optimism”, “Equality/Equalitarism”, “Action and Work Orientation”, “Directness, Openness, Honesty”; “Change”), які політик використовує у своїх комунікативних цілях з метою досягнення потужного впливу на цільову аудиторію. Як видається, структура маніпулятивного впливу, досліджувана на вербально-семантичному і глибинно-когнітивному рівнях лінгвістичного аналізу на матеріалі політичного тексту жанру інавгураційної промови буде мати приблизно один і той самий характер, що необхідно довести на основі безпосереднього дослідження інших політичних промов політиків, котрі належать різним політичним культурам. Це можна вважати перспективою цієї розвідки.

Ключові слова

Політичний дискурс, маніпуляція, комунікативна тактика, комунікативний хід, теза, антитеза, синтез, повтор, анафора, епіфора, імплицитна семантика, американські цінності.