

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Кафедра англійської філології і філософії мови

Курсова робота

на тему: Прагматичні і риторичні засоби у інавгураційних промовах
українською і англійською мовами у зіставному аспекті

Студентки групи Па 16-20
факультету германської філології і перекладу
заочної форми здобуття освіти
спеціальності 035 Філологія
Полешко Єлени Вячеславівни

Науковий керівник:
доктор філологічних наук,
професор
Кравченко Наталія Кимівна

Національна шкала	<u>4</u>
Кількість балів	<u>82</u>
Оцінка ЄКТС	<u>B</u>

Київ 2023

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Department of English Philology, Translation, and Philosophy of Language

Term Paper

Pragmatic and rhetorical devices in inaugural speeches in Ukrainian and English in
a comparative aspect

YELIENA POLESHKO

Group Pa 16-20

Germanic Philology and Translation Faculty

Research Adviser

DrSc

Kravchenko N. K.

Kyiv 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
CHAPTER ONE. PRAGMATIC AND LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF POLITICAL LEADERS' SPEECHES	6
1.1 Pragmatic means	6
1.2 Rhetorical means	10
1.3 Inaugural speeches – the meaning	13
CHAPTER TWO. SPECIFICS OF THE SPEECHES OF POLITICAL LEADERS	15
2.1 Volodymyr Zelenskyy's inaugural speech	15
2.2 Joseph R. Biden's inaugural speech	22
2.3 Comparative aspects of the pragmatic and rhetorical means used in the proposed inaugural speeches	28
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	30
RÉSUMÉ	33
LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS	34

INTRODUCTION

With the growing interest in the socio-political aspects of the linguistic picture of the world, the rapid development of disciplines that combine the features of linguistics and other sciences has begun. One of these disciplines is political linguistics, which at the present stage is attracting more and more attention from domestic and foreign linguists.

Various problems of analysing political speeches, comparative aspects of pragmatic means and the peculiarities of their translation are presented in the works of many scholars: N. Kravchenko, I. S. Bilonizhka, L. P. Nahorna, M. M. Nazarenko, O.V. Padalka, L. L. Slavova, L. I. Striy, etc.

The relevance of the study is due to the insufficient number of works related to the peculiarities of applying certain translation transformations when translating official speeches of politicians, which is of practical interest to the translator, especially given the rapid development of business partnership between the United States and Ukraine.

The aim of the study is to investigate pragmatic and rhetorical means in inaugural speeches in Ukrainian and English from a comparative perspective.

In accordance with the aim of the work, the following tasks need to be solved:

1. To identify the pragmatic and linguistic features of political leaders' speeches.
2. To outline the specifics of Volodymyr Zelenskyy's inaugural speech.
3. To study the inaugural speech of Joseph R. Biden.
4. To conduct a comparative aspect of the pragmatic and rhetorical means used in the proposed inaugural speeches.

The object of the study is the pragmatic and linguistic features of political leaders' speeches.

The subject of the study is the comparative aspect of the pragmatic and rhetorical means used in the proposed inaugural speeches of Volodymyr Zelenskyy and Joseph R. Biden.

The research methodology is determined by the purpose of the work and is complex in nature, which consists in the use of both general scientific (analysis,

synthesis, induction, deduction, observation, generalization) and philological methods of analysis: the definitional method to define the main concepts of the study; the content analysis method to highlight the characteristics of English-language journalistic literature; descriptive method to highlight the results of the study; the method of continuous sampling to create a corpus of factual material; communicative and pragmatic analysis.

Structure of the work. The term paper consists of an introduction, two main chapters, conclusions and a list of references.

CHAPTER ONE. PRAGMATIC AND LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF POLITICAL LEADERS' SPEECHES

1.1 Pragmatic means

The key to the success of any influence is its well-thought-out strategy and clear organisation. In order to effectively achieve the communicative goal, the sender of a message – a politician – needs not only sufficient information about the recipient, but also strategic planning of influence techniques and possible audience reaction. Since there is virtually no feedback between the sender and the recipient of the message (except for spontaneous shouts), the speech cannot be adjusted on the fly based on a direct analysis of the recipient's reaction.

Interpretations of the concept of “strategy” vary depending on the approach used: textual, psychological, rhetorical, cognitive and pragmalinguistic. In a general sense, a strategy can be understood as a system of components built “according to the principle of hierarchy”, a “cognitive plan of communication”, a “general plan, or vector, of speech behaviour”, a certain invariant “model of action or several actions aimed at overcoming certain difficulties”, the purpose of which is to achieve the communicative goals of the speaker [7, p. 56].

The strategy is purposeful, systematic, interactive and is implemented with the help of a set of language tactics, as well as communicative moves or techniques that implement language tactics. In a sense, a strategy is not implemented, but is created in the process of achieving a goal (a specific interaction).

A tactic is “a specific linguistic move (step, turn, stage) in the process of implementing a linguistic strategy”, which is “one or more actions that contribute to the implementation of the strategy”. The tactic correlates with a certain stage in the implementation of the strategy and is aimed at the realisation of a separate communicative task of this stage [9, p. 77].

Thus, O. Padalka notes in her work that the content of a political speech should

be receptive, understandable to the society and “with its information and its verbal embodiment should correspond to active or at least passive linguistic competence of the general mass of members of the ethnic group” [13, p.67].

Speechwriting is the preparation of texts for oral speeches by a politician to an audience, i.e. citizens of a particular state, who are mostly potential voters. This process is multifaceted and time-consuming, as it requires the processing of dozens of sources, fact-checking, and compliance with language etiquette. It is important to study several factors, such as the target audience, technical means, place and time of the speaker's speech.

The world's leading politicians of the past and present have achieved recognition partly due to their ability to establish communication contact with people or subordinates and to implement their policies and be responsible for them from the rostrum.

It is clear that this effect is created by the hidden intention, i.e. the intention to convince the listeners of one's position. The pragmatic intention, i.e. the main impact of the speech on the audience, depends on the type of speech, which in turn depends on the place and circumstances of the speech [26, p. 154]. The effectiveness of political speeches makes officials extremely thoughtful about both their content and form – language, style, composition of an oral or written political text [23, p. 866].

Regardless of the event, the main functions of political discourse are: manipulative; persuasive; informative; argumentative; creating a convincing picture of a better future, attracting attention, gaining support, and calling for action. With the skilful work of speechwriters, these motives do not seem obvious compared to the statements about change, unity and the improvement of the state apparatus.

By the nature of the speech presentation, imagery and lexical content, political speeches belong to the journalistic style of speech, which is distinguished by its inherent socio-political vocabulary, the presence of emotionally coloured words, rhetorical questions, exclamations, and repetitions. Political discourse is interpreted

as institutional communication that uses a certain system of professionally oriented signs, i.e. is characterised by its own sublanguage (vocabulary, phraseology and paremiology). Therefore, it is necessary to fully characterise this sublanguage as a way of communication at a high socio-political level [12].

Characteristic features of political discourse at the lexical level of the language are the widespread use of professional political terminology and the frequent use of bookish words. For example: *to affirm the promise, a vision, an allegiance; реіндустріалізація економіки, узурпація влади, антикорупційний пакт, фундамент суспільної довіри*. We can also observe the presence of language clichés: *to bear in mind, makes us exceptional, to sum up the above-said; на державному рівні, настав час змін, хвилина мовчання*. The language of political texts is usually dry and abstract in terms of lexicon, with a high level of generalisation due to the richness of complex words. Political speeches are characterised by the use of proper names, exact dates and numbers. In addition, for political language, which is characterised by a high density of information, it is typical to use common abbreviations and acronyms: G8, USA, WMD; ЄС, Кабмін, підприємства ВПК, ОБСЄ [10, p. 68].

It is a common fact that politicians use quotes and expressions of famous people in their speeches, as well as references to them. This emphasises unity with the people and the state, and at the same time, the speech achieves its main goal – a positive impact on the minds of the listeners. Petro Poroshenko's inaugural speech contains the following examples: *«Ми, українці, «живий вогник у сім'ї європейських народів і діяльні співробітники європейської цивілізаційної праці»*. Phraseological constants are also frequently used. For example, *to take something for granted, to go hand in hand; to put on a fat cross, to keep up, to keep one's powder dry*. Phraseological expressions have all the characteristics necessary for political discourse, i.e. they are vivid, accurate, expressive, and universally understood.

Particular attention is drawn to new developments in the vocabulary of

political discourse. Scientific research of political processes and trends involves the emergence of new discoveries, the introduction of new concepts and terminology. This happens in the process of dialogue between the authorities and society. The paradox of political neologisms is that, despite the novelty of the idea, they should be understandable and recognisable. That is why political eloquence includes many linguistic innovations proposed by politicians. For example, *unipolarity, environmentalism, player; кіборги, атовці, євроінтеграція*.

Politicians widely use euphemisms in their speeches, as these lexical substitutes have a softening and ameliorative function, which is necessary for conflict-free communication and effective communication. The essence of euphemism is that the same phenomenon (situation, action) can be described with the help of linguistic expressions that have different semantic meanings [10, p.163]. For example, the use of such political euphemisms as *undernourishment – недоїдання instead of starvation – голод; saving – збереження instead of profit – прибуток; the building up of labour reserves – нарощування трудових ресурсів instead of unemployment – безробіття*, allows to completely disguise facts that are inconvenient for publication. Linguists point to the connection between euphemisms and political correctness (a term describing a style of speech, ideas, policies, behaviour), which aims to minimise pressure on certain groups of people.

Also, in order to influence the audience at the communication level and establish a positive dialogue with them, the US presidents and some Ukrainian presidents used numerous expressive techniques and artistic means in their inaugural speeches. Among the former, the most common are comparative constructions, inversion and climax; the latter, which are divided into tropes and stylistic figures, are more common as elements of diversification in official speech. The most commonly used tropes in political texts are metaphor and epithet, while stylistic figures most often include anaphora, epiphora, rhetorical questions and parallel constructions.

Political speech is diverse, topical and listener-oriented. In modern practice,

politicians rely on the skills of professionals, the so-called speechwriters, who process large amounts of material to write an effective, acceptable and accurate speech. Recently, linguists have been paying more attention to political discourse, as world politicians deliver speeches at numerous events, constantly adding to the archives of political texts.

The pragmatic intention of political speeches plays a major role in the writing of the text. The purpose of the speech varies depending on the event or audience. The linguistic content of political speeches is determined by the formality and officialness of the event. Typically, the language should be logical and structured, with extensive use of bookish words, clichés, terms, established phrases, proper names, precise numbers and abbreviations to represent specific data.

To achieve the pragmatic intention, political speeches use a variety of expressive techniques, such as phonetic, lexical, morphological and syntactic units and forms that enhance emotions in speech and language and contribute to better assimilation of what is said by the audience. To achieve the imagery of language, political speeches are widely used artistic means, which are divided into tropes and stylistic figures.

1.2 Rhetorical means

Political discourse allows one to influence the audience and achieve certain political goals, so it can be said that whoever has control over political discourse gains control over society. In this regard, it seems necessary to understand how the invisible manipulation of the public consciousness is carried out.

A politician is required to be highly skilled at exerting targeted influence. Public speaking is both a set of technologies and an art. It requires not only certain physical and psychological data, but also talent and skill. This suggests that the decisive factor in this kind of persuasion is the audience – the recipient and interpreter of the political message that the speaker is targeting. And the key to the success of a speech is the “consonance” of the consciousness of the audience, the

“consumers” of political discourse, its adequacy to the situation, and compliance with socially acceptable frameworks [8, p. 46].

The effectiveness of a private speech and the entire manipulative discourse in general can be determined by the success of achieving this goal, i.e. the manipulator will be able to achieve the desired result – controlling the minds of the audience – provided that the real goals, attitudes and expectations of the listeners are identified with sufficient accuracy, their value system, level of awareness, education, social status are determined. For example, comparing a politician's speeches to his constituents or, in another situation, to members of Congress, we can conclude that for a speech to be successful, a politician must take into account all of the above features of his audience.

The friendlier the audience is towards the speaker, the easier it is for him or her to instill certain thoughts in them. For example, in the United States, in a two-party system, a Republican candidate often has to speak during the election campaign in states where there are more Democrats than Republicans. Undoubtedly, the Democratic candidate in these states needs to make much less effort to win the sympathy of voters [10, p .35].

The structure of the genre of public political speech is determined by the following elements: Sender – a political figure; and Recipient – the electorate.

The relationship between them is determined by the image and linguistic and pragmatic role of the politician: depending on the situation, the role can vary from “One of the people, the same as us” to “The chosen one, the only one who knows what to do and is able to do it”.

The political figure also determines the position of the audience in relation to him or her (partner, friend, mentor, student), which is reflected in the use of various appeals to the audience, as well as the trusting, encouraging or mentoring tone of the entire message; text functions: incentive, persuasive and suggestive, which implies a conflict-free nature of information reception; topic political life of the country or

the world; the subject of the speech varies, depends on the political situation, the needs of the government, the tasks set; the presentation and expression comply with the rules of the style of oratory and, of course, depend on the personal professionalism and oratory skills of the politician [10, p. 36].

The key to effective speech is to take into account the peculiarities of public broadcasting that cause repetition of information, taking into account the factors of age, profession, education, religion, interests or income level of the audience. According to the author, “speech should have signs of communicativeness and sociability, i.e., correspond to the capabilities of a person's working memory, vision and hearing, be accessible in terms of presentation and meet the needs and interests of the audience, evoke positive emotions and a desire to accept it as a guide to action; be specific, then it has "more chances to be fixed in the memory and, accordingly, to influence the addressee” [18, p. 240].

To generate a statement, a participant in political discourse needs to have knowledge, new information, reasonable conclusions or proposals that fascinate people with ideas. Language skills, logic, composition and expressiveness play a significant role in generating a statement.

Thus, in a political discourse, the speaker's speech actions should be carried out, taking into account the addressee's cognitive basis, and the whole speech is built on the basis of the speaker's and the addressee's cognitive bases.

For a speaker in a political discourse, it is important to induce the listener to act with the help of a statement. For the listener, it is important to understand the meaning, motive or purpose of the speaker's statement and formulate a response.

Speech influence in political discourse can be supplemented or replaced by other means of influence, such as facial expressions, gestures, etc. At the very beginning of a political dialogue, the tone and timbre of the speaker's speech make the interlocutor adjust in a certain way to the speaker and his or her statement. Further, with direct auditory perception of the interlocutor, the role of power,

intonation and timbre characteristics of the speaker's speech increases in political discourse.

Thus, the above shows that speech influence is an integral part of political discourse, in which the factor of the addressee, to whom the speech influence is directed, plays an important role, and who is involved in shaping the structure of political discourse. Understanding is the most important factor of speech influence in political discourse, as its purpose is to achieve an appropriate feedback (action, change of opinion, political views, etc.) from the addressee.

1.3 Inaugural speeches – the meaning

The inaugural speech is a ritually important political text that occupies a high position in the system of political communication. The first speech of the newly elected president formulates the ideological basis for uniting society at a new stage of the country's development. The inaugural speech can be considered both a speech and a political action. Delivering an inaugural speech is a political action, as delivering a speech is an act of formal inauguration of a new president.

The objectives of inaugural speeches are to unite the nation and articulate the values that currently dominate society. The inaugural speeches discuss the fundamental question of any ideology – the question of what it means to be a citizen of one's country [16, p. 86].

An inaugural speech is a speech of praise on a solemn occasion, delivered at a solemn gathering, glorifying the people and the system of government, connecting the past and the future, referring to the present, using a lofty style, resorting to amplification and exaggeration. The general rhetorical mood of inaugural speeches is characterised by loftiness, pathos of unity of effort, solemnity, and imagery that emphasises the importance and uniqueness of the political event.

Mandatory stable components of the speech's compositional structure are as follows: address to the addressee of the message; positive assessment of the former

president's activities; gratitude to the supporters who voted for the elected president; address to the voters who voted for other candidates; definition of the country's development goals; confidence in the ability to implement the tasks; the president's promise to fulfill his duties with dignity; culminating ending [11, p.118].

In their inaugural speeches, presidents address the theme of the unity of the nation, the historical past; emphasise the significance of the moment and the novelty of the situation; talk about the need for transformation, define the role and personal task of the president.

CHAPTER TWO. SPECIFICS OF THE SPEECHES OF POLITICAL LEADERS

2.1 Volodymyr Zelenskyy's inaugural speech

V. Zelensky became the first actor-president in the history of Ukraine. The choice of the people was determined by the desire for significant changes and the rejection of old preferences and political ideals.

I analyzed Zelenskyy's speech on three aspects – structural and semantic, linguoconceptual and linguopragmatic.

1. The structural and semantic aspects provide for the allocation of the main parts of the presidential speech that are mandatory for this genre of political discourse.

According to the structure, the inaugural speech as a ritual speech contains mandatory framework elements – a greeting (an appeal to the addressees) and the final part of a ritual nature (an optative, ritual or etiquette formula). In Zelenskyy's speech, the greeting contains the ethnonym: “*Dear Ukrainians! Dear Nation!*” [3]

The main part of the inaugural speech focuses on a positive assessment of the people's choice and outlining the political program of the elected leader of the state. At the semantic level, this is expressed in the conceptual juxtaposition of the past and the future in the axiological plane. In Zelenskyy's speech, the appeal to the past contains a negative assessment of the actions of the previous government: “*My election proves that our citizens are tired of the experienced, pompous system politicians who over the 28 years, have created a country of opportunities — the opportunities to bribe, steal and pluck the resources*”[3]. The evaluation category is expressed in adjectives and substantiates-jargon containing the characteristics of politicians – the predecessors of the newly elected president – and their activities. The use of factual information – the period of independence of Ukraine before the election of President V. Zelenskyy – as a time of activity of politicians who failed to realize popular aspirations is presented in an ironic dimension: “create a country of opportunities” has a negative connotation. There is also an implicit appeal to the main opponent – the previous president of Ukraine P. Poroshenko: “*And then, there are also the mythical Ukrainian roads that are being built and repaired only in someone's prolific imagination*”[3]. Given that in the implementation of the political program, P. Poroshenko indicated the roads made, thus V. Zelenskyy not only criticizes his predecessor, but also questions the veracity of his statements.

Semantically equivalent positions include the unification of the president with the people: *“From now on, each of us is responsible for the country that we will leave to our children. Each of us, in his place, will be able to do everything for the prosperity of Ukraine”*[3]. The frequent use of the plural pronouns of the 1st Person (We, us) and the signifier (each) indicates the union of the speaker with the addressees.

The second component of the main part of the inaugural speech – priorities and program theses – contains a list of the main tasks that the Presidents consider the main ones. V. Zelenskyy submits the following list according to the order of implementation: *“Our first task is ceasefire in the Donbas. Our next challenge is returning the lost territories. Besides the war, there are many other problems that trouble Ukrainians. Among them are the shocking utility tariffs, humiliating wages and pensions, painful prices and non-existent jobs. There is also the health care that is seen as improving mostly by those who have never been to a regular hospital with their child”*[3]. According to the semantic groups of program provisions, the territorial integrity of the country, economic problems, medicine, and road repairs are distinguished. It should be noted that the program provisions do not contain future priorities, but statements of existing problems that are relevant to the solution. Thus, the political program of the newly elected president and his priorities in this position are presented.

The final part of the speech of the Ukrainian President contains the ritual formula *Glory to Ukraine!* And the traditional formulation of the speaker's credo or goal for this genre: *“And finally: Dear Nation! All my life I tried to do all I could so that Ukrainians laughed. That was my mission. Now I will do all I can so that Ukrainians at least do not cry any more”*[3]. V. Zelenskyy formulates this as the mission of the presidency, since he was not a professional politician, but came to power from the art of comics. Comparing his mission as an actor-comedian and as the country's president, he contrasts these missions by using antonyms to laugh and cry and trying to identify them.

Analyzing the semantics of the main part of the speech of the Ukrainian President, note that the semantic actualization of the speaker as president is carried out through the use of pronouns and forms of the 1st Person Singular: *“It hasn’t been only me who has just taken the oath. Each of us has just put his hand on the Constitution and swore allegiance to Ukraine”*[3]. In this case, there is a semantic identification of the speaker with the addressees: we = all, each of us.

2. Linguocognitive analysis

Zelenskyy's inaugural speech is dominated by the concept of “President”, which contains a nuclear part represented by the token “president”: *“After my election victory, my six-year-old son said: «Dad, they say on TV that Zelenskyy is the President ... So, it means that...I am... the President too?!» At the time, it sounded funny, but later I realized that it was true. Because each of us is the President”*[3]. The frequency of use of this token in V. Zelenskyy's speech is quite high – 10 words used in total in the text, we gave a fragment with the highest frequency. At the same time, the use has a concentrated character: the lexeme is used several times in a row, which actualizes the method of repetition as a stylistically powerful means of floating in oratory. So, a syntactic anaphora is used based on the repetition of the token “President”: *“Now, imagine the headlines: «The President Does Not Pay Taxes,» «The Intoxicated President Ran the Red Light» or « The President Is Quietly Stealing Because Everyone Does»”*[3]. The stylistic figure of syntactic parallelism increases the conceptual load of the lexeme in speech.

The second key concept of the speech of the president of Ukraine is the concept of “Europe”, represented by the following verbal markers: Europe, the European Union, the European Union, the alliance: *“We have chosen a path to Europe, but Europe is not somewhere out there. Europe is here. And after it appears here, it will be everywhere, all over Ukraine”*[3]. At the same time, Zelenskyy's speech uses the toponym “Europe” both to denote the territory and to denote the European Union and a special type of culture and value system. Europe appears as an idealized world that Ukrainians want to enter and that the president promises to

create in Ukraine.

In Zelensky's inaugural speech, we observe an expansion of the semantics of the “Ukrainian” token: *“Ukrainians are all those who live on the territory of Ukraine, regardless of ethnicity”*[3]. In addition, the use of Russian in speech: *“For being Ukrainian is not a line in the passport — being Ukrainian is here (in the heart — Ed.)”* – indicates the actualization of the language as a semantic component of the token “Ukraine”, that is, a Ukrainian is someone who lives on the territory of Ukraine regardless of citizenship and language of communication.

In Zelensky's speech, the concept of “war” is also relevant, which is due to the political situation in the country: *“We are not the ones who have started this war. But we are the ones who have to finish it”*[3]. Note the use of the token “war”, which has two meanings in the Ukrainian language: 1. organized armed struggle between states, social classes, etc. or 2. state of enmity between someone; dispute, quarrel with someone; struggle. I believe that in this context, the lexeme is used in a direct sense, indicating the assessment of the situation in the country by the president.

3. Linguopragmatic analysis involves determining the main speech acts and strategies for interaction between the speaker and the addressees in the inaugural speech.

The main place belongs to commissions aimed at expressing oaths and promises. This is due to the fact that the inaugural speech as a genre of political discourse in general has a performative character and is based on the speech act “oath”.

V. Zelenskyy does not use commissions, although his statements have the pragmatic potential of promises: *“I will do everything I can to make you feel respect”*[3]. If we interpret the inaugural speech as a commission-based speech genre, then the speaker's communicative intention here is to promise certain actions to the addressees in the future.

Representatives in speech acts are used to express a message, record certain phenomena, and describe situations, which is typical of the part of the inaugural speech that deals with the state of affairs in the country. V. Zelenskyy uses representatives to express general statements and well-known information: *“There can be no strong army in a place where the authorities do not respect the people who every day sacrifice their life for the country”*[3]. Using representations, speakers report known information, but add certain accents to it.

Declaratives are the realization of power in reality, since their use changes a certain order of things. For the speech of politicians, declaratives are generally typical, because it is politicians who are able to make decisions and make changes to reality, for example: *“I am dissolving the Verkhovna Rada of the eighth convocation”*. This type of speech act is typical for V. Zelenskyy's inaugural speech, since one of the communicative tasks of his speech was to declare radical changes in the government. Through declaratives, the newly elected president announces the beginning of these changes, choosing the verbal form of orders.

Directives are represented by requests, prohibitions, and instructions. In Zelenskyy's speech, there is a speech act of request: *“So, dear deputies! You have appointed the inauguration on Monday, a work day, which has one benefit — it means you are ready to work. Therefore, I ask that you approve: 1. The law on removing parliamentary immunity. 2. The law establishing criminal liability for illegal enrichment. 3. The long-awaited Electoral Code and open-lists. Also, please dismiss: 1. Head of the Security Service of Ukraine. 2. Prosecutor General of Ukraine. 3. Minister of Defense of Ukraine”* [3]. In this case, directives are used together with declaratives: the president expresses his intention to change the country's leadership, but asks permission from the Verkhovna Rada, which has the appropriate powers. Zelenskyy's inaugural speech is dominated by declaratives and directives.

The strategic aspect of presidential discourse covers a set of strategies and tactics in the inaugural speech. I can define such communicative strategies in the

inaugural speech of V. Zelenskyy.

The self-presentation strategy is aimed at presenting the speaker's face, in particular its positive characteristics. If we are talking about a talking president, then in this case there are statements from the 1st person regarding obligations and assurances in office: *“I'm definitely not afraid to make difficult decisions and I'm ready to lose my fame, my ratings, and if need be — without any hesitation, my position to bring peace, as long as we do not give up our territories [3]”* Verbal markers of the self-presentation strategy are grammatical forms of the 1st Person Singular, representing presidential discourse as personal. In addition, the self-presentation strategy is designed to outline the features of the newly elected president as an outstanding person who can take responsibility for the country.

The consolidation strategy is represented by the unification of the speaker-president with the people, which provides for the use of tokens common, together, unite, unite, we, our, etc.: *“This is not just mine, this is our common victory. And this is our common chance that we are responsible for together. Our European country begins with each one of us. This is our common dream. But we also share a common pain [3]”* We can consider this strategy to be the main one in the inaugural speech, since “the ceremony of the president taking office is a solemn mutual agreement: the people, the nation is as full a participant in the inauguration as the president”.

Presidential rhetoric is also characterized by identifying the president with the people: *“I guess not everyone likes what I'm saying? Too bad, since it's not me, but the Ukrainian people who are saying that[3]”*. Such identification implies not just consolidation, but the presentation of the president as a whole to the people, and not his leader.

The strategy of appeal involves contacting the addressee in order to encourage certain actions. Appeal can have a declarative character when the speaker formulates an appeal to the addressee: *“Today I appeal to all Ukrainians in the world. There*

are 65 millions of us. Yes, don't be surprised: there are 65 million of us — those born on the Ukrainian soil. Ukrainians in Europe and Asia, in North and South America, Australia and Africa — I appeal to all Ukrainians on the planet! [3]” In this case, it is a performative speech act of a declarative type. The strategy of Appeal as opposed to the consolidation strategy does not involve combining the speaker with the addressee, but distancing: the speaker appeals to a certain target audience (deputies, young people, the elderly, compatriots) and encourages them to take appropriate actions.

The strategy of intellectuality involves the actualization of cultural symbols, historical heritage, quoting famous, primarily national cultural figures: *“Allow me to quote one American actor who has become a great American president: «The government does not solve our problems. The government is our problem» [3]”*. Zelenskyy quotes the 41st president of the United States, R. Reagan, who also began his professional career as an actor, and later became president of the United States, thus comparing himself to him.

For the most part, in the inaugural speech, the strategy of intellectuality is based on the category of precedent, since the addressee has a mass character. Later on, Zelensky appeals to a precedent – setting situation—a well-known football match of the Icelandic national football team at the European Championship, in which non-professional football players took part, but came out victorious. Thus, the precedent situation is used to draw an analogy between the president of Ukraine as a non-professional politician and an amateur player.

During the analysis of Zelenskyy's inaugural speech, features at the structural-semantic, linguocognitive and linguopragmatic levels were determined. The structure of the speech is subject to the general requirements for the ritual texts of presidential rhetoric and includes framework components (greeting and mission statement) and the main part (stating and program Parts). At the semantic level, verbalized oppositions “friend – foe” and the triad “I – we – They” are presented.

At the linguocognitive level, the fundamental concepts are defined – “president” and “Europe”, “Ukrainian” and “war”.

At the linguopragmatic level, the use of speech acts in speech is considered, among which there are commissions and representations, declaratives and directives. Among the dominant communication strategies, strategies of self-presentation, consolidation, appeal and intellectualization are characterized.

2.2 Joseph R. Biden's inaugural speech

Joseph R. Biden's inaugural speech as the 46th President of the United States on January 20, 2021, was filled with pragmatic devices and rhetorical devices that helped to convey his message of unity and hope. They also conveyed his vision for the country and his plans for his presidency.

Biden frequently used direct addresses to engage his audience and emphasize his message. For example, he said, *“Мої дорогі Американці! Це велика нація. Ми хороші люди. Ми пройшли через століття, крізь шторми і розбрати, мирний і воєнний час, але у нас попереду ще далекий шлях”* [4].

The usage of rhetorical questions to challenge his audience and make them think about the issues facing the United States is very wide. For example, he asked, *“Чи зуміємо ми спільно подолати труднощі? Чи зможемо ми впоратися з цим труднощами? Чи зможемо ми виконати свої зобов'язання і передати нашим дітям новий, кращий світ?”* [4].

Joseph R. Biden strongly appealed to his audience's emotions to build support for his vision for the United States. For example, he said, *“Вірус, який буває раз на століття, безмовно вражає країну. За один рік він уже забрав стільки життів, скільки Америка втратила під час Другої світової війни. Втрачено мільйони робочих місць, закриті сотні тисяч підприємств, поклик до расової справедливості, якому щонайменше 400 років, рухає нами. Мрія про справедливість для всіх більше не буде відкладена на потім”* [4].

There are many more pragmatic devices that he uses in the inaugural speech. Among them are repetition and concrete examples. Biden used repetition to emphasize key points in his speech. For example, he said, “*Ми рухатимемося вперед швидко й невідкладно, тому що нам потрібно багато зробити цієї зими, повної небезпек і можливостей*” [4].

The usage of concrete examples was to illustrate his points and make his vision for the United States more tangible. For example, “*Ми відновимо наші альянси та знову співпрацюватимемо зі світом. Не вчорашні виклики, а сьогоднішні та завтрашні*” [4].

Overall, Biden's inaugural speech was a powerful example of how pragmatic devices can be used to convey a clear and compelling message to an audience. His pragmatic devices helped to convey his message of unity, healing, and progress, and set the tone for his presidency. The usage of rhetorical devices in his inaugural speech helped to create a sense of unity and hope among his audience. It helped to convey his message more effectively and make his vision for the United States more compelling.

Moreover, I analysed the concepts that were used in Biden's speech. They are the following.

The concept of “the people” is conveyed in Biden's speech through the repeated use of the pronoun *we*, and its grammatical variant *us* in contextual use (*any one of us, some of us, all of us, enough of us*): “*У кожен із цих моментів достатньо з нас збиралося разом, щоб вести всіх нас вперед. І ми можемо це зробити зараз* [4]”.

The concept of “President” in Joe Biden's speech is mainly expressed in reference to his predecessors: *predecessors, President Carter, Abraham Lincoln*. However, this concept is also expressed by the personal pronoun *I*, as well as by the lexeme *President*: “*Як і президент Картер, з яким я розмовляв учора ввечері, але який не може бути з нами сьогодні, але якого ми вітаємо за його службу*”

протягом усього життя[4]”.

The second most representative concept is “Struggle”. This can be explained by a number of factors. The concept of struggle is responsible for the struggle in a broad sense and can be applied to various situations. The units of the nominal field of the concept of struggle in Joe Biden's inaugural speech are syntagms with the following nuclear elements *to fight, to confront, to defeat, to tear apart, struggle, battle, destroy, war, violence*: *“Наша історія була постійною боротьбою між американським ідеалом про те, що всі ми створені рівними, і жорсткої потворною реальністю, коли нас розривали на частини расизм, нативізм, страх, демонізація. Вірус, який буває раз на століття, безмовно вражає країну. За один рік він уже забрав стільки життів, скільки Америка втратила під час Другої світової війни [4]”.*

Unlike traditional and “static” concepts (*people, president*), the concept of “Challenge of Time” is relevant and dynamic, corresponding to the time, era, and present. In the synchronous slice of the present, the content of this concept is set by the coronavirus pandemic, the fight for minority rights, environmental problems, and unemployment: *“Я прошу кожного американця приєднатися до мене у цій справі. Об'єднатися для боротьби з ворогами, які нам протистоять, зі злістю, образою і ненавистю, екстремізмом, беззаконням, насильством, захворюванням, безробіттям і безнадією. Разом ми здатні на великі справи, важливі справи [4]”.* This concept is expressed by any syntagms and linguistic units that indicate the pressing problems of American society: *racism, unemployment, virus, pandemic, climate crisis*: *“Настав час нового випробування. Наша демократія, наша правда піддаються нападам. Лютує вірус, зростає несправедливість, гноблення у зв'язку зі системним расизмом, кліматична криза. Роль, яку США відіграють у світі. Кожне з цих випробувань є серйозним викликом. Але ми стикнулися з усіма ними одночасно. На нашу країну лягла найважча відповідальність в історії, і ми пройдемо це випробування [4]”*

The concept of “America” is characteristic of the American inaugural discourse and is represented mainly by the toponym *America*: “Крізь горнило століть Америка знову пройшла випробування. І Америка відповіла на виклик [4]”

The concept of the “American Dream” is expressed in terms that contain stereotypical goals and desires for American society, for example: *safe schools, good jobs, racial justice, public good*: “Ми можемо виправити неправильне. Ми можемо дати людям хорошу роботу. Ми можемо навчати наших дітей в безпечних школах. Ми можемо подолати цей смертоносний вірус. Ми можемо винагородити за роботу і відновити середній клас і гарантувати охорону здоров’я для всіх. Ми можемо забезпечити расову справедливість і ми можемо знову зробити Америку провідною силою добра у світі [4]”

The concept of “Law and Order” is conveyed by nominal elements that describe American institutions and laws, as well as objects and phenomena that embody the Law: *Capitol, Constitution, transfer of power, sacred ground, Security*: “Я щойно склав священну присягу, яку склали всі ці патріоти. Першим цю присягу склав Джордж Вашингтон” [4].

The presence of the concept of “Democracy” in the speech is due to the fact that the institution of inaugural speeches is impossible without democracy and is the result of a democratic electoral process. This concept is explicated by the following nominal units: *right to vote, election, democracy, liberty*: “Сьогодні ми святкуємо перемогу не кандидата, а справи, справи демократії” [4].

Thus, according to statistical analysis, the core of the conceptsphere is the concepts of people (38%) and struggle (14%). The nuclear elements are the concepts of America (10%), the challenge of time (10%), unity (9%), the American dream (6%), law and order (5%), democracy (5%), and the president (3%).

There is also a strong connection between some of the concepts. Given that common struggle and overcoming difficulties unites people, it is not surprising that

the concepts of “People”, “Struggle”, “Community” and “Challenge of the Times” are discursively accentuated in the same speech episodes: *“Сьогодні, в цей січневий день, я всією душею підтримую об’єднання Америки, об’єднання нашого народу, об’єднання нашої країни. Я прошу кожного американця приєднатися до мене у цій справі. Об’єднатися для боротьби з ворогами, які нам протистоять, зі злістю, образою і ненавистю, екстремізмом, беззаконням, насильством, захворюванням, безробіттям і безнадією. Разом ми здатні на великі справи, важливі справи” [4].*

Thus, summarizing the results of the discourse analysis and conceptual analysis of Joe Biden's inaugural speech, we can conclude that the inaugural speech places a strong emphasis on uniting people and demonstrating the unity of the president and the people through the concepts of “People” and “Unity” as well, the high representation of the concept of “Struggle” emphasizes that by reminding of common difficulties and calling for a fight against them, the President achieves a strong emotional reaction from the audience and even encourages action. This study shows that there is a complex relationship between language and politics.

2.3 Comparative aspects of the pragmatic and rhetorical means used in the proposed inaugural speeches

While J. Biden is characterized by such qualities as straightforwardness and rationalism, V. Zelenskyy has a more complex character, a multilayered consciousness, as he must constantly overcome certain traditional constructs, being in an eternal search and confrontation between the old and the new. In contrast to the bright rationalism of the American, he is characterized by compassion, sincerity, and emotional sensitivity. J. Biden's communication practices are determined by their national culture: “The formation of values, the worldview of Americans is conditioned by history, culture, geographical location; many ancestors of modern Americans fled to the continent, leaving their native places, because freedom of conscience, religion was more precious to them than earthly goods... adaptation to harsh conditions, survival and war with the natives tempered the character of

Americans, made them strong, stubborn, proactive, and rose above their own destiny” [21]. One of the values is individualism, which often manifests itself in selfish behavior.

A verbal manifestation of the American president's egoism is his frequent use of the pronoun “I” in comparison to the pronoun “We”. The pronouns “I” and “We” have a subjective/objective meaning and demonstrate the speaker's attitude to what he says, what he talks about, and how he thinks. A person who has recently taken the position of a political leader and become the first person in the state changes his or her language. Young politicians use the pronoun “I” more often, because the word “I” is associated with a lot of attention to oneself, preoccupation, anxiety, internal thoughts and feelings. V. Zelenskyy feels more comfortable and uses the pronoun “We” in his speech more often than “I”.

Figures of speech used by Ukrainian and American politicians are often common in form, but differ significantly in content, which reflects national and cultural markers and is determined by the level of personal culture of the speaker. For example, jokes, humor, and anecdotes are used by politicians of both countries, but their content is fundamentally different. While J. Biden's humor is more social, quite personal, and usually ironic about his own qualities (for example, he subtly ridicules the thirst for personal gain), V. Zelenskyy's humor is more politicized, not allowing ridicule of himself, his family members, or political partners.

In their speeches, politicians of both countries often use expressive means in the form of grammatical forms and phrases used to evaluate/characterize an object or phenomenon in order to influence the interlocutor, persuade him/her to their own point of view, or make a threat. However, while V. Zelenskyy often uses jokes and a vernacular style of speech that differs from an official speech in its uncodified, profane, mixed nature of the means used, J. Biden's speech is more often pretentious and belligerent. Such an expressive tool as pathos is more pronounced in J. Biden's speech than in V. Zelenskyy's.

Overall, both Zelenskyy and Biden used a variety of pragmatic and rhetorical devices in their inaugural speeches to convey their messages effectively and engage their audiences. While their speeches were delivered in different contexts and to different audiences, they shared many similarities in terms of their use of language and persuasive techniques.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Having conducted the research, the following conclusions can be drawn:

Political discourse allows one to influence the audience and achieve certain political goals, so we can say that those who have control over political discourse gain control over society. In this regard, it seems necessary to understand how the

invisible manipulation of the public consciousness is carried out.

The pragmatic intention of political speeches plays a major role in the writing of the text of a speech. The purpose of the speech varies depending on the event or audience. The linguistic content of political speeches is determined by the formality and officialness of the event. Typically, the language should be logical and structured, with extensive use of bookish words, clichés, terms, established phrases, proper names, precise numbers and abbreviations to represent specific data.

To achieve the pragmatic intention, political speeches use a variety of expressive techniques, such as phonetic, lexical, morphological and syntactic units and forms that enhance emotions in speech and language and contribute to better assimilation of what is said by the audience. To achieve the imagery of language, political speeches are widely used artistic means, which are divided into tropes and stylistic figures.

Speech influence is an integral part of political discourse, in which an important role is played by the factor of the addressee, to whom the speech influence is directed, and who is involved in shaping the structure of political discourse. Understanding is the most important factor of speech influence in political discourse, as its purpose is to achieve appropriate feedback (action, change of opinion, political views, etc.) from the addressee.

The inaugural speech is a ritually important political text that occupies a high position in the system of political communication. The first speech of the newly elected president formulates the ideological basis for uniting society at a new stage of the country's development. The inaugural speech can be considered both a speech and a political action. Delivering an inaugural speech is a political action, as the fact of delivering a speech is an act of formally inaugurating a new president.

I have analysed V. Zelenskyy's speech in three aspects: structural and semantic, linguistic and conceptual, and linguistic and pragmatic.

The structure of the speech is subject to the general requirements for ritual texts of presidential rhetoric and includes framework components (greeting and mission statement) and the main part (statement and programme parts). At the semantic level, the article presents the verbalised opposition “*friend or foe*” and the triad “*I – we – they*”. At the linguistic and cognitive level, the fundamental concepts are defined – “president” and “Europe” and “Ukrainian” and “war”.

At the linguopragmatic level, the use of speech acts in the speech, including commissives and representatives, declaratives and directives, is considered. The dominant communication strategies are self-presentation, consolidation, appeal and intellectualisation.

RÉSUMÉ

Полешко Єлена Вячеславівна, Па 16-20

Темою курсової роботи є: “Прагматичні і риторичні засоби у інавгураційних промовах українською і англійською мовами у зіставному аспекті”.

Актуальність дослідження зумовлена недостатньою кількістю праць, пов’язаних з особливостями застосування тих чи інших перекладацьких

трансформацій при перекладі офіційних промов політиків, що становить практичний інтерес для перекладача, особливо з урахуванням стрімкого розвитку ділового партнерства між Америкою та Україною.

Метою роботи є дослідження прагматичних і риторичних засобів у інавгураційних промовах українською і англійською мовами у зіставному аспекті.

Структура: курсова робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів основної частини, висновків, анотації та списку використаних джерел.

У першому теоретичному розділі були представлені та проаналізовані прагматичні та риторичні засоби, а також описано значення інавгураційних промов. У другому розділі представлена практична частина курсової роботи. Проаналізовано інавгураційну промову президента України Володимира Зеленського за трьома аспектами – структурно-семантичним, лінгвоконцептуальним і лінгвопрагматичним. В інавгураційній промові Дж. Байдена були виділені основні стратегії та концепти. У висновках було доведено та запропоновано головну ідею наукової роботи – об'єднання і стратегій прагматичних і риторичних засобів із точки зору аналізу політичного дискурсу відкриває нові перспективи для досліджень.

Ключові слова: інавгураційна промова, Володимир Зеленський, Джо Байден, прагматика, риторика, зіставний аспект, концепт, політика, президент, Америка, США, Україна, стратегія.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

1. Бацевич Ф. С. *Нариси з лінгвістичної прагматики*. Львів: ПАІС, 2010. 336 с.
2. Білоніжка І. С. *Лінгвостилістичні засоби інавгураційної промови президента США Джозефа Р. Байдена-молодшого*. Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Сер.: Філологія.

- Видавничий дім «Гельветика», 2021. № 48. Том. 1. С. 12-15.
3. Інавгураційна промова Президента України Володимира Зеленського. Retrieved from <https://www.president.gov.ua/news/inavguracijna-promova-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelensk-55489>
 4. Інавгураційна промова Президента США Джозефа Р. Байдена. Відновлено з <https://ua.usembassy.gov/uk/inaugural-address-by-president-joseph-r-biden-jr/>
 5. Климанська Л. *Потенціал метафори в політиці вирішення соціальних проблем*. Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Політологія, Соціологія, Філософія. Випуск 14, 2010. С. 18 – 23.
 6. Кожен з нас – президент. Головні тези інавгураційної промови Зеленського. Відновлено з <https://www.pravda.com.ua/articles/2019/05/20/7215535/>
 7. Корнієць К. А. *Основи теорії перекладу (для студентів-тюркологів ОС «Бакалавр»)*. Київ: ТОВ «Рекол», 2018. 114 с.
 8. Корунець І. В. *Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад): підручник*. Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2001. 448 с.
 9. Литвин І. М. *Перекладознавство. Науковий посібник*. Черкаси: Видавництво Ю. А. Чабаненко, 2013. 288 с.
 10. Нагорна Л.П. *Політична мова і мовна політика: діапазон можливостей політичної лінгвістики*. К.: Світогляд, 2005. 315 с.
 11. Назаренко М. М. *Труднощі перекладу текстів політичних промов*. Вісник ЛНУ імені Тараса Шевченка № 7 (321), 2018. С. 118–123
 12. Павловська В.Ю. *Способи вираження емфаз та особливості її перекладу українською мовою (на матеріалі текстів різних стилів)*. Филологические науки. Актуальные проблемы перевода. 2010.
 13. Падалка О. В. *Політична промова та її просодичні характеристики*. Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету імені Лесі Українки. Філологічні науки. Мовознавство. 2012. № 6. С. 66 – 69.

14. Селіванова О. О. *Проблема диференціації перекладацьких трансформацій*. *Нова філологія*, 2012, С. 201–208.
15. Серажим К. С. *Дискурс як соціолінгвальне явище: методологія, архітектоніка, варіативність*. Київ: КНУ, 2002. 392 с.
16. Славова Л. Л. *Мовна особистість лідера у дзеркалі політичної лінгвоперсонології: США – Україна*. Житомир: Житомирський державний університет ім. І. Франка, 2012. 360 с
17. Словник української мови. Академічний тлумачний словник. Відновлено з <http://sum.in.ua/s/intencija/komentari>
18. Стрій Л.І. *Структурно-композиційні особливості інавгураційної промови як жанру політичного дискурсу*. *Слов'янський збірник*. 2014. Вип.18. С. 240–247. Відновлено з http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/slzb_2014_18_30
19. Структурно-типологічні характеристики політичної промови (на матеріалі виступів А. Меркель). Відновлено з <http://philology.lnu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/RedePol.pdf>
20. Що спільного в інавгураційних промовах Зеленського, Рейгана і Трампа? Відновлено з <https://ukrainian.voanews.com/a/zelensky-speech/4926485.html>
21. Bellah R.N., Madsen R., Sullivan W.M., Swidler A., Tipton S.M. 2007. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. – *The Journal of American History*. Vol. 73. No. 1. P. 99-122. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2307/1903616>
22. Gallo C. *This is what made President Joe Biden's inauguration speech so powerful*. *Forbes*. 2021. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/carminegallo/2021/01/20/joe-biden-inauguration-speech-an-american-story-of-hope/?sh=1c911d2dfe50>
23. George H. Sabine. *The Pragmatic Approach to Politics*. *The American Political Science Review*. Vol. 24, 1930. P. 865-885.
24. Hazhar R.A., Shamaila A. *Speech act analysis of the Joseph R. Biden, Jr.'s*

- Inaugural address on 20th of January 2021 as the 46th President of the USA* (February 6, 2021). *Electronic Research Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*. 2021. Vol 3: Issue I, pp. 43–55, Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3780457>
25. Kravchenko, N., Vilenskij, S., Yudenko, O. (2022). *Deictic mitigation vs. Commissive acts in political interview (based on the modern European discourse of aid to Ukraine)*. *Bulletin of Alfred Nobel University. Series “Philological Sciences”*, Vol. 2, no. 44, pp.193-200.
26. Kravchenko, N., Pasternak, T., Korotka, S. (2021). *Deontic modality in epideictic discourse: Speech acts facet (based on COVID-associated texts)*. *Cogito. Multidisciplinary research journal*. 13(2), pp. 167–184.
27. Kravchenko, N. (2022). *Manipulative Argumentation in Anti-Ukrainian Discourse of Russian Politicians: Integration of Discourse-Analytical and Classical Rhetorical Approaches*. *Cogito*. Vol. XIV, no. 3., pp. 224–247.
28. Kravchenko, N., Goltsova, M., Kryknitska, I. (2020). *Politics as Art: The Creation of a Successful Political Brand*. *Journal of History, Culture and Art Research*. Volume 9, Issue 3, pp. 314-323
29. Lakoff R. T. *Talking Power: The politics of language in our lives*. New York. Basic Books.1990. 324 p.
30. Maliuk D. S., Sitko A. V. *Stylistic means of intention representing in speeches of U.S. political leaders. Issues of modern philology in the context of the interaction of languages and cultures*. International scientific and practical conference. Internship proceedings, December 27–28, 2019. Venice, Italy. C. 153-157.
31. Rohler L. E., Cook R. *Great speeches for criticism and analysis*. Alistair Press. 2001. 363 p
32. WBUR Newsroom. *Analysis: President Biden’s Inaugural Address, Annotated*. 2021. Retrieved from <https://www.wbur.org/news/2021/01/20/factcheck-joe-bidens-inaugural-address>

