

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Кафедра англійської філології, перекладу і філософії мови
імені професора О. М. Мороховського

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра

**Інтертекстуальні елементи в американському та британському
політичному дискурсі: семантика та функціонування**

Вітер Марії Сергіївни

студентки групи МЛа 52-19

факультету германської філології

денної форми навчання

Спеціальності 035 Філологія

Науковий керівник

кандидат філологічних наук,

доцент Ситенька О. В.

Допущена до захисту

«_____» _____ року

Завідувач кафедри

_____ проф. Маріна О. С.

(підпис) (ПІБ)

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів: _____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ – 2020

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Professor O. M. Morokhovsky Department of English Philology, Translation, and
Philosophy of Language

Master's Thesis
Intertextual References in American and British Political Discourse:
Semantics and Functioning

Maria Viter

Group MLa 52-19

Department of Germanic Philology

Full-Time Study

Speciality 035 Philology

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. O. V. Sytenka

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv – 2020

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES OF INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCES IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	7
1.1. Political Discourse as a Linguistic Phenomenon.....	7
1.1.1. Approaches to the Definition of Political Discourse.....	11
1.1.2. Prototypical Features of Political Discourse.....	12
1.1.3. Types (Classification) of Modern Political Discourse.....	14
1.2. Intertextuality as a Category of Political Discourse.....	16
1.2.1. The Notion of Intertextuality.....	19
1.2.2. Pragmatic and Communicative Dimensions of Intertextuality in Political Discourse.....	22
1.2.3. Types and Functions of Intertextual References in Political Discourse.....	24
Conclusions to Chapter One.....	27
CHAPTER TWO. SEMANTICS AND FUNCTIONING OF INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCES IN AMERICAN AND BRITISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	28
2.1. Semantic and Functional Aspects of Biblical Intertextual References in American and British Political Discourse.....	29
2.1.1. Citation of the Bible.....	30
2.1.2. Biblical allusions.....	34
2.2. Semantic and Functional Aspects of Intertextual References to Literary, Historical and Legislative Texts in American and British Political Discourse.....	40
2.2.1. Literary allusions.....	41

2.2.2.		Historical
allusions.....	43	
2.2.3.	Quoting legislative instruments	
(texts).....	46	
2.3. Cultural and Functional Aspects of Quoting Famous Personalities in American and British Political Discourse.....	47	
2.3.1. Quoting personalities.....	48	
Conclusions to Chapter Two.....	54	
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	55	
RÉSUMÉ.....	57	
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	59	
LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS.....	67	
APPENDICES.....	68	

INTRODUCTION

Intertextuality is an ideological strategy used by politicians in order to influence people through the power-play. As far as all people depend on understanding and sharing presuppositions during the communication process (see Knoblauch 2005: 334–40), they should share common knowledge, or in other words K-device (see van Dijk 2001: 350). Otherwise, people face misunderstanding and political campaign fails. That is why politicians always thoroughly prepare their speeches taking into consideration their audience, its tastes, cultural and historical aspects, or habitus in other words. Politicians may use allusions (Biblical, historical, and literary), but they may directly quote famous personalities or cite the Bible as well. Both allusions and quotations are forms of intertextual references and are used as a strategy of influence and persuasion. Functioning and semantics of intertextual references differ in American and British political discourse. It depends on the cultural and historical differences between British and Americans. Critical

discourse analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary approach, which encompasses the studies of historical and cultural aspects of the nation. CDA includes systematic linguistic (pragmatic, rhetorical, argumentative, and text-linguistic) analysis of the political speeches (Wodak 2011: 67).

The topicality of this study lies in the diversity of modern approaches to the definition of intertextuality as the means in which discourses produce their meaning through references to other discourses (Wodak 2011: 167). The investigation of the intertextual potential of British and American political discourse can help to reveal how intertextual elements are employed in it for intensifying its communicative and pragmatic influence on the audience.

The object of the study is intertextual references in American and British political discourse (citation of the Bible, Biblical allusions, literary allusions, historical allusions, quoting legislative instruments, and quoting personalities).

The subject of the research is the semantic and functional aspects of intertextual references in American and British political discourse.

Theoretical value of the master's paper lies in a thorough investigation of the aspects that influence American and British politicians' choice of intertextual references, reasons of their use as well as consequences of their use.

Practical value of the results gained in the study is in their further application in pragmatics and stylistics. The results can also be applicable to writing students' papers, diploma papers and post-graduates' researches.

The aim of this work is to study the communicative and pragmatic aspects (semantics and functioning) of intertextuality in American and British political discourse.

The realization of the aim presupposes the solution of such **tasks**:

- 1) to study political discourse as a linguistic and social phenomenon;
- 2) to define rhetorical features in political discourse;
- 3) to clarify the communicative and pragmatic aspects of British and American political discourse;

- 4) to specify the term intertextuality in the context of modern linguistic studies;
- 5) to define specific features of British and American political discourse which predetermine its intertextuality;
- 6) to reveal the intertextual potential of British and American political discourse;
- 7) to study the way elements of Christian mythology integrate in the American and British political discourse to create new shades of meaning;
- 8) to study semantic and functional aspects of intertextual references to literary, historical, and legislative texts;
- 9) to study cultural and functional aspects of quoting famous personalities in American and British political discourse.

Methods of research used in the paper include critical discourse analysis (CDA), discourse-historical analysis (DHA) and sociocognitive approach to study semantic and functional aspects of intertextual references in American and British political discourse.

The novelty of the paper is in the investigation of semantic and functional aspects of such intertextual references as citation of the Bible, Biblical allusions, historical allusions, literary allusions, quoting legislative texts, and quoting famous personalities, which were not in the focus of political discourse studies before now.

Compositionally, the paper consists of the introduction, two chapters, conclusions to each chapter and general conclusions to the whole paper, resume, the list of references and appendices.

In the **Introduction** the paper presents the object and the subject of the investigation, underlines the topicality of the problem under study, mentions the novelty of the gained results, sets the main aim and the tasks by which it is achieved, considers the methods of research used in the paper, and discusses the content of each chapter separately.

Chapter One presents general theoretical foundations of political discourse studies of intertextual references in political discourse. It includes the study of political discourse as a linguistic phenomenon, approaches to the definition of political discourse, prototypical features of political discourse, types of modern political discourse, intertextuality as a category of political discourse, the notion of intertextuality, pragmatic and communicative dimensions of intertextuality in political discourse, types and functions of intertextual references in political discourse.

Chapter Two considers semantics and functioning of intertextual references in American and British political discourse. It includes semantic and functional aspects of Biblical intertextual references in American and British political discourse (citation of the Bible, and Biblical allusions), semantic and functional aspects of intertextual references to literary, historical, and legislative texts in American and British political discourse (literary allusions, historical allusions, and quoting legislative instruments), semantic and functional aspects of quoting famous personalities in American and British political discourse.

General Conclusions outline the tasks solved, the goals achieved in the current study and the perspectives of further investigation in this area.

CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES OF INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCES IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Political discourse is a type of discourse that is based on cultural myths and is aimed at persuading people to believe in ideological beliefs. Political discourse is mainly studied from the perspective of critical discourse analysis (CDA) because it describes the mechanisms that construct ideological foundation of a political speech. When studying political discourse it is important to give the definition of this phenomenon, then to study its rhetoric (rhetorical devices) and persuasive strategies that play a key role in shaping people's opinions. Intertextual references are used as persuasive strategies by both American and British politicians in order to influence their audience. However, the employment of intertextual references

depends on the cultural and historical background of the nation. In addition, there are certain conditions that must be met for intertextual references to have their impact on people's minds.

1.1. Political Discourse as a Linguistic Phenomenon

Political discourse is one of the types of discourse. Discourse itself is a complicated phenomenon because there is no hard demarcation between “discourse” and “text” as these two phenomena share different and similar characteristics at the same time. Discourse is interactive, while text is not. There are many scholars and linguists who thoroughly examined the phenomenon of discourse as well as the one of text. They are Laclau Ernesto, Habermas Jürgen, Foucault Michel, Mouffe Chantal, Luhmann Niklas.

Generally, “discourse” may be defined as a political strategy, a speech, a policy, a topic-related conversation or a language. The meaning of “discourse” is vast because it covers such phenomena as “genre”, “style” and “register”. Moreover, discourse may even be called a programme that is used by politicians as a tool of influence (Reisigl 2007; Wodak & de Cillia 2006; Blommaert 2005). When studying the phenomenon of discourse, it is more appropriate thus to adhere to only one definition of discourse.

As far as the focus is on American and British political discourse, the phenomenon of discourse from the perspective of these two nations is studied. It is acceptable to use the notion “discourse” when dealing both with oral and written texts (Schiffrin 1994; Gee 2004). However, some researchers preferring a Foucauldian approach adhere to the idea that text differs from discourse and discourse is not fulfilled through text (Jäger & Maier 2009). However, it is true that discourse is more abstract than text (Lemke 1995). Thus, “discourse” is some abstract knowledge, while “text” is a physical realization of this knowledge.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is applied while examining this question because CDA is an approach that presents discourse as a use of language in speech and in writing. In addition, CDA enables us to treat discourse as a form of “social

practice”. It presupposes that discourse is based on an interrelation between a social structure and discursive event, an institution or situation that frame it or vice versa. Discourse is thus conditioned and constituted by society itself. In other words, it is constructed by people but at the same time it influences people. Firstly, politicians, for example, propagate certain ideas by creating an influential political company. It influences the society modifying its way of thinking. Once the society have absorbed these influential ideas transforming them, the tendencies change and politicians have to adjust to them. Thus, one may conclude that discourse is socially constituted and conditioned. It is also socially consequential and has ideological effects (Fairclough & Wodak 1997: 260).

Critical discourse approach takes into account the interrelation between society and language. Speaking more precisely, Critical discourse analysis is such an analytical approach that focuses on the interrelations between ideology, inequality and identity as well as the ways they are reflected in texts (van Dijk 2001: 352). Ideology and identity are tightly connected and are found in social and political contexts (van Dijk 2001). Social identities as well as inequalities exist owing to language which is extremely important when it’s about constructing ideologies (Wodak 2001: 10). That is why “discourse” as a linguistic phenomenon is primarily viewed as language because language is a tool exploited by politicians in creating political discourse.

Political discourse may be defined as a cluster of hidden motivations, influence, ideology in speech both oral and written. Thus, CDA is used to deconstruct reading and interpret a text with its hidden ideology (cf. Wodak 2011a). Political discourse is also viewed as a cluster of semiotic data which comprises power and ideologies that must be demystified (Wodak 2013: 21). That is why it is important to treat political discourse both as a linguistic unit and as a social phenomenon (Wodak 2013: 21).

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is used to reveal the implicit in the text. Implicit is a hidden ideology that must be demystified and become explicit (Wodak 2013: 27). In order to do that one needs to apply a critical analysis of a semiotic

data of the text, that is to say, to analyse text vertically and horizontally. With this purpose different approaches of the study PD are used. They are Dialectical-Relational Approach of Fairclough, Sociocognitive Approach of van Dijk, Discourse-Historical Approach of Wodak et al., Critical Metaphor Analysis of Charteris-Black, or Cognitive-linguistic Approach of Chilton. Each of the mentioned representatives choose their own tool that they use in order to analyse the text. In other words history, social cognition, conceptual metaphor theory, sequential order, discourse practice, cognitive processing underlie the distinction.

The main distinguishing feature among all these representatives arguably lay in the aspects which acquire a mediating role between language and politics, which are, in sequential order, history, social cognition, discourse practice, or conceptual metaphor theory (Filardo-Llamas and Michael S. Boyd 2018: 317).

Discourse-Historical Approach (Wodak et al.'s), Dialectical-Relational Approach (Fairclough) and Sociocognitive Approach (van Dijk) are applied in order to study the relationship between language, its use and influence. A great number of different elements should be taken into account such as the use and implementation of discourse practices (including into consideration the study of PD genres and their influence of the meaning and form of PD) and history that is mentioned in the political speeches through intertextuality.

While analyzing the political speeches three-stage approach to CDA is used (Fairclough 1989): interaction, textual features and representation. Such notions as context and text are taken into account when studying background knowledge that is implemented in text. In practice, the description, interpretation and explanation of the usage of intertextuality in the political speech are provided because intertextual references are used as powerful tool of influence. The application of theory of metafunctions (ideational, interpersonal, and textual) of language introduced by Halliday (2004) is appropriate as the focus is on the study of the pragmatic aspect of the usage of intertextual references.

Moreover, PD genres are also taken into account because the usage of intertextual reference are inextricably connected with the usage of political genre.

In general, PG comprise political effects and political participants (Laura Filardo-Llamas and Michael S. Boyd 2018: 256). However, the focus is mainly on the political effects and their catalysts such as political statements, political speeches and intertextuality that is used in them. Thus, the interest is in the intertextual relation with other texts, discursive relations and socio-political context (Benke and Wodak 2003: 225).

To sum up, discourse is a linguistic phenomenon that may be viewed as language in use if it is studied from the communicative aspect. Regarding discourse from a linguistic aspect, it may be defined as language that is far beyond the sentence level. From the extralinguistic aspect discourse is language as social practice. In order to be objective studying the phenomenon of political discourse as well as its intertextual relations with other texts while defining political discourse all three aspects, namely linguistic, communicative and extralinguistic are taken into account. Focusing on an interdisciplinary approach namely CDA political discourse and intertextual relations within it are studied.

1.1.1. Approaches to the Definition of Political Discourse

Studying political discourse CDA analysts pay attention to economical, political and social spheres of a certain nation (Wodak 2011: 36). They also study the changes of the text as well as explain them (Van Leeuwen 2006).

Political discourse analysts study language and its power. However, the definition of this phenomenon differs accordingly to the approach. For example, if Ruth Wodak uses discourse-historical approach, she examines historical and cultural layers that influence the nature of political discourse. Fairclough views discourse from dialectical-relational approach, van Dijk uses sociocognitive approach, Charteris-Black is focused on critical metaphor analysis, Chilton is interested in cognitive-linguistic approach. In general, they all regard discourse from different perspectives but what unites them is that they consider a social practice to underlie political discourse (Fairclough & Wodak 1997: 258). Language

in use, or language in context is thus important when studying ideology of the text (Wodak 2001: 87). Taking into consideration that different aspects are highlighted in political discourse depending on the approach, the attention is paid particularly to CDA because CDA is classified as an interdisciplinary approach that comprises different methods and different perspectives to study the interrelation between language and social context (Wodak 2011). Fairclough and Wodak (1997) employ several principles to the study of political discourse.

Firstly, the explicitness of power relationships is possible when linguistic characteristics and cultural processes are taken into account (Fairclough & Wodak 1997: 156). Secondly, power relations exist in discourse (Fairclough & Wodak 1997: 159). Thirdly, society and culture are constituted by discourse (Pierre Bourdieu 1984; Fairclough & Wodak 1997). Fourthly, discourse contains ideology. Study the way the texts are interpreted means to study explicit ideologies (Fairclough & Wodak 1997). In addition, history is never excluded from discourse because historical context plays an important role in revealing its implicit ideology (Wodak 1996, 2001; Fairclough & Wodak 1997).

Consequently, definitions of discourse depend on the stages of its development (Fairclough 1993). There are three stages that characterize political discourse from different perspectives. The first stage is called linguistic because language is studied beyond the sentence level (Fairclough 1993). The second stage is called communicative because language is studied in its use (Fairclough 1993). The third stage is called extralinguistic because language is perceived as a social practice (Fairclough 1993). To successfully define the nature of political discourse it is important to view discourse from the perspective of the three stages because, firstly, discourse is beyond the suprasentential level (Wodak 2011). Secondly, discourse is a practical usage of language (Wodak 2011). Thirdly, discourse is a result of historical and cultural background (Wodak 2011).

To conclude, CDA is applied because it is an interdisciplinary approach that regards political discourse in the interrelation to the social practice. Its aim is to make explicit the implicit ideologies through studying culture, history and

language of the text. Generally, the definition of political discourse is not changeable. It depends on the approach in which political discourse is employed. Those linguists who adhere to the linguistic stage of discourse development, for example, Harris Zellig, define political discourse as the language beyond the sentence level. Such linguists as Dijk Teun, G. Brown, G. Yule, Hatch E.M. conceive discourse as language in use according to the communicative stage of discourse development. Ruth Wodak adheres to the extralinguistic stage viewing discourse as social practice. The focus in our Master's qualification paper is on the extralinguistic stage.

1.1.2. Prototypical Features of Political Discourse

Political discourse includes such pivotal constituents as *timing, role and location* which are taken into consideration while studying historical, social and cultural contexts of the text (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 16). Michel Foucault pointed at two significant aspects that are important for PD Studies. First, Michel Foucault (1981) described discourse as a social practice that is realized through language and organised by power relationships. The notion "text" was thus questioned in PD. Second, the language in PD is studied through the study of political myths and symbols which constitute ideology of the discourse (Kaal, Maks and van Elfrinkh 2014). It may be concluded that ideology is always implicitly present in political discourse.

One of the main focuses in PD Analysis is on the relationship between language and ideology (Fowler et al. 1979). In order to study the way language and ideology are interrelated as well as to make ideology explicit, such processes as "defamiliarization and consciousraising" are used (Fowler 2009: 273). Defamiliarization is a technique and theory that is used to make familiar sounds unfamiliar placing words, which hide the notions and images, in a new context. In our Master's paper the technique "defamiliarization" is applied to see the way historical events, quotations of the Bible and of other literary works appear in a new context and become intertextual references that constitute a new text.

One more important feature of political discourse is the presence of political stance. It is important to take into account this notion when studying functioning of intertextual references and semantics in PD (Fowler 2009: 273). Chilton and Schäffner (2002: 32) state that the speaker and the audience are always physically positioned in a certain manner, in time, in ongoing utterance and discourse.

Epistemic and deontic modal uses underlie prototypical features of political discourse. Epistemic modal use is the evaluation of the speaker's proposition that helps audience to understand the degree of "truth commitment" (Chilton 2004: 59). Deontic modality is normativity, or in other words, it is a way in which the speaker's authority is either emphasized or deemphasized (Chilton 2004: 59). The relationship between speaker and audience is explained by the interaction dimension. Political discourse in the form of a political speech, for example, transmits the message and serves as the interaction dimension because speaker pronounces the message and his audience perceives it. Thus, one of the features of political discourse is to convey a message. Discourse cannot exist if there is no information, idea and message. It is called an interpersonal metafunction which carries "deontic powers" (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012: 72). Deontic powers are the human ability to impose ideas on others as well as regulate the activities of others. The analysis of deontic modality is thus important for the study of political discourse. When speaker and audience share some common beliefs the implicit message hidden in the discourse is understood and the speaker's aim to influence his audience is achieved.

Past experiences, present events and future visions are always integrated in political discourse. Intertextuality and recontextualization are thus common for PD (Wodak 2011: 31–32).

Fairclough and Wodak as well as other key figures as van Dijk, Scollon, Gee and van Leeuwen are interested in the relation between power and language implemented in discourse, although Fairclough and Wodak focus primarily on political discourse. All abovementioned linguists use exactly CDA as a tool of studying discourse because CDA provides them with the methodological and

ontological principles that enable them to see the way social power turns into the “typifications” and “habitualizations”. Typifications and habitualizations are the important notions for PD. These processes make semiotic devices quite objective and as a result logic is manifested through symbols, strategies, values and hierarchy. It is also contextualized and recontextualized (Wodak 2011: 43)

In conclusion, PD contains such constituents as timing, role and location. There is always an interaction dimension. Defamiliarization and consciousness-raising, deontic modality and deontic powers, intertextuality and recontextualization, typifications and habitualizations are prototypical features of PD.

1.1.3. Types (Classification) of Modern Political Discourse

In general, there are approaches to classifying discourse. They are linguistic (e.g. publicistic, belletristic, scientific), communicative (e.g. monological and dialogical) and extralinguistic (e.g. film discourse/cinematic) (Wodak 2011: 78).

Linguistic approach takes into consideration functional styles. Communicative reflects the interaction of different people. Extralinguistic takes into account the components of a communicative situation (Wodak 2011: 79).

In our paper the focus is exactly on the extralinguistic approach as it takes into account all the aspects of PD. Multimodality is one of the most important notions in this very case because it enables the textual, linguistic, aural, spatial, and visual resources to be taken into account when describing communication practices. Multimodality enhances potential of PD because the more senses are involved into perception of the information, the stronger is effect of the influence of PD.

Extralinguistic approaches comprise monodefinitions and polydefinitions. Monodefinition of PD is exactly the type of discourse with respect to communicative situation components (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 116). Polydefinitions take into account several components of a communicative situation (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 116–120).

Monodefinitions of PD are characterized by presence in PD either participant-related types, topic-related types, setting-related types, channel-related types or message form/ code-related types (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 132). Taking into account all components is important, however for this approach only presence of only one type is common.

Discourse studies may be classified with respect to the number of components of an event or communicative situation that are taken into account (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 135). There are two components, three components, four components etc. discourse studies. Generally, it is preferable for the discourse studies to include one, two and three components, otherwise text becomes incomprehensive and too overloaded with information what actually makes it difficult for the recipients to perceive the message. The dominating combinations includes two situation components. Nature of component combinations may be of two types, namely cross-discursive and in-discursive (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 137). When one component is connected with different components, one deals with a cross-discursive type. When components are connected with one component, one speaks of in-discursive type (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 140). Examples of poly components discourse are “A gender-based Approach to Parliamentary Discourse” (Benamins 2016) or “Telecinematic Discourse – films, film trailers and television series” (Benamins 2011). A specific feature of poly components discourse is that the number of participants, topic, setting, channel, message form are numerous (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 150).

More specifically, discourse types vary according to the components. The most common types of discourse are agricultural discourse, courtroom discourse, digital discourse, financial discourse, foreign discourse, gendered discourse, immigration discourse, pedagogical discourse, political discourse, reality show discourse, terrorism discourse, theatrical discourse, tourism discourse, workplace discourse, zoo discourse (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 152).

In conclusion, three approaches to classifying discourse are linguistic, communicative and extralinguistic. Extralinguistic approaches to discourse

typology are divided into monodefinitions and polydefinitions. Types of discourse depend on events and situation components. They are participants, channel, topic, setting and message form. Monodefinitions comprise only one component. Polydefinitions have two and more components. As a result there are two components, three components, four components etc. discourse studies. The dominating combinations include two situation components. Nature of component combinations may be cross-discursive and in-discursive.

1.2. Intertextuality as a Category of Political Discourse

Intertextuality is a several stage process that includes decontextualization, entextualization and recontextualization. Irrespectively of the focus, which may be placed on spoken/ written language or on all forms of semiotic units (Blommaert 2005: 3), a text is still an objectified unit of discourse (Gal 2006: 178) that is emerged from its originating context (decontextualized) and transferred into a new setting where it is recontextualized (Bauman and Briggs 1990). In this way, fragments of discourse are entextualized because having being inserted in a new context they become new pieces of information. They enter thus into a social “circulation” (Wodak 2011: 135). Intertextuality is a very important category of PD as it is used as a tool of influence.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, it was the Russian philosopher and literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin who worked on the concept of intertextuality. Mikhail Bakhtin along with the Bakhtin Circle treated language as a phenomenon which is full of “dialogic overtones” (Bakhtin 1986: 92). By dialogic, Bakhtin means that what is known and said by a person is already said and known by others as everyone possesses a common knowledge (Bakhtin 1986: 279). That is to say, nothing new is not actually new but already known. The world of discourse according to Jakobson is pre-populated. This means that even “inner speech” as well as traditional monologues have already existed before because the world is full of utterances already uttered by someone else (Jakobson 1953: 15). As Bakhtin (1981) writes people’s judgements are transmitted, weighed and recalled on others’

opinions, information and words. As a result, people continually accentuate and reaccentuate what has already been said before (Bakhtin 1986: 89) and thus “the chain of speech communion” appears (Bakhtin 1986: 94). From the perspective of Bakhtin, language use becomes a social phenomenon because all people’s utterances and speeches are filled with the utterances and thoughts of others. The question is in the degree of detachment (Bakhtin 1986: 89).

The Bakhtinian perspective differs greatly from the approaches of the linguists who worked in the tradition established by Ferdinand de Saussure and in the one established later by Chomsky. They conceived language as an individual rather than a social phenomenon (Mannheim and Tedlock 1995), consequently no “social milieu” is important (Voloshinov 1973: 93). For example, Barthes (1977) creates an imagery of “text as a woven fabric” to describe the phenomenon of intertextuality. It means that intertextuality is a network of texts. Texts are interwoven into a new patchwork of coherent texts.

In our work two views are combined. Generally, it is true that there is a finite number of grammatically correct constructions and ideas may sound similar because they are socially limited and constrained. However, the way the words are combined are different because it finally depends on the cognitive capacities of the individual. As a result it is more appropriate to take into account both Bakhtinian perspective and the one of Chomsky.

Literary theorist Julia Kristeva introduced Bakhtin’s ideas to French audiences (Kristeva 1967, 1968, 1969, 1974). It was she who coined the term “intertextuality”. She coined this term to describe Bakhtin’s idea of “dialogism” (Ruth Wodak, 2011). Therefore, our focus is on the works of Kristeva, however Bakhtinian perspective is taken into account too. Kristeva (1980) defines text as “a permutation of texts, an intertextuality” (Ruth Wodak, 2011). According to Kristeva (1980) there are two axes of intertextuality namely horizontal and vertical. Horizontal axe represents the relationship between subject and addressee (Ruth Wodak, 2011). Bakhtin described such relations as “the chain of speech communion” (Bakhtin, 1986: 94). Fairclough and Johnstone use the notion of

horizontal intertextuality (Fairclough 1992: 103; Johnstone 2008: 164). They say that horizontal intertextuality is expressed through the remarks of speakers. One speaker listens to another making remarks. A “conversational turn” is created (cf. Du Bois 2014 on dialogic syntax). In this way, horizontal intertextuality contributes to the creation of the syntagmatic or sequential relationships between texts (Johnstone 2008: 164). Of course, a dialogue that takes place in a single setting is not limited to horizontal intertextuality because a speaker’s words may be quoted, alluded, or paraphrased (Wodak 2011). Thus, the words are constantly repeated. Ruth Wodak describing the day of a politician notes that wherever this politician is, he constantly propagates consciously and unconsciously the main ideas of his party’s campaign. He spreads the ideas at all meetings whether they are formal or not. His words that constitute the speech chains are later may be, for example, paraphrased and used by someone else in his response (Wodak 2011). Tannen (2006) introduces the term “recycling”. Fairclough (1992: 104) uses the term “manifest intertextuality” of French discourse analysts Authier-Révuz (1982) and Maingueneau (1987). Quotatives (in spoken discourse) and quotation marks (in written discourse) “manifestly” mark the objectified units of discourse (i.e., the texts) and transfer the message of a prior discourse into a new discourse (Wodak 2011).

The term “type-source’d intertextuality” is introduced to show the paradigmatic relationship between texts (Johnstone 2008: 164; Silverstein, 2005). Authier-Révuz (1982) and Maingueneau (1987) employ the term “constitutive intertextuality” to mark the fusion of discourse conventions that constitute the emerged text. Fairclough (1992: 104) uses the same term but prefers to substitute intertextuality by interdiscursivity speaking of intertextuality as a broader term. However, other linguists, for example American linguistic anthropologists, on the contrary use interdiscursivity as a general term (Bauman 2005: 146).

Linguists, especially sociocultural linguists, say that “an active process of negotiation” is the process of contextualization and that the meaning is created due to the process of negotiation (Bauman and Briggs 1990: 69; cf. Voloshinov 1973:

102; see also Duranti and Goodwin 1992). Becker (1995) calls this process “reshaping”, a person remembers the prior texts or pieces of these prior texts quite imperfectly and the coherence and unity of the original text is thus lost, but is still reshaped into a new context. Discourse has various connections with past and future discourses, meaning is thus a result of not an isolated speech but of different relationships linking (Tannen 2007: 9).

To conclude, connections between reality and prior experience is constructed due to intertextual references. Each instance of discourse constitutes the discourse worlds. To understand how it works, it is indispensable to do a thorough analysis of the discourse worlds as well as to study the way how the instances connect to the deictic centre of the discourse world (Wodak 2011).

1.2.1. The Notion of Intertextuality

Fairclough introduces the concept of intertextuality from two perspectives: text “before” and text “after” (Fairclough 1992a, 1995a). The notion of intertextuality exists “between texts” because this term offers a perspective of looking at both writing and written texts, that is to say intertextuality is a result of a text’s interactions with readers, prior texts, writers, and conventions as well (Wodak 2011). Thibault (1994: 1751) says that all new texts (whether they are spoken or written) have connections with prior texts due to the meanings that text readers attach to them referring to other texts. Thus, in some sense intertextual references undermine such values as autonomy and originality (Allen 2000).

Scholars view the notion of “intertextuality” from different perspectives depending on their purpose. One can categorise them into two groups (Wodak 2011). The first group include scholars that focus on semiotics, mainly on literary semiotics. They are Frow (1986), Riffaterre (1978), Kristeva (1981), Culler (1981), Meinhof and Smith (2000), and Chandler (2005). They study the way codes are expressed in different texts and how these codes are transmitted between texts (Wodak 2011).

The second group includes those scholars who study critical discourse analysis and discourse analysis. They are Scollon (2004), Devitt (1991), Bazerman (1993, 2004), Fairclough (1992a, b, c, 1995a, b), Lemke (1983, 1985, 1988a,b, 1995a,b), Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), and White (2002). Their focus is non-literary works. In our paper the focus is on the second group of scholars. What is important to us is that the second group of scholars views intertextuality not only as the interrelation between texts regarding the semiotic codes that are transmitted from one text to another, but the interrelation between social and cultural aspects of the texts (Fairclough 1992a, b, c, 1995b). However, while analysing the phenomenon of intertextuality, it is preferable to combine different approaches (Wodak 2011).

Approaches to the definition of the notion intertextuality are defined by two conventions namely linguistic (White 2002) and social (Lemke 1995a). On the basic level of their examination, the focus is on the study of intertextual references and on the description of their nature that may be explicit or implicit (Wodak 2011). One speaks about the explicit intertextual references when they deal with direct quotations (e.g. the citations of the Bible or quotations of the literary texts) (Wodak 2011). Implicit intertextual references are those that are mentioned indirectly (Wodak 2011).

Fairclough (1992a, b, c, 1995b) describes intertextuality as a power that generates new texts restructuring existing conventions (Fairclough 1992b: 270). More specifically, prior texts take part in the production of the future texts as well as in the construction of conventions (Fairclough 1992b).

Fairclough (1992a, b, 1995b) views “discourse representation” as a form of intertextuality that consists of explicitly or implicitly marked devices such as quotation marks or allusions. According to Fairclough (1995b: 76) social practice is present in discourse due to intertextual references.

Intertextual relations are “power relations” because intertextual references whether they are implicit or explicit influence the audience’s perception of the information (Fairclough 1995b).

Devitt (1991) and Bazerman (1993, 2004) are scholars that belong to the new rhetoric tradition. They are mentioned because their focus is a social nature of the discourse that is constructed with the help of intertextual references. Intertextual relations are “social practice” (Bazerman 2004). Bazerman in his 2004 article outlines the basic concepts of intertextuality. These are intertextual distance, techniques that represent it, marks of contexts/recontextualization (Bazerman 2004). Bazerman (2004: 94) states that intertextuality is the way one uses the texts (why, for what, how) and the way one positions themselves in relation to the text.

Lemke views intertextuality as “activity patterns” that are results of community’s activities and are present in the discourse; activity patterns are interconnected, joined or disjoined, constituted on the basis of particular texts (Lemke 1995a: 86). For Lemke, intertextuality is connecting link between cultural and social aspects of different texts. Intertextual relations in the texts are always dependent on the “context of culture” (Malinowski 1923, 1935; Hasan 1985). The produced meanings depend on the situation-types and are characterized by a community’s culture (Wodak 2011).

White (2002 a, b) introduces the term “engagement” that is relevant when analysing intertextual references. “Engagement” is about “sourcing” different attitudes in a text (Martin 2002, p.58). According to White (2002a) “engagement” incorporates two categories of resources namely “intra-vocalisation” and “extra-vocalisation” (White 2002 a, b).

“Intra-vocalisation” is a term that used to describe the internal voice of the speaker or writer (Wodak 2011). The term “extra-vocalisation” is used to describe the external voice that is expressed in the text explicitly (Wodak 2011). Extra-vocalisation is connected with “attribution” (Wodak 2011). Quotations and references referring to the external sources are involved into attribution (Wodak 2011). In other words, the focus is on the linguistic resources that are used to find the “outside sources” in the text and find the way of objective evaluation of these sources (Droga & Humphrey 2002).

Intertextuality is employed in different political genres and with different purposes. Reisigl and Wodak (2009: 91) use eight political functions to categorise political genres: political advertising, lawmaking procedure, party-internal formation of attitudes, formation of public attitudes, inter-party formation, political executive, administration and political control, and organisation of international relations. However, one important aspect to be included is the notion of persuasion (Laura Filardo-Llamas and Michael S. Boyd, 2018). Chilton (2008: 226) sees the notion of persuasion as an important part of political discourse because one of the main functions of PD is to influence. Intertextuality is a device used to make audience believe and follow the imposed ideas (Laura Filardo-Llamas and Michael S. Boyd, 2018).

In conclusion, intertextuality is defined as the interrelation between texts. However, it is not simply the connection between semiotic devices, but the connection between cultural and social backgrounds. There is always an intra-vocalisation and extra-vocalisation in the texts that express reader's and writer's positions. They are present in the text due to the presence of intertextual references that are connecting links between texts.

1.2.2. Pragmatic and Communicative Dimensions of Intertextuality in Political Discourse

The French philosopher Michel Foucault (1981) coined the term “power-knowledge”. The term “power-knowledge” is a specific type of organizational knowledge (Michel Foucault 1981). According to Foucault, there is the interdependence between knowledge and power (Michel Foucault 1981). The one who possesses power influences those who has no knowledge using their knowledge (Michel Foucault 1981).

Every human being is dependent on understanding and sharing presuppositions during conversations (see Knoblauch 2005: 334–40; Polanyi 1967). Misunderstandings occur in case a hearer does not recognize such indirect pragmatic devices as presuppositions (Wodak 2011). In order to understand each

other people should have some common knowledge. If there is no common knowledge, the implicit message stays implicit for the hearer. Sometimes it causes problems in perception of the message, but sometimes it becomes a strategy used by politicians to achieve their aims (Wodak 2011).

Intertextuality is expressed through such figures as pastiche, calque, parody, quotations, allusions (Wodak 2011). Some scholars define intertextuality as one of the linguistic-pragmatic devices that indicates power and knowledge in PD (Wodak 2011).

Pragmatic and communicative aspects of intertextual references are expressed through the interrelation “power and knowledge” (Wodak 2011). Intertextual references are used as means of influence. Politicians use intertextual references (citation of the Bible, legislative documents, literary texts etc.) with only one aim that is to underpin their words with something usual, familiar and known for others as well as to trigger emotional response of their audience (Wodak 2011). Moreover, intertextual reference are used to construct myths in the political arena (Barthes 1957). Roland Barthes uses the term “myth” when speaking about the second semiotic reality (Barthes 1957; Edelman 1967: 16). According to Barthes semiotic reality is formed by myths that convey “ideologies of the ruling classes” (Barthes 1957). What is important for us is the usage of intertextual references as means of myths creation with the aim of influence. That is why it is important to take into account social and cultural aspects. Myths are created with the help of common knowledge. Common knowledge in its turn does not exist without shared cultural and social backgrounds. Those who have knowledge, have power as well (Wodak 2011). Holzschleiter (2005) defines power in PD as the struggle between political actors over various interpretations of one meaning. This struggle is called a struggle for “semiotic hegemony” that is a struggle for different linguistic codes, rules for turn-taking, decision-making, opening of sessions etc. (Holzschleiter 2005: 69).

According to van Dijk shared values and ideologies are found in political texts (van Dijk 1997:16–18). These shared values and ideologies concern different

political institutions, organisations and groups. They may be revealed due to intertextual references (van Dijk 1997). Intertextual references become powerful tool in the hands of powerful people that create them into ideological strategies (Wodak and de Cillia 2006: 714).

According to Chilton politicians use intertextuality as “an objective veil” to hide the real ideological message Chilton (2004: 46). Thus, the way they view reality is full of ideological beliefs (van Dijk 1998).

In conclusion, studying pragmatic and communicative potential of intertextual references it is important to pay attention to the interdiscursive and intertextual relationships between genres, texts and discourses, utterances. Intertextual references always contribute to the creation of myths in the political arena. That is why one should not miss the extra-linguistic cultural and social variables (Wodak 2011).

1.2.3. Types and Functions of Intertextual References in Political Discourse

Intertextuality is expressed through such forms as allusions, quotatives, quotations, pastiche, parody, calque etc. (Wodak 2011). In our paper the examination concerns primarily citations of the Bible and Biblical allusions because they constitute the American mentality and are an indispensable part of the American culture. The focus is also on citations of the legislative instruments, quotations of the famous personalities, literary allusions and historical allusions.

According to Fowler, such processes as “consciousraising” and “defamiliarization” are possible due to intertextuality (Fowler 2009: 273). Intertextuality is possible due to the processes of “consciousraising” and “defamiliarization”. Thus, it may be stated that it is a two-way process. A familiar idea is defamiliarised when it is put in a new context and is told by other words (Fowler 2009). Consequently, intertextuality appears. Intertextual references may be both implicit and explicit. It depends on the intentions of the speaker (Wodak 2011). However, the speaker’s intention is the intention to trigger an emotional response as well as to influence the audience. Political discourse disseminates

ideological beliefs that have social effects (Laura Filardo-Llamas and Michael S. Boyd 2018). Ideological beliefs are expressed through intertextual references. Adjustment of a text to social expectations is possible due to intertextual references as well (Laura Filardo-Llamas and Michael S. Boyd 2018). It may be thus concluded that one of the most important functions of intertextual references is to influence the audience and make them believe in what politicians want them to believe.

Discourse communities determine the aim of the political speech (Fairclough 1989). According to Fairclough, “order of discourse” exists in each social domain (Fairclough 1989: 29–37). It means that order of political discourse is strictly structured and random occasional use of intertextual references in political speeches is excluded. The order of discourse reflects the changes in the socio-political tendencies of the society, that is to say it may change with time but still remains structured. As for intertextual references, they have always been used in political speeches. It is proved owing to the analysis of political speeches of politicians from different times (Wodak 2011).

Briggs and Bauman (1992) introduce a term “intertextual gap” (Briggs and Bauman 1992 :149; see also Bauman 2004: 7). A gap arises when a new text lacks what a prior one has possessed. It is explained by the fact that an original thought can be only duplicated but never be original twice. However, it is possible to eliminate the distance between the original and duplicated idea, in other words, the difference may be minimized (Briggs and Bauman 1992). For example, in “ritualized intertextuality”, such as citations of the Bible or Biblical allusions, the gap between the original text/quotation and the intertextual reference used in the political speech is minimized in order to sustain religious authority (Briggs and Bauman 1992: 149; see also Bauman 2004: 7). The notion of the intertextual gap emphasizes the fact that “diachronic repetition” (Tannen 2007) and introduction of familiar ideas in new contexts (Becker 1995: 185) reshape meanings. Bakhtin introduces the notion of double-voiced discourse (Bakhtin 1981) that describes two participants of the discourse that express themselves simultaneously but have

different intentions (Bakhtin 1981: 324). This type of discourse is also called varidirectional (Morson and Emerson 1990: 149ff). The examples of varidirectional discourse are forms of parody (Kristeva 1980: 73; see also Bakhtin 1981: 340). Parody is one of the forms of intertextuality as it was mentioned. Gordon describes intertextuality as a binding element between a prior and new text (Gordon 2006). As seen in the discussion of intertextuality thus far, connections across contexts of situation create understandings, establish relations, construct identities, and generally “yield social formations” (Agha 2005a: 4). Intertextuality in action, therefore, not only contributes to the propagation of hegemonic discourses but also holds the key to understanding processes of social change.

In conclusion, intertextual references (citations of the Bible and of the legislative texts, quoting personalities, Biblical allusions, literary allusions and historical allusions) are used in political speeches with the aim of influence. Intertextual references contribute to the dissemination of ideological beliefs as well as to the adaptation of the text to the need of the society.

Conclusions to Chapter One

Intertextual references are integral to political discourse because they are used as ideological strategy. However, they can be perceived only when politicians and audience share common knowledge. Dijk calls it “K-device”. Intertextuality is one of the phenomena studied by CDA and is expressed through such forms as allusions, quotatives, quotations, pastiche, parody, calque etc. Intertextual

references may be both implicit and explicit, but they always perform one function that is to influence the audience and make them believe in what politicians want them to believe. Thus, ideological beliefs are expressed through intertextual references.

Order of political discourse is strictly structured and random occasional use of intertextual references in political speeches is excluded. The order of discourse reflects the changes in the socio-political tendencies of the society, that is to say it may change with time but remains structured. As for intertextual references, they have always been used in political speeches. Consequently, application of CDA is very important because it is an interdisciplinary approach, which takes into account habitus as well as social and historical aspects.

In PD an “intertextual gap” arises when a new text lacks what a prior one has possessed. It is explained by the fact that an original thought can be only duplicated but never be original twice. However, it is possible to eliminate the distance between the original and duplicated idea, in other words, the difference may be minimized (Briggs and Bauman 1992). For example, in “ritualized intertextuality”, such as citations of the Bible or Biblical allusions, the gap between the original text/quotation and the intertextual reference used in the political speech is minimized in order to sustain religious authority (Briggs and Bauman 1992: 149; see also Bauman 2004: 7). Bakhtin introduces the notion of double-voiced discourse (Bakhtin 1981) that describes two participants of the discourse that express themselves simultaneously but have different intentions (Bakhtin 1981: 324). This type of discourse is also called varidirectional (Morson and Emerson 1990: 149ff).

In conclusion, intertextual references are used in political speeches with the aim of influence.

CHAPTER TWO. SEMANTICS AND FUNCTIONING OF INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCES IN AMERICAN AND BRITISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Studying semantics and functioning of intertextual references in American and British political discourse it is important to take into account their habitus, socio-cultural and historical backgrounds.

Habitus underlies the way intertextual references function in American and British political discourse (Elias 1998). Knowing habitus is having knowledge; consequently, knowledge is power in PD (Michel Foucault 1981). Habitus is all the aspects that are anchored in daily practices individuals, societies, groups and nations (Wodak 2011). More specifically, habitus is non-discursive knowledge (Wodak 2011). It characterizes a certain group of people. Habitus exists on the level of beliefs and ideology (Elias 1998). Thus, knowing habitus of the Americans and the British, one may understand how, who and with what purpose intertextual references are used in both American and British political discourse. There is no hard demarcation though of social and cultural tradition of Americans and British because both of them belong to the English-speaking world. However due to the different historical background of these two nations, their mentality differs greatly. Hence, they use intertextual references in their PD with different purposes.

Impact of intertextual references used in political speeches is assessed in the socio-political context (Parris 2007: 30). Discourses are interconnected due to the same contexts of different situations caused by social life of the society (Parris 2007). Social actors formulate utterances only with a certain aim; “speech events” cannot be separated because they do not happen randomly in a chaotic order (Hymes 1974). On the contrary, Mannheim and Tedlock (1995) say that discourse is always full of allusions, quotations, paraphrases, and echoes of prior discourse. In other words, discourses from different contexts are inevitably connected (Mannheim and Tedlock 1995).

American political discourse is full of Biblical allusions and citations of the Bible in comparison with British PD. History of the USA explains this simply by the need of the American government to create a power that would unite all the nationalities in one “melting pot” (Lakoff 1990). According to Lakoff, two major models, namely, Nature Parent Model and Strict Father Morality, underlie

American mentality (Lakoff 1990). The idea of “an inclusive America” underlies the American mentality (Laura Filardo-Llamas and Michael S. Boyd 2018). British politicians, on the contrary, rarely use quotations and allusions because it is not typical for their culture. However, they still address their audience appealing to the Bible and literary texts. Among British politicians, Winston Churchill was the one who used so many allusions and quotations in his speeches. In any case, intertextual references are used both in American and British political discourse as means of influence and persuasion.

2.1. Semantic and Functional Aspects of Biblical Intertextual References in American and British Political Discourse

Biblical intertextual references are used both in American and British political discourse with one aim that is to influence people and impose on them ideology. However, American politicians use intertextual references in their speeches more often than British ones because of the cultural and historical reasons. Biblical intertextual references are a part of “the God strategy” (Domke and Coe 2010: 54).

British political leaders use intertextual references in more indirect and subtle way. For example, instead of appealing directly to “God”, they use the word “faith” (Crines 2002: 4). Tony Blair once said that “debating religion makes politicians feel uncomfortable” (Crines 2002: 5).

Bruce (2013: 4) and Cooper (2013: 5) say that historically senior politicians and British Prime Ministers usually do not quote the Bible because they cannot see the pragmatic benefits of it. Spencer (2006: 16) notes that British Prime Ministers may mention just Church of England or Christianity in their speeches without any specific references to the Bible. Historically, British politicians are not used to quote the Bible, or use Biblical allusions in their speeches. In their culture Biblical allusions or quotations of the Bible do not create a desirable effect, that is to say do not influence people a lot.

American politicians, on the contrary, quote the Bible and use Biblical allusions all the time because it is common for their culture. Lakoff perfectly explains it describing two models, namely, Nature Parent Model and Strict Father Morality (Lakoff 1990). In addition, during the colonization of the United States there was a dire need of having one document that would unite all people. That document was the Bible. Further, the first legislative texts referred to the Bible. That explains why American politicians constantly quote Bible as well as the Founding Fathers (because those used Bible as the basis when creating laws) (Spencer 2006). American politicians, thus, quote the Bible in order to evoke an emotional response in people, impose on them ideological beliefs.

2.1.1. Citation of the Bible

Every campaign rhetoric is full of Biblical allusions and quotations because they are integral to American and British political discourse. Politicians quote the Bible to influence their audience and evoke an emotional response. However, these are American politicians who often quote the Bible in their speeches because the Bible underlies their cultural myth (Barthes 1977).

In 2016 on the campaign trail Candidate Hillary Clinton constantly highlights that she is Christian in order to demonstrate the proximity to her audience (MCPPS). That is why she cites the Bible:

“For the gift of personal salvation, and for the great obligation of a social gospel. To use the gift of grace wisely, to reflect the love of God and follow the example of Jesus Christ to the greater good of God’s beloved community”. To explain the gist of “social gospel” she cites the Bible: *“The scripture tells us that “faith without works is dead”. The Epistle of James tells us we cannot just be hearers of the Word, we must be doers”*(MCPPS: Hillary Rodham Clinton, “A speech before the National Baptist Convention”, USA, Inc. in Kansas City, Missouri on Thursday, September 8, 2016; Cf. James 2:20, 26, Cf. James 1:22-23).

Hillary Clinton refers to the words of the Prophet Micah in order to ensure her audience that she is a perfect candidate:

“Yes, we need a President who will do justice, love kindness, and walk humbly with our God”. Clinton does not say directly that voters have to choose her because they need a president like she. Instead, citing the Bible she makes her audience mull over the question “what president do we need?” as well as think that it is Clinton who can become their president (MCPPS: Hillary Rodham Clinton, “A speech before the National Baptist Convention”, USA, Inc. in Kansas City, Missouri on Thursday, September 8, 2016; Cf. Micah 6:8).

In a September speech at a Human Rights Campaign event the pious Roman Catholic politician Senator Tim Kaine used the word “creator” to refer to God to convince people that there is nothing bad or extraordinary in same-sex marriages, thus endorsing same-sex marriage (MCPPS):

“My church also teaches me about a Creator in the first chapter of Genesis who surveys the entire world, including mankind, and said, “It is very good...” Who am I to challenge the beautiful diversity of the human family? I think we’re supposed to celebrate, not challenge it” (MCPPS: Tim Kaine, “A September speech at a Human Rights Campaign event”, 2016; Cf. Genesis 1:31).

Hillary Clinton refers to Scripture in the closing lines of her address to evoke an emotional response in the audience assuring them that she does not give up and is ready to continue working even after the defeat (MCPPS):

“You know,” she said, “scripture tells us, “Let us not grow weary of doing good, for in due season, we shall reap if we do not lose heart”, My friends, let us have faith in each other, let us not grow weary and lose heart, for there are more seasons to come and there is more work to do” (MCPPS: Hillary Clinton, “Concession Speech”, 2016; Cf. Galatians 6:9).

Donald J. Trump invokes Scripture: *“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 minds honestly, but always pursue solidarity”*. These lines have an implicit message, that is “follow me and be on my side, otherwise you are my enemy”. Donald Trump thus positions himself from quite an aggressive but

confident side demonstrating the character (MCPPS: Donald Trump, “The Inaugural Address”, 2017; Cf. Psalm 133:1).

Although the Bible may have a great presence in the modern political discourse, its prominence was consistent with tradition. For example, Martin Luther King intertwined elements of Christian mythology in all his political speeches to make them sound dynamic and inspiring.

King delivered his speech “Give Us the Ballot” at the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom gathering at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C. on May 17, advocating voting rights for African Americans in the United States (MCPPS):

“There is still a voice crying out through the vista of time, saying: “Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you”” (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, a speech “Give Us the Ballot”, 1957; Cf. Matthew 5:44; Luke 6:27-28). *“That same voice cries out in terms lifted to cosmic proportions: “He who lives by the sword will perish by the sword””* (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, a speech “Give Us the Ballot”, 1957; Cf. Matthew 26:52). *“When that happens, “the morning stars will sing together, and the sons of God will shout for joy””* (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, a speech “Give Us the Ballot”, 1957; Cf. Job 38:7).

“I Have a Dream” is a public speech that was delivered by Martin Luther King Jr. during the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom on August 28, 1963, in which he called for an end to racism in the United States:

“No, no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until “justice rolls down like waters, and righteousness like a mighty stream”” (MCPPS). He cites the Bible in order to inspire people to fight for their civil and economic rights (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, a speech “I Have a Dream”, 1963; Cf. Amos 5:24 (rendered precisely in The American Standard Version of the Holy Bible).

“I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, and every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight; “and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed”

and all flesh shall see it together” (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, “I Have a Dream”; Cf. Isaiah 40:4-5 (King James Version of the Holy Bible).

On September 20, 1963, John F. Kennedy addressed the United Nations General Assembly. Citing the Bible President Kennedy thus reminds world leaders that building peace is their task (MCPPS).

By saying “*man does not live by bread alone*” he calls for achieving peace: “*And finally, a worldwide program of farm productivity and food distribution, similar to our country’s “Food for Peace” program could, now, give every child the food he needs. But man does not live by bread alone, and the members of this organization are committed by the Charter to promote and respect human rights*” (MCPPS: John F. Kennedy, “Final United Nations Address”, 1963; Cf. Matthew 4:4).

In the speech “The Sinews of Peace”, Churchill cites the Bible to show his acknowledgement of America’s economic and social power in the world (BPS):

“*None of these clash with the general interest of a world agreement, or a world organization; on the contrary, they help it. In my father’s house are many mansions*” (BPS: Winston Churchill, “The Sinews of Peace”, 1946; Cf. John 14:2).

Gordon Brown cites the Bible in order to make people mull over the question whether there is any faith in politics encouraging them to be free of prejudices and defend their rights (BPS):

“*So when we talk about faith in politics let me say first of all that you should be proud that it was Churches and faith groups that created the momentum – and the mass membership, the mass crowds – for the Jubilee Debt Campaign and for Make Poverty History, answering in a modern way the injunction of Isaiah that we should “loose the chains of injustice and let the oppressed go free”* (BPS: Gordon Brown (Labour), “Faith in Politics?”, London 2011; Cf. Isaiah 58:6).

Our research reveals that a frequent usage of biblical allusions is an integral part of American PD rhetoric. Biblical allusions are more common for British

political discourse than direct citation of the Bible because British do not associate power with religion. It is not common for their culture.

2.1.2. Biblical allusions

American and British political discourse is full of Biblical allusions. They are used as a powerful ideological tool of influence (Wodak 2011). In order to understand implicit message of any political speech a reader should possess some common knowledge. Audience easily recognizes biblical allusions because Bible underlies American culture and is quite common for British culture.

George Washington paraphrased Micah 6:8 to encourage Americans improve themselves, be virtuous if they really want to be “a happy Nation” (MCPPS):

“I now make it my earnest prayer, that God would have you, and the State over which you preside, in his holy protection, that he would incline the hearts of the Citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to Government, to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another, for their fellow Citizens of the United States at large, and particularly for their brethren who have served in the Field, and finally, that he would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all, to do Justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that Charity, humility and pacific temper of mind, which were the Characteristicks of the Divine Author of our blessed Religion, and without an humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy Nation” (MCPPS: George Washington, “Circular to the States”, 1783).

The specificity of George W. Bush’s speeches is that he refers to the Biblical figures rather than to the Biblical events. He quotes the words of a Biblical figure to encourage people to give a helping hand to those who has a dire need in it (MCPPS):

“I know this is in our reach because we are guided by a power larger than ourselves, who creates us equal, in His image, and we are confident in principles that unite and lead us onward. Many in our country do not know the pain of

poverty, but we can listen to those who do. And I can pledge our nation to a goal: When we see that wounded traveler on the road to Jericho, we will not pass to the other side” (MCPPS: George W. Bush, “Inaugural Address”, 2000). The reference “when we see that wounded traveler on the road to Jericho, we will not pass to the other side” is a parable of the Good Samaritan.

Martin Luther King uses Christian elements in his political speeches. However, in comparison with other political personas he makes the Biblical allusions explicit:

“Jesus say so, if you must use the power of competition, if you must compete with one another: make it as noble as you can by using it [in] noble things. Use it for a fine unselfish thing. He that is greatest among you shall serve. Use it for human good. Shall be the most useful; compete with one another in humility. See which can be the truest servant”. He mentions Jesus as an example of an ideal human being that was benevolent to others in order to encourage Americans be benevolent and helpful (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, “Cooperative/Noble Competition”, at the King center; Cf. Luke 22:24).

The specific feature of Martin Luther King’s speeches is that he uses biblical allusions in an explicit way, so that they are easily recognizable (“*promised land*”). He does it for his audience to be influenced by his speech as not all his supporters are intelligent enough to understand the implicit allusions. Martin King makes an allusion to Moses that pleads God to let him cross the Jordan river and enter the “promised land” together with the people. According to the parable, God did not allow Moses to enter the promise land. God allowed him only to view the land from a distance (MCPPS). Martin King compares himself to Moses. Thus demonstrating that his primary aim is to lead the people, to make them a happy nation:

“Well, I don’t know what will happen now. We’ve got some difficult days ahead. But it really doesn’t matter with me now, because I’ve been to the mountaintop. I just want to do God’s will. And He’s allowed me to go up to the mountain. And I’ve looked over. And I’ve seen the Promised Land. I may not get

there with you. But I want you to know tonight, that we, as a people, will get to the promised land!" The second allusion may be to a song entitled the "Battle Hymn of the Republic", alternatively, "Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory" – whose lyrics allude to God's coming judgment upon the wicked at the end of the age : "*And so I'm happy, tonight. I'm not worried about anything. I'm not fearing any man! Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord!*" (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, "I've Been to the Mountaintop", 1968; Cf. Deut 3: 23-27, Cf. Isaiah 63, Revelation 19).

In his speeches, Abraham Lincoln mostly refers to the Old Testament because Old Testament is more traditional, stricter and more rigorous. That is why quoting Old Testament is quite common and typical for those times. Modern politicians, on the contrary, mostly quote the New Testament, as now political tendencies are more democratic. Abraham Lincoln compares himself to a "*shepherd*" that "*drives the wolf from the sheep's throat... especially as the sheep was a black one*" that is to say, he defends the rights of the black people. We may understand it due to the hidden Biblical allusion:

"The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as a liberator, while the wolf denounces him for the same act as the destroyer of liberty, especially as the sheep was a black one" (MCPPS: Abraham Lincoln, "Speeches and Letters of Abraham Lincoln", 1832-1865, p. 138; Cf. the Gospel of John 10:9-11 (I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. Jesus, as quoted in the Gospel of John 10:9-11)).

Donald Trump continues the tradition of using the elements of Christian mythology in his political speeches, although he does not often quote Bible, or use the Biblical allusions:

"Together, let us choose a future of patriotism, prosperity, and pride," Trump said. *"Let us choose peace and freedom over domination and defeat. And let us come here to this place to stand for our people and their nations, forever strong, forever sovereign, forever just, and forever thankful for the grace and the goodness and the glory of God"* (MCPPS: Donald Trump, "Remarks by President

Trump to the 73rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly”, September 25, 2018).

Second Inaugural Address is full of allusions that belong to different categories, namely, “Biblical allusions” and “quoting legislative instruments”. Barack Obama quotes the United States Declaration of Independence (“*Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness*”) that already includes the Biblical allusion (Creator = God):

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” (MCPPS). He refers to the Creator in order to support his idea that there must be equality between people as Creator has created people equal (MCPPS: Barack Obama “Second Inaugural Address”, 2013).

William J. Clinton refers to God in the First Inaugural Address in order to inspire confidence in the people: *“The Scripture says, “And let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not. From this joyful mountaintop of celebration we hear a call to service in the valley. We have heard the trumpets. We have changed the guard. And now, each in our own way and with God’s help, we must answer the call”* (MCPPS: William J. Clinton, “First Inaugural Address”, 1993).

Winston Churchill uses Biblical allusions to inspire confidence in the people and encourage them to fight for the better place for themselves and for their future generations:

“What is the use of living, if it be not to strive for noble causes and to make this muddled world a better place for those who will live in it after we are gone? How else can we put ourselves in harmonious relation with the great verities and consolations of the infinite and the eternal? And I avow my faith that we are marching towards better days. Humanity will not be cast down. We are going on swinging bravely forward along the grand high road and already behind the distant mountains is the promise of the sun” (BPS: Winston Churchill, Speech

at Kinnaird Hall, Dundee, Scotland (“Unemployment”), October 10, 1908, in *Liberalism and the Social Problem* (1909), Churchill, Echo Library (2007), p. 87; Cf. Psalm 121: 1).

Making allusion to the Bible Winston Churchill encourages people to fight for their freedom and create such politics so that the country can prosper:

“We must make sure that its work is fruitful, that it is a reality and not a shame, that it is a force for action, and not merely a frothing of words, that it is a true temple of peace in which the shields of many nations can some day be hung up, and not merely a cockpit in a Tower of Babel. Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments for self-preservation we must be certain that our temple is built, not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock” (BPS: Winston Churchill, “The Sinews of Peace”, 1946; Cf. Matthew 7:24-27).

John Major uses Biblical allusion in an ironic way highlighting that new government leads people not to the New Jerusalem (New Labour) but to the chasm:

“And – now I think about it – isn’t it odd. Those unemployment figures John Prescott said were “fiddled” are now a triumph for New Labour as they march to the New Jerusalem. Or – as it’s probably now called – the People’s new, New Jerusalem” (BPS: John Major (Conservative), “Leader’s speech”, Blackpool 1997).

Tony Blair refers to God appealing to the sentiments of gratitude for the end of the Iraq War:

“Be glad in your hearts. Give thanks to your God. People of Britain, your children are safe. Your husbands and your sons will not march to war. Peace is a victory for all mankind. And now let us go back to our own affairs. We have had enough of those menaces, conjured up from the continent to confuse us” (BPS: Tony Blair, “Iraq War”, 2003).

Winston Churchill appeals to the people’s responsibility. Adopting the quotation from Maccabees, he thus says to people to be ready to arm themselves and fight:

“Today is Trinity Sunday. Centuries ago words were written to be a call and a spur to the faithful servants of Truth and Justice: “Arm yourselves, and be ye men of valour, and be in readiness for the conflict; for it is better for us to perish in battle than to look upon the outrage of our nation and our altar. As the will of God is in Heaven, even so let it be” (BPS: Winston Churchill, “Be Ye Men of Valour”, 1940). Churchill adopted the quotation from Maccabees 3:58-60. The four Books of the Maccabees, also spelled “Machabbes” are not in the Hebrew Bible but the first two books are part of canonical scripture in the Septuagint and the Vulgate and are in the Protestant Apocrypha. However, Churchill somewhat edited the text (BPS).

“Rivers of Blood” is Enoch Powell’s speech that is totally based on the Biblical allusions. Powell even uses Biblical allusion in the title of the speech to evoke a strong emotional response in his audience, create a fighting mood (BPS: Enoch Powell, “Rivers of Blood”, 1968; Cf. Exodus 7:14).

Oliver Cromwell compares the people to Judas who betrayed his God to shame them for their passive behaviour, create a fighting mood and make them fight for their liberties and rights:

“Ye are a pack of mercenary wretches, and would like Esau sell your country for a mess of pottage, and like Judas betray your God for a few pieces of money. Is there a single virtue now remaining amongst you? Is there one vice you do not possess? Ye have no more religion than my horse; gold is your God; which of you have not barter’d your conscience for bribes? In the name of God, go!” (BPS: Oliver Cromwell, “Dissolution of the Long Parliament”, 1653).

Winston Churchill uses the Biblical allusion, referring to God, to make people arm themselves and fight: *“I can say: It is to wage war, by sea, land and air, with all our might and with all the strength that God can give us; to wage war against a monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalogue of human crime. That is our policy”* (BPS: Winston Churchill, “Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat”, May 13, 1940). “Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat” is one of the most famous calls-to-arms in history.

Our research shows that the Bible is a rich source of the Biblical allusions that are further used in political speeches as their function is to evoke an emotional response and inspire audience.

Several tendencies emerge from our research. Firstly, the usage of Biblical allusions prevails over the citation of the Bible. Secondly, intertextuality is more prominent in British political discourse of the past. That is to say, the modern politicians rarely use intertextuality in their speeches (Wodak 2011).

2.2. Semantic and Functional Aspects of Intertextual References to Literary, Historical and Legislative Texts in American and British Political Discourse

Intertextual references to literary, historical and legislative texts in American and British political discourse are not that frequently used as Biblical intertextual references because they may be inconceivable for the audience because of the lack of K-device (common knowledge). The main aim of politicians is to evoke feelings, convince, and influence their audience. They appeal to literary texts, historical events and legislative texts to make their speeches sound more plausible, persuasive, strong and assertive.

These are commemorative events that are perpetuated in political discourse in the form of intertextual references to literary, historical and legislative texts and concern traumatic pasts of American and British societies (Agha 2005a: 4). They contribute to the propagation of ideological beliefs, hegemonic discourse as well as facilitate understanding of social changes in American and British societies (Agha 2005a: 4).

Intertextual references to literary and historical texts are used in American and British political discourse when they perform an emphatic function (Spencer 2006) that is to say their main function is to evoke an emotional response in the audience. Citation of literary and historical texts make politicians' speeches sound more dynamic and persuasive. Their audience thus becomes more open and vulnerable, which means it is easy to manipulate.

Intertextual references to legislative instruments (texts) are more common for American rather than British political discourse. This can be explained by the fact that Founding Fathers relied on the Bible when writing legislative texts resulting from historical events and cultural habitus. Consequently, politicians use intertextual references to legislative instruments to make their speeches sound more plausible establishing the connection between present and past, modernity and traditions.

2.2.1. Literary allusions

Literary allusions are less used than historical ones, although they are not less effective in the political rhetoric. Literary allusions make the political speech more poetic and give it the various slants (Wodak 2011). For example, quoting John Magee's poem "High Flight", Ronald Reagan makes his speech sound more dramatic and influential:

"We will never forget them, nor the last time we saw them, this morning, as they prepared for their journey and waved goodbye and "slipped the surly bonds of earth" to "touch the face of God"" (MCPPS: Ronald Reagan, "The Space Shuttle "Challenger" Tragedy Address, 1986).

John Gillespie Magee Jr., "High Flight":

"Oh! I have slipped the surly bonds of Earth

And danced the skies on laughter-silvered wings...

... And, while with silent, lifting mind I've trod

The high untrespassed sanctity of space,

Put out my hand, and touched the face of God" (MCPPS).

Martin King's speech is composed of the quotations taken from books and poems. He uses literary allusions to evoke an emotional response in his audience. He thus makes people understand that truth is always a priority and whatever happens those, who adhere to the truth, win:

“There is something in this universe which justifies James Russell Lowell in saying: Truth forever on the scaffold,

Wrong forever on the throne. (Oh yeah)

Yet that scaffold sways the future,

And behind the dim unknown

Stands God (All right), within the shadow,

Keeping watch above His own” (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, a speech “Give Us the Ballot”, 1957). These lines are taken from Thomas Carlyle’s book “The French Revolution” (1837), part 1, book 3, chapter 1; William Cullen Bryant’s verse “The Battlefield” (1839), stanza 9; and James Russell Lowell’s verse “The Present Crisis” (1844), stanza 8.

Martin Luther King refers to the literary texts to make his speech sound poetic, emotional, profound and inspirational:

“Free at last! Free at last!”

Thank God Almighty, we are free at last!” (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, a speech “I Have a Dream”). “Free at Last” from “American Negro Songs” by J. W. Work. Martin King evokes a feeling of happiness, salvation in his audience quoting the lines “Free at last!” from the song.

Martin Luther King refers to William Cowper’s “The Negro’s Complaint” in order to evoke in his audience the feeling of responsibility for their actions, inspiring them to defend their rights:

“If you will do that with dignity, when the history books are written in the future, the historians will have to look back and say, “There lived a great people. A people with “fleecy locks and black complexion,” but a people who injected new meaning into the veins of civilization; a people which stood up with dignity and honor and saved Western civilization in her darkest hour; a people that gave new integrity and a new dimension of love to our civilization” (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, a speech “Give Us the Ballot”, 1957; Cf. William Cowper, “The Negro’s Complaint”, 1788).

Patrick Henry refers to the literary allusion in order to make their compatriots open their eyes and accept a painful truth:

“We are apt to shut out eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren, til she transforms us into beasts” (MCPPS: Patrick Henry, “Speech to the Virginia Convention”, 1775). This is an allusion to the Greek myth in which seductive sea maidens known as sirens lure sailors to a rocky shore using their beautiful voices and then turn the men into pigs (MCPPS).

As one may see, modern politicians do not quote the literary texts in their speeches. Literary allusions remain to be a part of tradition, but not a part of the contemporary American political discourse (Wodak 2011). It is so because people should be intelligent enough and well-read in order to grasp the literary allusions. New generations do not read many classical masterpieces and thus there are not many people who would be able to understand the literary allusions.

“As I look ahead, I am filled with foreboding. Like the Roman, I seem to see “the River Tiber foaming with much blood”. That tragic and intractable phenomenon which we watch with horror on the other side of the Atlantic but which there is interwoven with the history and existence of the States itself, is coming upon us here by our own volition and our own neglect. Indeed, it has all but come” (BPS: Enoch Powell, “Rivers of Blood”, 1968). In this very case a literary illusion performs an emphatic function. Powell uses it to evoke in his audience a feeling of fear and to make them worry for their present and future. Powell quotes the Sibyl’s prophecy in the epic poem Aeneid, 6, 86 – 87, of *“wars, terrible wars, / and the Tiber foaming with much blood”*. Sibyls were oracles in Ancient Greece (BPS).

As far as one can see, the usage of literary allusions require the appropriate situational context as well as a well-read audience. That may be one of the reasons of their rare occurrence in political discourse.

In addition, there are no examples of literary allusions in the contemporary political speeches. Thus, the conclusion is that they are not widespread in the modern political discourse.

2.2.2. Historical allusions

Historical allusions are frequently used in American political discourse and is almost never used in British ones. Its main function is to evoke the feeling of patriotism. References to the past events give the political leaders an opportunity to reinforce the main idea of their speech.

Barack Obama refers to historical allusions in order to lift the people's spirits and remind them the beginning of American history:

"We the people, in order to form a more perfect union. Two hundred and twenty one years ago, in a hall that still stands across the street, a group of men gathered and, with these simple words, launched America's improbable experiment in democracy. Farmers and scholars; statesmen and patriots who had traveled across an ocean to escape tyranny and persecution finally made real their declaration of independence at a Philadelphia convention that lasted through the spring of 1787" (MCPPS: Barack Obama, "A More Perfect Union" 18 Mar. 2008).

Martin King refers to the historical event of signing a "Southern Manifesto" in order to provide the comparison between the present will of the people "to give them the ballot" and the past "signing of a manifesto":

"Give us the ballot, and we will fill our legislative halls with men of goodwill and send to the sacred halls of Congress men who will not sign a "Southern Manifesto" because of their devotion to the manifesto of justice" (MCPPS: Martin Luther King, "Give us the Ballot", 1957). In March 1956, ninety southern congressmen and all but three southern senators signed the "Declaration of Constitutional Principles," also known as the "Southern Manifesto," which contended that desegregation was a subversion of the Constitution and pledged that southern politicians would firmly resist integration (MCPPS).

Malcolm X uses a famous slogan during the independence struggle in order to remind his compatriots all the hurdles they had to overcome to become free:

"Liberty or death" was what brought about the freedom of whites in this country from the English... This is how big it was, yet these thirteen little scrawny

states, tired of taxation without representation, tired of being exploited and oppressed and degraded, told that big British Empire, “Liberty or death” (MCPPS: Malcolm X, “The Ballot or the Bullet”, 1964). “Liberty or death”, alternatively independence or death, is a slogan made famous during the independence struggle of several countries, notably the United States of America (MCPPS).

Referring to historical events Barack Obama propagates the idea that “all people are created equal”:

“We, the people, declare today that the most evident of truths – that all of us are created equal – is the star that guides us still; just as it guided our forebears through Seneca Falls, and Selma, and Stonewall” (MCPPS: Barack Obama “Second Inaugural Address”, 2013).

The Seneca Falls Convention was the first women’s rights convention. Selma March, also called Selma to Montgomery March, political march from Selma, Alabama, to the state’s capital, Montgomery, that occurred March 21–25, 1965 and led by Martin Luther King (MCPPS).

The Stonewall riots (also referred to as the Stonewall uprising or the Stonewall rebellion) were a series of violent and spontaneous demonstrations by members of the gay (LGBT) community against a police raid that took place in the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, at the Stonewall Inn in the Greenwich Village neighborhood of Manhattan, New York City (MCPPS).

Barack Obama mentions the following historical events to demonstrate their historical and cultural value as they caused a revolution in the development of the world:

“Three languages comprise an ancient oath that bears the city’s name. You [Strasbourg] served as a center of industry and commerce, a seat of government and education, where Goethe studied and Pasteur taught and Gutenberg imagined his printing press” (MCPPS: Barack Obama, “Address in Strasbourg Town Hall”, 2009). Goethe, Pasteur and Gutenberg are remarkable and well-known scientists and personalities (MCPPS: Barack Obama, “Address in Strasbourg Town Hall”, 2009).

Barack Obama mentions the Marshall Plan and appeals to the Cold War to make the people understand that although the Cold War is over, there is still a danger of invasion. Obama's intention thus is to create a fear-like atmosphere in order to justify the need of a war in Afghanistan (MCPPS):

“Even with the Cold War now over, the spread of nuclear weapons or the theft of nuclear material could lead to the extermination of any city on the planet. It was 61 years ago this April that a Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe helped to deliver hope to a continent that had been decimated by war” (MCPPS: Barack Obama, “Address in Strasbourg Town Hall”, 2009).

The Marshall Plan helped to rebuild Europe thanks to the United States. Again, he reminds the audience the positive determination that America has shown to Europe historically and also the creation of the NATO as an alliance that had the purpose of being defended by any attack: “an attack on one would be viewed as an attack on all” (Bianca 2016).

As it may be seen a general slant of the analyzed speeches is very emotional due to the usage of historical allusions. Politicians use historical allusions in order to remind their audience some events or the consequences of that events (Barack Obama, “Address in Strasbourg Town Hall”, “Second Inaugural Address”, Bill Clinton, “The Second Inaugural Speech”) and thus influence them.

2.2.3. Quoting legislative instruments (texts)

Citation of the legislative instruments is rarely used in American political discourse. It is almost never used in British political discourse. Our research reveals that only Barack Obama refers to the legislative instruments. He quotes the United States Declaration of Independence that underlies the basis of his political speeches.

Obama's quotation makes reference to the founding documents of France and America and the coincidences of their contexts:

“Our two republics were founded in service of these ideals. In America, it is written into our founding documents as “life, liberty, and the pursuit of

happiness.” In France: “Liberté” – absolutely – “égalité, fraternité.” Our moral authority is derived from the fact that generations of our citizens have fought and bled to uphold these values in our nations and others” (MCPPS: Barack Obama, “Address in Strasbourg Town Hall”, 2009). These words (“life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”) are easily recognized by the audience and again Obama is creating ties between both countries naming their common values.

Second Inaugural Address is a bright example of the fusion of several allusions. Barack Obama quotes the United States Declaration of Independence because Founding Fathers wrote legislative texts referring to the Bible (“*Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness*”). That is why there are also the Biblical allusion in his speech (Creator = God):

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” (MCPPS: Barack Obama “Second Inaugural Address”, 2013).

One may conclude that citation of the legislative instruments is useless until the audience easily recognizes it. Thus, when referring to the United States Declaration of Independence Barack Obama chooses the phrases (“Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness”) that are well known for his audience.

2.3. Cultural and Functional Aspects of Quoting Famous Personalities in American and British Political Discourse

Politicians quote famous personalities because thus intertextual connections are established across contexts of different situations that consequently creates understandings, constructs identities and establishes relations (Agha 2005a). Politicians quote personalities in order to make their speeches sound more assertive, forceful and powerful because of the believe that what powerful people support is worth being supported by everyone (Wodak and de Cillia 2006: 714). Famous personalities form tendencies, shape values and influence events. Their

opinion is valued, so politicians use it as an ideological strategy to influence people and impose on them their ideological beliefs (Agha 2005a).

In addition, politicians quote famous personalities because they are easily recognized. That is to say, the audience has common knowledge that makes it possible for them to understand the implicit message of politicians' speeches. It is more likely that the audience would be more impressed and thus highly susceptible to the rhetoric of the political discourse (Agha 2005a).

Quoting personalities, politicians imbue their speeches with shared ideologies and values that are common for groups of people irrespective of the party or organization to which they belong (van Dijk 1997:16–18). That is to say, they disseminate their ideas interweaving in their speeches ideas of others. It inspires a sense of credibility, reliability, confidence and plausibility, as well as equitability and the sharing of common (van Dijk 1997).

However, quoting famous personalities is not the most frequently used strategy because the number of personalities to whom people trust and by whom they admire is quite small. More specifically, this strategy is effectively used only in case this famous personality is distinguished, respectable, and honorable (van Dijk 1997:16–18).

2.3.1. Quoting personalities

Quoting personalities is not much used in political discourse as in order to influence people a politician should find whom to quote. People are likely not to support a politician if the person he quotes is not an admirable by audience figure.

The name of Malcolm's speech "The Ballot or the Bullet" is catchy and recognizable because it has already been used by Lincoln. Referring to Lincoln is a good ideological strategy because it makes Malcolm's speech sound plausible as its name is already familiar for the audience. Malcolm X quotes such a famous personality as Lincoln: "*There can be no successful appeal from the ballot to the bullet*" (MCPPS: Abraham Lincoln, "Letter to James C. Conkling", 1863).

Herbert Hoover refers to George Washington in order to make his speech sound plausible. A speech “Message Regarding International Peace” resonates with George Washington’s speech “First Annual Message of George Washington”:

“Never has there been a President who did not pray that his administration might be one of peace, and that peace should be more assured for his successor. Yet these men have never hesitated when war became the duty of the Nation. And always in these years the thought of our Presidents has been adequate preparedness for defense as one of the assurances of peace” (MCPPS: Herbert Hoover, “Message Regarding International Peace”, September 18, 1929). *“To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace”* (MCPPS: George Washington, “First Annual Message of George Washington”).

Donal Trump establishes several intertextual connections between his speech and speeches of Herbert Hoover and George Washington in order to inspire confidence to his words in the people:

“Together, let us choose a future of patriotism, prosperity, and pride,” Trump said. “Let us choose peace and freedom over domination and defeat. And let us come here to this place to stand for our people and their nations, forever strong, forever sovereign, forever just, and forever thankful for the grace and the goodness and the glory of God” (MCPPS: Donald Trump, “Remarks by President Trump to the 73rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly”, 25 September, 2018).

Malcolm X makes his speech sound dramatic and forceful due to using allusions to such famous personalities as Lincoln and George Washington:

“They’re not getting it by singing. We Shall Overcome. No, they’re getting it through nationalism... Had you marching back and forth between the feet of a dead man named Lincoln and another dead man named George Washington, singing, “We Shall Overcome” (MCPPS: Malcolm X, “The Ballot or the Bullet”, 1964).

Malcolm appeals to the memories of his audience evoking thus appropriate emotions: *“First thing, Johnson got off the plane when he become president, he*

ask, “Where’s Dickey? You know who Dickey is? Dickey is old southern cracker Richard Russell” (MCPPS: Malcolm X, “The Ballot or the Bullet”, 1964).

Malcolm X establishes intertextual connections between his speech and Patrick Henry’s speech in order to inspire confidence to his words in the people: “Liberty or death” was what brought about the freedom of whites in this country from the English” (MCPPS: Malcolm X, “The Ballot or the Bullet”, 1964).

Barack Obama mentions the forebears of such historical events as Seneca Falls, Selma, and Stonewall as well as Martin Luther King because all they fought for the liberties and rights of the black, so does Obama:

“We, the people, declare today that the most evident of truths – that all of us are created equal – is the star that guides us still; just as it guided our forebears through Seneca Falls, and Selma, and Stonewall; just as it guided all those men and women, sung and unsung, who left footprints along this great Mall, to hear a preacher (MLK) say that we cannot walk alone (MLK, Have a Dream) to hear a King proclaim that our individual freedom is inextricably bound to the freedom of every soul on Earth” (MCPPS: Barack Obama, “Second Inaugural Address”, 2013).

Obama mentions such a key political figure as Martin King because Martin fought for the liberty of the black, so does Obama. By saying “our forebears” he means those honored ancestors who fought for the liberty. They are Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott (Seneca Falls), Martin Luther King (Selma March) and other veterans of Selma including still-living Rep, John Lewis, and the protestors 44 years ago at the Stonewall (MCPPS).

Barack Obama refers to Lincoln in his speech in order to establish a link between Lincoln who was a fighter for the rights of the black and himself thus positioning himself as a defender of the rights and liberties of the black:

“Through blood drawn by lash and blood drawn by sword, we learned that no union founded on the principles of liberty and equality could survive half-slave and half-free. We made ourselves anew, and vowed to move forward together” (MCPPS: Barack Obama, “First Inaugural Address”, 2009).

Half-slave, half-free was an allusion to Lincoln's most famous addresses, his "House Divided" speech from his campaign for the Senate in 1858. Lincoln's phrase "house divided" was his own allusion to the Book of Mark (MCPPS).

"Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether" (MCPPS: Barack Obama, "First Inaugural Address", 2009). "Blood drawn by the lash" is an allusion to a closing passage of the second Abraham Lincoln's inaugural address, 1865.

Bill Clinton refers to Cardinal Bernardin quoting him in order to make people appreciate time and ignore all the divisions that exist in the society. Cardinal Bernardin is viewed as an epitome of wisdom:

"Let us remember the timeless wisdom of Cardinal Bernardin, when facing the end of his own life. He said, "It is wrong to waste the precious gift of time on acrimony and division" (MCPPS: Bill Clinton, "The Second Inaugural Speech", 1997).

"As Robert Kennedy once told a crowd of students in South Africa, "It is a revolutionary world that we live in, and thus, it is young people who must take the lead" (MCPPS: Barack Obama, "Address in Strasbourg Town Hall", 2009). In this reference Robert Kennedy believes in young people. He was a young victim of a conspiracy when killed; President Obama is also young and is addressing to young people in a delicate historical moment (MCPPS).

Richard Nixon quotes Lincoln to inspire his compatriots to defend their rights: *"But I also feel that it's essential in this country of ours that a man of modest means can also run for President, because, you know, remember Abraham Lincoln, you remember what he said: "God must have loved the common people – he made so many of them" (MCPPS: Richard M. Nixon, "The Checkers speech or Fund speech", 1952).*

Donald Trump quotes Truman and John Adams thus creating a fighting mood and calling for the revolution and for the change in the society:

“If this organization is to have any hope of successfully confronting the challenges before us, it will depend, as President Truman said some 70 years ago, on the “independent strength of its members.” One of the greatest American patriots, John Adams, wrote that the American Revolution was “effected before the war commenced. The Revolution was in the minds and hearts of the people” (MCPPS: Donald Trump, “Speech to United Nations General Assembly”, 2017).

William Clinton quoting Jefferson encourages people not to be afraid of changes: *“Thomas Jefferson believed that to preserve the very foundations of our Nation, we would need dramatic change from time to time”* (MCPPS: William J. Clinton, “First Inaugural Address”, 1993).

Bush quotes Mother Teresa in order to make people be more benevolent and responsive: *“But as a saint of our times has said, “Every day we are called to do small things with great love””* (MCPPS: George Walker Bush, “First Inaugural Address”, 2001). It is reference to Mother Teresa (a saint of our times) and it is her quotation (*“Every day we are called to do small things with great love”*) (MCPPS).

George Walker Bush quotes John Page and Thomas Jefferson in order to make people see that changes in society happen owing to themselves:

“After the Declaration of Independence was signed, Virginia statesman John Page wrote to Thomas Jefferson, “We know the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong. Do you not think an angel rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm?” (MCPPS: George Walker Bush, “First Inaugural Address”, 2001).

Bush quotes Lincoln in order to support the implicit message of his speech making his speech sound plausible: *“The rulers of outlaw regimes can know that we still believe as Abraham Lincoln did: “Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves and, under the rule of a just God, cannot long retain it”* (MCPPS: George W. Bush, “The Second Inaugural Address”, 2005).

Charlie Falconer quotes Frances, his colleague, in order to show that his actions are supported by other politicians too: *“She [Frances] says “the potential*

contribution that the Human rights Act and its underlying principles could make to social justice is waiting to be realised” (BPS: Charlie Falconer (Lord of Thoroton) (Labour), “Using human rights in the voluntary sector”, London 2004).

Winston Churchill quotes Mr. Bourke Cockran to make his speech more vivid: *“I have often used words which I learned fifty years ago from a great Irish-American orator, a friend of mine, Mr. Bourke Cockran, “There is enough for all. The earth is a generous mother; she will provide in plentiful abundance food for all her children if they will but cultivate her soil in justice and in peace.” So far I feel that we are in full agreement*” (BPS: Winston Churchill, “The Sinews of Peace”, 1946). Mr. Bourke Cockran was an Irish-American politician.

Barack Obama quotes Lincoln in order to reinforce the message hidden in his speech: *“As Lincoln said to a nation far more divided than ours, we are not enemies but friends. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection*” (MCPPS: Barack Obama, “Yes, we can”, 2008).

Bill Clinton reinforces the implicit message of her speech by quoting Martin King and Cardinal Bernardin at the same time. King is associated with a dream that would become a reality of the 21st century. In addition, she mentions Cardinal Bernardin that encouraged people not to waste their time. Thus, an implicit message is to strive for changes, create new politics and become a happy nation:

“Thirty-four years ago, the man whose life we celebrate today spoke to us down there, at the other end of this Mall, in words that moved the conscience of a nation. Like a prophet of old, he told of his dream that one day America would rise up and treat all its citizens as equals before the law and in the heart. Martin Luther King’s dream was the American dream. His quest is our quest: the ceaseless striving to live out our true creed. Our history has been built on such dreams and labors. And by our dreams and labors, we will redeem the promise of America in the 21st century. Let us remember the timeless wisdom of Cardinal Bernardin, when facing the end of his own life. He said, “It is wrong to waste the precious gift of time on acrimony and division” (MCPPS: Bill Clinton, “The Second Inaugural Speech”, 1997).

Quoting personalities is one of the strategies many contemporary American politicians use in their speeches. It gives a deep insight into the correlation between the members of the same political party, between past and present (Wodak 2011). Politicians enhance the power and weight of rhetoric of their speeches through its identification with the speeches of other politicians (Wodak 2011).

Conclusions to Chapter Two

Intertextual references are more common for the American political discourse rather than British one. It is explained by the difference in American and British cultures. Thus, studying semantics and functioning of intertextual references in American and British political discourse it is important to take into account their habitus, socio-cultural and historical backgrounds.

American political discourse is full of Biblical allusions and citations of the Bible in comparison with British PD. History of the USA explains this simply by the need of the American government to create a power that would unite all the nationalities in one “melting pot” (Lakoff 1990). In addition, it explains why American politicians often quote legislative documents because those are often correlate with the Bible. British politicians, on the contrary, rarely use quotations and allusions because it is not typical for their culture. However, they still address their audience appealing to the Bible and literary texts. Among British politicians, Winston Churchill was the one who used many Biblical allusions as well as cited

the Bible a lot in his speeches to inspire British and encourage them to defend their rights and to fight for their territory during the WWII.

American politicians quote Abraham Lincoln a lot in their speeches in order to inspire confidence in people and make them believe that they do as Lincoln did, that is to say they defend black people's rights and liberties. They appeal to the people's emotions making them feel proud of the past and hopeful for the future.

Literary allusions are rarely used because they acquire a well-read audience. If audience does not know Greek myths, for example, they cannot understand what Patrick Henry means when saying "sirens lure sailors" in his "speech to the Virginia Convention".

From the semantic and functional aspects intertextual references are used both in American and British political discourse as means of influence and persuasion. Both British and American politicians use intertextual references to fulfil their ideological strategies.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Intertextual references are integral to political discourse because they are used as ideological strategy. However, they can be perceived only when politicians and audience share common knowledge. Most widespread forms of intertextuality in public discourse are allusions, quotatives, quotations, pastiche, parody, calque etc. Intertextual references may be both implicit and explicit, but they always perform one function that is to influence the audience and make them believe in what politicians want them to believe. Thus, ideological beliefs are expressed through intertextual references.

The order of political discourse is strictly structured and random occasional use of intertextual references in political speeches is almost excluded. Unlike the order of discourse that reflects the changes in the socio-political tendencies of the society and thus may change with time though, intertextual references have always been used in political speeches. Consequently, application of CDA is very

important because it is an interdisciplinary approach, which takes into account habitus as well as social and historical aspects.

Our research shows that such intertextual figures as allusion and quotation are the most effective means of persuasion [Table 1]. American political discourse is full of Biblical allusions and citations of the Bible in comparison with British PD. History of the USA explains this simply by the need of the American government to create a power that would unite all the nationalities. In addition, it explains why American politicians often quote legislative documents because those often correlate with the Bible. British politicians, on the contrary, comparatively rarely use quotations and allusions because it is not typical for their culture. However, they still address their audience appealing to the Bible and literary texts. Among British politicians, Winston Churchill was the one who used many Biblical allusions as well as cited the Bible a lot in his speeches to inspire the British and encourage them to defend their rights and to fight for their territory during the WW II.

American politicians quote Abraham Lincoln a lot in their speeches in order to ignite confidence in people and make them believe that politicians act as Lincoln told or as he would have acted himself, that is to say they defend black people's rights and liberties. They appeal to the people's emotions making them feel proud of the past and hopeful for the future.

Literary allusions are rarely used because they presuppose a well-read audience. If audience does not know Greek myths, for example, they cannot understand what Patrick Henry means when saying "sirens lure sailors" in his "Speech to the Virginia Convention".

From the semantic and functional perspective intertextual references are used both in American and British political discourse as means of influence and persuasion. Both British and American politicians use intertextual elements to fulfil their ideological strategies. Intertextual references add expressiveness and power to politicians' speeches, make them more memorable and emotional, help to be better understood by the audience. By means of intertextuality, political leaders

establish links with their audience outlining common values with the support of history, cultural traditions, and religion.

RÉSUMÉ

Актуальність дослідження пов'язана з недостатньо вивченою полемічною й імперативною природою інтертекстуальності в американському та британському політичному дискурсі. Дослідження ролі інтертекстуальності, передумови та причини її використання в політичному дискурсі продуктивно розвивається на сучасному етапі мовознавства й літературознавства.

На практиці інтертекстуальність в американському й британському політичному дискурсі виявляється по-різному, тобто семантичний і функціональний аспекти кожного виду інтертекстуальності (алюзія, цитата, непряма мова) різняться й використовуються з різними цілями. Ба більше, враховуючи культурний, історичний та соціальний аспект використання інтертекстуальності та подальшого її тлумачення з точки зору прагматики, необхідно час від часу робити переоцінку отриманих результатів аналізу, оскільки результати залежать від суб'єктивного бачення того, хто тлумачить,

а отже зі зміною часу може також змінюватися й тлумачення. Отже, дослідження інтертекстуальності в політичному дискурсі є багатоаспектним явищем, що уможливорює подальше вивчення цієї теми.

Великий вибір можливостей аналізу комунікативно-прагматичного аспекту політичного дискурсу зумовив вибір теми кваліфікаційної роботи: **«Інтертекстуальні елементи в американському та британському політичному дискурсі: семантика та функціонування»**.

Кваліфікаційна робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів, висновку та додатків. Перший розділ ділиться на два підрозділи; два підрозділи діляться ще на шість підрозділів. Таким чином, перший розділ містить вісім пунктів. Другий розділ ділиться на три підрозділи; перший підрозділ ділиться на два підрозділи, другий – на три, третій – на один підрозділ. Таким чином, другий розділ містить дев'ять пунктів. Обсяг роботи складає 73 сторінки. У списку використаної літератури нараховується 120 джерел.

У першому розділі обґрунтовано сутність понять «політичний дискурс» й «інтертекстуальність», процес їх становлення та розвитку в мовознавстві й літературознавстві, а також досліджується функціональний і семантичний аспекти американського й британського політичного дискурсу.

У другому розділі розкривається специфіка інтертекстуальності в американському й британському політичному дискурсі, обґрунтовуються передумови використання інтертекстуальності в політичному дискурсі, а також досліджується семантичний та функціональний аспекти американського й британського політичного дискурсу.

Ключові поняття:

Політичний дискурс, риторика, інтертекстуальність, інтертекст, алюзія, цитація, християнська міфологія, семантичний та функціональний аспекти.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Agha, A. (2003). *The social life of cultural value*. Language & Communication, 23, 231–73.
2. Agha, A. (2004). *Registers of language*. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 23–45). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
3. Agha, A. (2005a). Introduction: semiosis across encounters. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 1–5.
4. Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. 238 p.
5. Austermühl, F. (2014). *The great American scaffold: Intertextuality and identity in American presidential discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 331 p.
6. Authier-Révuz, J. (1982). *Hétéroogenéité montrée et hétéroogenéité constitutive: éléments pour une approche de l'autre dans le discours*. DRLAV, 32, 91–151.
7. Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. In M. Holquist (Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

8. Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
9. Barthes, R. (1957). *Mythologie*. Paris: Edition du Seuil.
10. Barthes, R (1977). *Image – Music – Text*, trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang.
11. Bauman, R. (2005). *Commentary: indirect indexicality, identity, performance: dialogic observations*. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 145–50.
12. Bauman, R. and Briggs C. L. (1990). *Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life*. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 59–88.
13. Becker, A. L. (1994). *Repetition and otherness: an essay*. In B. Johnstone (Ed.), *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 162–75). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
14. Becker, A. L. (1995). *Beyond Translation: Essays Towards a Modern Philology*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
15. Benke, G. and Wodak, R. (2003). *Remembering and forgetting. The discursive construction of generational memories*. In M. N. Dédaic and D. N. Nelson (Eds.), *At war with words* (pp. 215–244). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
16. Billig, M. (2008). *Nominalizing and de-nominalizing: a reply*. *Discourse & Society* 19(6), 783–800.
17. Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
18. Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Homo Academicus*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
19. Bourdieu, P. (1996). *Sur la télévision*. Paris: Liber – Raisons d’Agir.
20. Chilton, P. and Schäffner, C. (2002). *Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse*. In P. Chilton and C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (pp. 1– 41). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
21. Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

22. Chilton, P. (2008). *Political terminology*. In R. Wodak and V. Koller (Eds.), *Handbook of communication in the public sphere* (pp. 223–242). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
23. Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
24. Cooper, Z. (2013). *God in Government: The Impact of Faith on British Politics and Prime Ministers, 1997–2012*. London: Demos. 18 p.
25. Crines, A. S., Theakston K. (2002). *Doing God in Number 10: British prime ministers, religion and political rhetoric*. *Politics and Religion*. Leeds Working papers in Linguistics and Phonetics, 6, 1–38.
26. Dijk, T. A. van (1993). *Principles of critical discourse analysis*. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 249–283.
27. Dijk, T. A. van (1997). *What is political discourse analysis?* In Blommaert and Bulcaen (Eds.), *Political linguistics* (pp. 11–52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
28. Dijk, T. A. van (1998). *Ideology*. London: Sage.
29. Dijk, T. A. van (2001). *Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity*. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of CDA* (pp. 95–120). London: Sage.
30. Dijk, T. A. van (2005). *Contextual knowledge management in discourse production: A CDA perspective*. In R. Wodak and Chilton (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis* (pp. 71–100). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
31. Dijk, T. A. van (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
32. Dijk, T. A. van (2012). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In H. Hamilton, D. Tannen, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: OUP (in press).
33. Domke D., Coe K. (2010). *The God Strategy: How Religion Became a Political Weapon in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 237 p.
34. Drămnescu, B. (2016). *Pragmatic Approaches in the Analysis of the Political Discourse*. Timișoara: Trivent Publishing. 52 p.

35. Dreisbach D. (2016). *The Bible and the 2016 Presidential Campaign*. Retrieved from <https://religioninpublic.blog/2017/03/20/the-bible-and-the-2016-presidential-campaign/>
36. Du Bois, J. W. (2014). *Towards a dialogic syntax*. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 25(3), 359–410.
37. Dunmire, P. (2009). “9/11 changed everything”: an intertextual analysis of the *Bush doctrine*. *Discourse & Society*, 20(2), 195–222.
38. Dunmire, P. (2011). *Projecting the Future through Discourse: The Case of the Bush Doctrine*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
39. Duranti, A. and Goodwin, Ch. (1992). *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
40. Edelman, M. (1967). *The Symbolic Uses of Politics* (2nd edn). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
41. Elias, N. (1998). *On Civilisation, Power, and Knowledge: Collected Writings*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
42. Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
43. Fairclough, N. (1992a). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
44. Fairclough, N. (1992b). *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman.
45. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
46. Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage. 258–284.
47. Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse: Text Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
48. Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J. & Wodak, R. (2011). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage. 357–378.
49. Fairclough, N. and Fairclough, I. (2012). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. London: Routledge.
50. *Famous Presidential Speeches*. Retrieved from <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches>

51. Filardo-Llamas, L. and S. Boyd, M. (2018). *Critical discourse analysis*. In J. Flowerdew & J. E. Richardson (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Routledge.
52. Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
53. Foucault, M. (1975). *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard.
54. Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Pantheon.
55. Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon.
56. Foucault, M. (1981). *The order of discourse*. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist Reader* (pp. 48–78). London: Routledge.
57. Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G. & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
58. Fowler, R. (2009). *Notes on critical linguistics*. In J. E. Joseph (Ed.), *Language and politics: Major themes in English studies* (pp. 271–282). London: Routledge.
59. Froese P. (2014). *Religion and American Politics from a Global Perspective*. *Religions*, 5, 1–15.
60. Gal, S. (2006). *Linguistic anthropology*. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (pp. 171–85). Oxford: Elsevier.
61. Gee, J. (2004). *Discourse Analysis. Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.
62. Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Anchor Books.
63. Gordon, C. (2006). Reshaping prior text, reshaping identities. *Text & Talk*, 26(4–5), 545–71.
64. Gramsci, A. (1978 [1921–1926]). *Selections from the Political Writings* (Ed. Quentin Hoare). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
65. Hall, S. (1997). *The work of representation*. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (pp. 13–74). London: Sage.

66. Hanks, W. F. (1989). Text and textuality. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18, 95–127.
67. Hart, R. P., Jarvis S. E., Jennings W. P. & Smith-Howell S. (2005). *Political keywords: Using language that uses us*. N. Y.: Oxford University Press. 279 p.
68. Hart, C. (2014). *Discourse, grammar and ideology: Functional and cognitive perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury.
69. Hebel, U. (1989). *Intertextuality, Allusion and Quotation*. N. Y.: Greenwood Press.
70. Hodges, A. (2008). *The politics of recontextualization: discursive competition over claims of Iranian involvement in Iraq*. *Discourse & Society*, 19(4), 479–501.
71. Hodges, A. (2011). *The “War on Terror” Narrative: Discourse and Intertextuality in the Construction and Contestation of Sociopolitical Reality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
72. Hodges A. (2015). *Intertextuality in Discourse*. In Tannen, D., Hamilton, E. D., and Schiffrin, D. (Eds.), *the Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2nd edn., Vol. 1). Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.
73. Holzscheiter, A. (2005). *Power of discourse and power in discourse. An investigation of transformation and exclusion in the global discourse of childhood*. PhD Thesis, FU Berlin.
74. Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
75. Irvine, J. (1989). *When talk isn't cheap*. *American Ethnologist*, 16(2), 248–67.
76. Jäger, S. & Maier, F. (2009). *Theoretical and methodological aspects of Foucauldian critical discourse analysis and dispositive analysis*. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer, (Eds.), *Methods of CDA* (pp. 34–61). London: Sage.
77. Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis*, 2nd edn. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
78. Kaal, B., Maks, I. and van Elfrinkhof, A. (2014). *From text to political positions: Text analysis across disciplines*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

79. Knoblauch, H. (2005). *Wissensoziologie*. Berlin: Springer.
80. Kress, G. (1996). *Representational resources and the production of subjectivity: questions for the theoretical development of critical discourse analysis in a multicultural society*. In Caldas-Coulthard, R. Carmen & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 15–31). London: Routledge.
81. Kristeva, J. (1967). *Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes*. *Tel Quel*, 29, 53–75.
82. Kristeva, J. (1968). *Problèmes de la structuration du texte*. *La Nouvelle critique* (special issue), Actes du Colloque de Cluny, April 16–17, 55–64.
83. Kristeva, J. (1969). *Séméiotiké*. Paris: Seuil.
84. Kristeva, J. (1974). *La Révolution du langage poétique*. Paris: Seuil.
85. Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. In L. S. Roudiez (Ed.), *The Kristeva Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
86. Kristeva, J. (1984). *Revolution in Poetic Language*, trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia University Press.
87. Kristeva, J. (1986). *Word, dialogue and novel*. In Moi, Toril (Ed.), *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
88. Lakoff, R. T. (1990). *The Politics of Language in our Lives*. N. Y.: Basic Books. 336 p.
89. Laux, L. and Schutz, A. (1996). *Wir, die wir gut sind. Die Selbstdarstellung von Politikern zwischen Glorifizierung und Glaubwürdigkeit*. Munich: DTV.
90. Lemke, J. L. (1995). *Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics*. London: Taylor & Francis.
91. Leeuwen, T. van (1996). *The representation of social actors*. In C. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Text and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32–70). London: Routledge.

92. Leeuwen, T. van (2006). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd edn., Vol. 3, pp. 290–294). Oxford: Elsevier.
93. Maingueneau, Dominique (1987). *Nouvelles tendances en analyse du discours*. Paris: Hachette.
94. Mannheim, Bruce and Dennis Tedlock. (1995). *Introduction*. In D. Tedlock and B. Mannheim (Eds.), *The Dialogic Emergence of Culture* (pp. 1–32). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
95. Morson, G. S. and Emerson C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
96. O'Toole (2012). *Faith and the Coalition: A New Confidence to 'Do God'*. Muslim Participation in Contemporary Governance, working paper no. 3. Bristol: University of Bristol. 71–98.
97. Parris, M. (2007). *The Quality of a Political Speech is a Symptom of Popularity, not a Cause*, *The Spectator*, 13 October 2007, 30.
98. Phillips, L. (1996). *Rhetoric and the spread of the discourse of Thatcherism*. *Discourse & Society*, 7(2), 209–41.
99. Polanyi, M. (1967). *The Tacit Dimension*. New York: Anchor Books.
100. Putnam, H. (1975). *The meaning of meaning*. In H. Putnam (Ed.), *Mind, Language and Reality: Philosophical Papers 2* (pp. 215–71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
101. Reisigl, M. (2007). *Nationale Rhetorik in Gedenk – und Festreden*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
102. Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
103. Scollon, R. and Scollon, S. (2004). *Nexus Analysis: Discourse and the Emerging Internet*. London: Routledge.
104. Silverstein, M. (2005). *Axes of evals: token versus type interdiscursivity*. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 6–22.
105. Smidt, C., Kellstedt, Lyman A. (2009). *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and American Politics*. N.Y.: Oxford University Press. 546 p.

106. Spencer, N. (2006). *Doing God: A Future for Faith in the Public Square*. London: Theos. 378 p.
107. Spencer, N. (2017). *The Mighty and The Almighty: How Political Leaders Do God*. London: Biteback Publishing. 384 p.
108. Springsteen, B. (2013). *Politics and Religion in the United Kingdom*. London: Routledge. 304 p.
109. Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
110. Thibault, P. J. (1991). *Social Semiotics as Praxis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
111. Voloshinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, trans. Ladislav Matějka and I. R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press.
112. Widowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext: Critical issues in discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
113. Wodak, R. (2001). *The discourse-historical approach*. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of CDA* (pp. 81–115). London: Sage.
114. Wodak, R. & Cillia, R. (2006). *Politics and language: overview*. In B. Keith (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics* (Vol. 9, pp. 706–719). Oxford: Elsevier.
115. Wodak, R. (2008). *Introduction: terms and concepts*. In R., Wodak & M. Krzyżanowski (Eds.), *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences* (pp. 1–42). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
116. Wodak, R. (2009). *Semiotics of racism*. In J. Renkema (Ed.), *Discourse, Of Course*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
117. Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2009). *Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology*. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of CDA* (2nd revised ed.). London: Sage.
118. Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009a). *Critical discourse analysis: history, agenda, theory, and methodology*. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of CDA* (pp.1–33). London: Sage.

119. Wodak, R. (2011). *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
120. Wodak, R. (2011a). *Complex texts. Analysing, understanding, explaining and interpreting meanings*. *Discourse Studies* 13(5), 623–633.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS



(MCPPS) <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches>

(BPS) <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm>

APPENDIX

Table 1

№	THE TYPE and SOURCES of INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCES	Its frequency of usage in the AMERICAN POLITICAL DISCOURSE	Its frequency of usage in the BRITISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE
1.	<u>Citation of the Bible</u>	11	2
2.	<u>Quoting personalities</u>	20	2
3.	<u>Citation of the legislative instruments</u>	2	0
4.	<u>Biblical allusions</u>	9	8
5.	<u>Literary allusions</u>	5	1

6.	<u>Historical allusions</u>	6	0
		 53	 13

❖ The total number of American political speeches analysed  30 :

1. Bush, G. W. "First Inaugural Address", 2001.
2. Bush, G. W. "Inaugural Address", 2000.
3. Bush, G. W. "The Second Inaugural Address", 2005.
4. Clinton, B. "First Inaugural Address", 1993.
5. Clinton, B. "Second Inaugural Speech", 1997.
6. Clinton, H. R. "A speech before the National Baptist Convention", 2016.
7. Clinton, H. R. "Concession Speech", 2016.
8. Hoover, H. "Message Regarding International Peace", 1929.
9. Kaine, K. "A September speech at a Human Rights Campaign event", 2016.
10. Kennedy, J. F. "Final United Nations Address", 1963.
11. King, M. L. "Cooperative/Noble Competition".
12. King, M. L. "Give Us the Ballot", 1957.
13. King, M. L. "I Have a Dream", 1963.
14. King, M. L. "I've Been to the Mountaintop", 1968.
15. Lincoln, A. "Letter to James C. Conkling", 1863.
16. Lincoln, A. "Speeches and Letters of Abraham Lincoln", 1832–1865, p. 138.
17. Malcolm X, "The Ballot or the Bullet", 1964.
18. Nixon, R. M. "The Checkers speech or Fund speech", 1952.
19. Obama, B. "Address in Strasbourg Town Hall", 2009.
20. Obama, B. "A More Perfect Union", 2008.
21. Obama, B. "First Inaugural Address", 2009.
22. Obama, B. "Second Inaugural Address", 2013.
23. Obama, B. "Yes, we can", 2008.

24. Patrick, H. "Speech to the Virginia Convention", 1775.
25. Reagan, R. "The Space Shuttle "Challenger" Tragedy Address, 1986.
26. Trump, D. "Speech to United Nations General Assembly", 2017.
27. Trump, D. "The Inaugural Address", 2017.
28. Trump, D. "Remarks by President Trump to the 73rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly", 2018.
29. Washington, G. "Circular to the States", 1783.
30. Washington, G. "First Annual Message of George Washington".

❖ The total number of British political speeches analysed  10 :

1. Blair, T. "Iraq War", 2003.
2. Brown, G. "Faith in Politics?", 2011.
3. Churchill, W. "Be Ye Men of Valour", 1940.
4. Churchill, W. "Blood, Toil, Tears, and Sweat", 1940.
5. Churchill, W. "Unemployment", 1908.
6. Churchill, W. "The Sinews of Peace", 1946.
7. Cromwell, O. "Dissolution of the Long Parliament", 1653.
8. Falconer, Ch. "Using human rights in the voluntary sector", 2004.
9. Major, J. "Leader's speech", 1997.
10. Powell, E. "Rivers of Blood", 1968.