

CONCATENATION OF GRAMMATICAL AND LEXICAL COMPONENTS
IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF THE USA

O. V. Popova, PhD in Philology, associate professor

iD ORCID: [https:// orcid.org/0000-0002-1851-2931](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1851-2931)

N. A. Prikhodko, lecturer

A. Spasskaja, student

Sumy State University

2, Rymkoho-Korsakova St., Sumy, 40007, Ukraine

E-mail: o.popova@gf.sumdu.edu.ua; n.prikhodko@gf.sumdu.edu.ua;

aniutaspasskaja@gmail.com

The article is devoted to the research of grammatical and lexical components in the political discourse of the USA, their concatenation and interdependence within the discourse. As lexical so grammatical characteristics of the political discourse of the USA serve to achieve the prime goal of the political discourse – to manipulate the electorate, thus to make theatrical performance for the recipients, i.e. the same electorate.

The objective of this research is not only to find the principal lexical and grammatical characteristics of the political discourse of the USA, but also to prove their correlation and interdependence while molding the very political discourse to achieve its key goal – theatre reflecting social needs and corresponding these needs. Besides addressing the strategy of theatre in the political discourse of the USA, the research is directed to the detection of the chief morphological and syntactic features of this strategy as an instrument for stylistic organization of the text belonging to the political discourse of the USA. To carrying out the given objectives there are certain methods used in the research: lexical-grammatical analysis, syntactic analysis, stylistic analysis, pragmatic analysis.

The article is written within the research topic “Mechanisms of Civil Society Influence upon Euro-Integration Processes in Ukraine” №15.01.10-02.16/18.3II.

Key words: communicative strategy, concatenation, grammatical component, lexical component, manipulation, political discourse, strategy of theatre.

DOI: 10.21272/Ftrk.2018.10(2)-11

Political thinking, political communication activity and language form are closely connected, which makes political discourse the subject of interdisciplinary research. And last decades witnessed the increase of linguist's attention to this branch of knowledge.

Political discourse as a special form of communication, the interaction mechanisms of language, power, society and the description of verbal means of political speeches influence on citizens' consciousness were studied by the following researchers: I. M. Borysova (aims and aspects of text analysis), A. P. Zahnitko (modern political newspaper discourse), K. S. Serazhym (sociolinguistic approach to discourse study), O. Yo Sheihal . (semiotics of political discourse), etc.

The rationale is grounded by the expediency of political discourse research not only taking into account discourse peculiarities, but also grammar component (morphological and syntactic), which models its construction.

The **tasks** of this research are:

- Identification of theatrical characteristics in political discourse of the USA
- Analysis of morphological implementers within strategy of theatre
- Analysis of syntactic implementers within strategy of theatre
- Finding out discourse basis for lexical and grammatical characteristics concatenation in the political discourse of the USA.

The following **methods** of modern linguistics are applied to the solution of the formulated tasks: lexical-grammatical analysis (to analyze language means determining the

strategy of theatre at grammatical level), syntactic analysis (to study the sentence structure and syntactic relations in the speeches of politicians), stylistic analysis (to find out the key stylistic devices characterizing the political discourse of the USA), pragmatic analysis (to follow the peculiarities of theatre strategy realization).

The research object is a political discourse of the USA with a set of its main peculiarities and characteristics.

The subject is complementarity of grammar and lexical component in political discourse of the USA.

The political discourse is considered from the aspect of text coherence, conditioned by a situation of political communication together with pragmatic, sociologic, psychological and other factors [1, p. 50]. V. Z. Demiankov states that the public mission of political discourse is to suggest the idea of “politically correct” actions and/or evaluations to the citizens, as it is to the advantage of those who strive for power. Thus, political discourse can be referred to a special type of communication which is characterized by a high degree of manipulation [2, p. 38].

Taking into account that any communication is manipulative as any language usage, including neutral, supposes influence on the world perception and the way it is structured, such manipulation acquires special significance in political discourse, including facts selection, certain events coverage, image creation, stereotype formation, creation of certain cultural and ideological context, introduction of new knowledge, thoughts, attitudes into the world model of a recipient and modification of the existing knowledge, thoughts, attitudes due to the various strategies [3, p. 97]. Thus, political discourse transforms into a real theatre as it includes gestures and dialogue aimed at public, mass influence; hyperboles of ordinary conduct is inherent in political discourse, which is considered to be the components of theatrical behavior [4, p. 135].

Such theatrical feature of political discourse presupposes the existence of politicians (actors) and people (audience), moreover the presence of addressee-observer directly influences the behavior of a politician-addressee making him follow certain speech behavior and communicative strategy, the creation of own image [5].

Let us focus on the notion of “certain speech behavior”, which includes not only lexical component, the selection of certain lexical units by an addressee, but also grammar component.

It is the grammar, which is a binding element facilitating communication. The grammatical structure of language requires the special word order, the agreement between the words, which in general constructs and models the utterance meaning and directly adds contextual shades of meaning.

Let us analyze Present Simple, which is used by politicians as a rule to describe the state of a country on a certain stage. Moreover, it can be used to describe common events, records and achievements as well as political failures, caused by the current government.

Obamacare doesn't work. It's very bad, very bad health insurance, far too expensive, and not only expensive for the person that has it, unbelievably expensive for our country [6].

The given example demonstrates that Present Simple and its negative form are used by Donald Trump not only to analyze, but to criticize the policy of his predecessor.

On the contrary, Present Continuous is used quite rarely in political discourse; it is used when politicians speak about long-term events and processes in society, in particular.

In Mosul, American troops are supporting Kurds, Sunnis and Shias fighting together for their homeland [7].

The next example illustrates the way Donald Trump speaks about the policy prospect for the years to come, but in order to make his statement more realistic and vivid he uses Present Continuous instead of Future Simple. Moreover, the use of Present Continuous is conditioned by the politician's intention to stress that the changes in country will not be easy and require time and patience.

We are getting rid of regulations, which goes hand in hand with the, lowering the taxes. But we're bringing the tax rate down from 35% to 15%. And I'll tell you, Hillary Clinton is raising your taxes [6].

It should be noted that when a candidate for presidency talks about himself, he uses pronoun *we* instead of *I*, thereby expressing his commitment to the nation, common hard work to which he is delighted to join. However, when it comes to his opponent Hillary Clinton, he uses singular form of the verb to be, *Hillary Clinton is*, to demonstrate her separation from the nation.

The political discourse texts widely use Present Perfect. On the one hand it is used to denote a completed action and, on the other hand, it shows that a political event has not become history yet and it remains urgent nowadays [8, p. 176].

The story of Poland is the story of a people who have never lost hope, who have never been broken, and who have never, ever forgotten who they are [9].

However, the analysis of American politicians' speeches found that Future Simple is used most often among other tenses. Yet politicians give wordy forecasts for the future, as a rule, promising changes for better with their rise to power.

I will be a president for all of our people [7].

The usage of pronouns *I* and *we* have acquired a great significance for realization of theatre strategy in American political discourse. The pronoun in the first person plural is used to identify a politician with a nation, because, on one hand, politicians try to convince the audience in their uniqueness and, on the other hand, they attempt to remain ordinary people in the audience mind, men of the people, who understand people's needs. On the contrary, the usage of the pronoun of the first person singular is inherent in high ranking politicians and it is explained by the desire to create an image of a strong individual, capable of reforms.

Let us consider the palette of verbs used in American political discourse. It is a common fact that modal verbs in contrast to notional verbs do not denote action, but an attitude to action or state, denoted by a notional verb expressed by an Infinitive. The main function of modal verbs is to demonstrate author's psychological and emotional state, attitude to communicative situation and its components. Their usage is explained by a desire to soften categoricalness of functional verbs. Therefore, the wide use of modal verbs in political speech is quite natural.

The analyses of politician's speeches found out that the modal verb "*must*" with the infinitive of main verb denotes necessity, obligation, inevitability of action and imperativeness.

We respect and cherish these values, too, and we must defend them [10].

The given modal verb does not suppose alternative, it renders strict instructional address to a recipient's consciousness. It is "*must*", which creates an image of a strong personality, a politician and a leader, who knows how to deal with state matters and defend statehood.

Necessity conditioned by a moral duty or an advice is expressed by modal verbs "*should*" and "*ought to*", which due to their semantics have lost firmness and absoluteness, mentioned above.

Our government shouldn't have allowed that to happen. [6].

The modality of "*should*" multiplied by Perfect Infinitive softens the meaning of the said words in the above mentioned example. At the same time the given sentence is not deprived of subjective author's negative point of view as to present situation in the country

Another language means, which rouse a recipient to action in American political discourse, except for modal verbs, can be Imperative and Conditional Moods.

You could have done it. If you were an effective senator, you could have done it. But you were not an effective senator [6].

Conditional Mood in the abovementioned statement is used by the politician to criticize all previous and current political career of his opponent, which is facilitated by Mixed Conditional. The usage of repetition effective *senator* only adds to this effect. It is the

syntax, which contains strong stylistic means to render subtle and sophisticated shades of meaning and peculiarities of author's thought [11, p. 150].

The analysis of political discourse peculiarities on the syntactic level proved that politicians use simple sentences for better information perception.

I don't think you understood what was said. This was locker room talk. I am not proud of it. [6].

In the case when compound sentences are used, the main clause does not bear/have significant information loading.

I want to thank everyone who has come together here right in front of the White House, that beautiful, beautiful White House, and everyone watching from home to see the lighting of this incredible national Christmas tree [12].

Talking about the syntax of political discourse, it should be mentioned that the usage of interrogative sentences is characteristic. It is explained by the fact that political speeches are often carried out in the form of debates, therefore, the politicians attempt to give negative evaluation of the activity of current government or opponent.

The great quantities of interrogative sentences in the politician's speeches are used in the form of rhetorical questions.

Are we still patriots? Do we love our nations enough to protect their sovereignty and to take ownership of their futures? [6].

The specific use of imperative and negative sentences is another characteristic trait of theatre strategy on syntactic level. As a rule, the usage of negative sentences is aimed at demonstrating the contrast between real and desirable state of things.

And I don't have to tell you, there are those who don't want to just stand in our way but want to turn the clock back [13].

The negative sentences are very informative, they only yield to affirmative sentences in quantity, but as the negative sentences are rarely used, they acquire greater expressiveness.

Of great interest is the specific use of simple affirmative sentences with parallel constructions. That fact is explained by the intense atmosphere they create; they help the author emphasize his point of view and make the audience reflect on the said words [14, p. 83].

I hope we will all come together in this campaign. Obviously I'm hoping to earn your vote, I'm hoping to be elected in November. I want to be the president for all Americans regardless of your political beliefs, what you look like, your religion [10].

Hillary Clinton spoke out during the pre-election debates in such a way. Using the parallel constructions *I hope, I'm hoping* and *I want*, the candidate for presidency stressed her desire to win the elections, to be helpful for every American as well as for the whole nation.

Thus, the following conclusion can be made. The effectiveness of theatre strategy depends, firstly, on what a politician says, his/her successful selection of lexical units, used communicative strategies and tactics in order to present himself/herself in the better light, concealing unpleasant facts. Secondly, how he/she shapes communication: what sentences are used, what tense forms dominate, singular or plural is preferred [15, p. 49]. That is why grammatical peculiarities of theatre strategy in the political discourse of the USA can not be studied separately, as they are concatenated with stylistic and lexical means.

Taking into account stylistic aspect, it is necessary to mention that politicians consciously use colloquialisms trying to demonstrate their proximity to people as they promote speech expressiveness and can produce a response, which can not be caused by following all language rules. It creates relaxed and non-official atmosphere. Due to this political speech is associated with a conversation and it is easier for a politician to convince the audience in his/her sincerity and rationality of actions.

We're gonna make America safe again. We're gonna make America great again. And we're gonna make America wealthy again [7].

This example shows that Donald Trump during pre-election debates 2016 not only actively uses "collective" pronoun *we* in order to attract attention of audience to the fact that

he belongs to American society, but also uses colloquial form *we're gonna* to add expressiveness to his speech in order to sound as an ordinary American. The politician uses short simple sentences, which demonstrate assurance of success and confidence of the pronounced words. The choice of *to be going to* structure subconsciously dispose to changes in the nearest future.

We want harmony and friendship, not conflict and strife. We are guided by outcomes, not ideology. We have a policy of principled realism, rooted in shared, interests, and values [6].

The abovementioned example demonstrates that Donald Trump in his speech during the United Nations General Assembly uses common lexemes: *friendship, strife, outcomes, goals, values*. It should be emphasized that that speech was intended not only for American audience, but for the whole world and that is why the politician uses a number of internationalisms such as *harmony, conflict, ideology, principled, realism, interests*, which promote understanding for the foreigners. The speech of American president contains simple sentences extended by homogeneous objects. Such an approach helps the politician seem convincing and deliver every word to the audience. Moreover, the first two sentences contrast positive and negative social processes, which together with the commissive *want*, give the audience the idea about seriousness of his intentions to improve the world situation. Present Simple implies that the president speaks about urgent problems, about what worries people most of all.

However, the next statement demonstrates the active usage of political terminology: *multinational trade deals, international tribunals, global bureaucracies*, which testify the transition from universal society problems to more specific political issues. In addition, this speech took place during the United Nations General Assembly, the usage of the adjectives *multinational, international, global* is aimed at emphasizing of importance of his activity as a president of the USA for the world community. And the usage of the adjectives of degree and measure *mammoth, unaccountable, powerful* only intensifies this effect.

For too long, the American people were told that mammoth multinational trade deals, unaccountable international tribunals, and powerful global bureaucracies were the best way to promote their success [9].

Past Simple together with adverbial modifier of time *for too long* in the above mentioned example is used to criticize the activity of the previous presidents, moreover, Passive Voice emphasizes desperate condition of the citizens.

Thus, the following conclusion can be made that it is concatenation of morphological, syntactic, lexical and stylistic means that promotes effective realization of theatre strategy in American political discourse. As such an approach gives a politician an opportunity to focus on wide audience, to combine psychological and emotional state with lexical units, which have narrow specialization; to express own attitude and conceal criticism, all of which is possible due to skillful manipulation of the grammar means of the language. The prospect of the given research remains analysis of the frequency of grammar forms usage in the political discourse of the USA, which will be a reliable resource to identify not only main grammar characteristics of this discourse, but also modern grammar tendencies of American English as political discourse demonstrates its influence and prevalence nowadays.

КОНКАТЕНАЦІЯ ГРАМАТИЧНОГО ТА ЛЕКСИЧНОГО СКЛАДНИКІВ У ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ США

О. В. Попова, канд. філол. наук, доцент;

Н. А. Приходько, викладач;

А. Спаська, студентка

Сумський державний університет,

вул. Римського-Корсакова, 2, м. Суми, 40007, Україна

E-mail: o.popova@gf.sumdu.edu.ua; n.prikhodko@gf.sumdu.edu.ua; anutaspasskaja@gmail.com

Стаття присвячена дослідженню граматичних та лексичних складників політичного дискурсу США, їх конкатенації та взаємозалежності в рамках цього дискурсу. Як лексичні, так і граматичні характеристики політичного дискурсу США слугують досягненню основної мети політичного дискурсу –

маніпуляція електоратом, а звідси і організація театральної вистави для його реципієнтів, тобто, все того ж електорату.

Мета дослідження – не лише виявити основні лексичні та граматичні характеристики політичного дискурсу США, а й довести їх взаємозалежність та взаємодоповнюваність при творенні все того ж політичного дискурсу для досягнення головної його мети – театральності, що відображає соціальні потреби та відповідає тим потребам. Окрім звернення до стратегії театральності у політичному дискурсі США, дослідження спрямовано на виокремлення основних морфологічних та синтаксичних характеристик цієї стратегії як інструменту стилістичної організації тексту, який належить до політичного дискурсу США. Здійсненню поставлених цілей сприяли наступні методи дослідження: лексико-граматичний аналіз, синтаксичний аналіз, стилістичний аналіз, прагматичний аналіз.

Стаття написана в рамках теми дослідження «Механізми впливу інститутів громадського суспільства на євроінтеграційні процеси в Україні» № 15.01.10-02.16/18.3П.

Ключові слова: граматичний компонент, комунікативна стратегія, конкатенація, лексичний компонент, маніпуляція, політичний дискурс, стратегія театральності.

КОНКАТЕНАЦИЯ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКОГО И ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОГО КОМПОНЕНТОВ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА США

Е. В. Попова, канд. филол. наук, доцент;

Н. А. Приходько, преподаватель;

А. Спасская, студентка

Сумский государственный университет,

ул. Римского-Корсакова, 2, г. Суми, 40007, Украина

E-mail: o.popova@gf.sumdu.edu.ua; n.prikhodko@gf.sumdu.edu.ua; aniutaspasskaja@gmail.com

Статья посвящена исследованию грамматических и лексических составляющих политического дискурса США, их конкатенации и взаимозависимости в рамках этого дискурса. Как лексические, так и грамматические характеристики политического дискурса США служат достижению основной цели политического дискурса – манипуляции электоратом, а отсюда и организация театрального действия для его реципиентов, т.е. все того же электората.

Цель исследования – не только определить основные лексические и грамматические характеристики политического дискурса США, но и доказать их взаимозависимость и взаимодополняемость при создании все того же политического дискурса для достижения главной его цели – театральности, которая отображает главные социальные потребности и отвечает им. Кроме обращения к стратегии театральности в политическом дискурсе США исследование направлено на вычленение основных морфологических и синтаксических характеристик этой стратегии, как инструмента стилістической организации текста, принадлежащего к политическому дискурсу США. Достижению поставленных целей сопутствовали следующие методы исследования: лексико-грамматический анализ, синтаксический анализ, стилістический анализ, прагматический анализ.

Статья написана в рамках темы исследования «Механизмы влияния институтов гражданского общества на евро интеграционные процессы в Украине» №15.01.10-02.16/18.3П.

Ключевые слова: грамматический компонент, коммуникативная стратегия, конкатенация, лексический компонент, манипуляция, политический дискурс, стратегия театральности.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Charteris-Black J. Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor / Jonathan Charteris-Black. – Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. – 296 p.
2. Демьянков В. З. Политический дискурс как предмет политологической филологии / В. З. Демьянков // Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: История и современные исследования. – 2002. – № 3. – С. 32–43.
3. Попова О. В. Передвыборчий дискурс США в динаміці англійської мови середини ХХ – початку ХХІ століть : дис. ... кандидата филол. наук : 10.02.04 / Олена Володимирівна Попова [Електронний ресурс]. – Суми, 2014. – 252 с. – Режим доступу : <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/36099>.
4. Хализев В. Е. Драма как род литературы. Поэтика, генезис функционирования / В. Е. Хализев. – М. : Изд-во Московского ун-та, 1986. – 260 с.
5. Шестопап О. Г. Театральність як перцептивна категорія у контексті сучасних міждисциплінарних досліджень [Електронний ресурс] / О. Г. Шестопап // Літературознавчі студії. – 2013. – Режим доступу : http://philology.knu.ua/library/zagal/Literaturoznavchi_studii_2013_37_2/436_442.pdf.
6. Trump's statement to the United Nations General Assembly on Sept. 19, 2017 [Електронний ресурс] / Politico Staff. – Режим доступу : <https://www.politico.com/story/2017/09/19/trump-un-speech-2017-full-text-transcript-242879>.
7. Remarks of President Donald J. Trump Inaugural Address [Електронний ресурс] / White House. – Режим доступу : <https://www.whitehouse.gov/inaugural-address-summit>.
8. Лосева І. В. Мовностилістичні особливості політичної полеміки кандидатів у президенти США (на матеріалі інтернет-дискурсу) : дис. кандидата филол. наук : 10.02.04 / Ірина Вікторівна Лосева. – Львів, 2016. – 261 с.

9. Trump's speech in Warsaw [Електронний ресурс] / CNN Politics. – Режим доступу : <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/07/06/politics/trump-speech-poland-transcript/index.html>.
10. Hillary Clinton's concession speech full transcript : 2016 presidential election [Електронний ресурс] / Vox. – Режим доступу : <https://www.vox.com/2016/11/9/13570328/hillary-clinton-concession-speech-full-transcript-2016-presidential-election>.
11. Четвертак Є. О. Вербалізація національної ідентичності США в англomовному політичному дискурсі : дис. ... кандидата філол. наук : 10.02.04 / Євгенія Олександрівна Четвертак. – Запоріжжя, 2016. – 237 с.
12. President Trump's extraordinary Christmas speech [Електронний ресурс] / Life Site. – Режим доступу : <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/jesus-birth-changed-the-course-of-human-history-trumps-extraordinary-2017-c>.
13. Obama at HRC Dinner: GOP Presidential Candidates Must 'Stand Up' For Gay Soldiers [Електронний ресурс] / Think Progress. – Режим доступу : <https://thinkprogress.org/obama-at-hrc-dinner-gop-presidential-candidates-must-stand-up-for-gay-soldiers-6d2f48be13b4/>.
14. Никифорова О. О. Дискредитація противника в парламентських дебатах [Електронний ресурс] / О. О. Никифорова // Политическая лингвистика. – 2013. – Режим доступу : <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/diskreditatsiya-protivnika-v-parlamentskih-debatah>.
15. Popova Y. V. Grammatical and lexical constituent of pre-election discourse / Y. V. Popova, N. A. Prykhodko, Y. V. Yemelyanova // Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research. – 2014. – № 19 (1). – С. 48–51. <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/33923>

REFERENCES

1. Charteris-Black, J. (2013). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.
2. Demiankov V. Z. (2002). Politicheskij diskurs kak predmet politologicheskoy filologii [Political discourse as a subject of political philology]. *Political Science. Political Discourse: History and Modern Researches*, 3, 32–43.
3. Popova, O. V. (2014). *Peredvyborchiy diskurs SShA v dynamitsi anhliiskoi movy seredyny XX – pochatku XXI stolit* [Pre-Election Discourse of the USA in the Dynamics of the English Language in the Middle of XX – Beginning of XXI Centuries]. Unpublished candidate dissertation, Sumy, Ukraine. Retrieved from <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/36099>
4. Khalizev, V. E. (1986). *Drama kak rod literatury. Poetika, genезis funkcionirovaniya* [Drama as a literature genre. Poetics, functioning genesis]. Moscow, Russia: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo Universiteta.
5. Shestopal, O. G. (2013). Teatralnist yak pertseptyvna katehoriia u konteksti suchasnykh mizhdystyplinarnykh doslidzhen [Theatre as a perceptive category in the context of modern interdisciplinary researches]. *Literature Science Studios*. Retrieved from http://philology.knu.ua/library/zagal/Literaturoznavchi_studii_2013_37_2/436_442.pdf
6. Trump's statement to the United Nations General Assembly on Sept. 19, 2017. (2017). *Politico Staff*. Retrieved from <https://www.politico.com/story/2017/09/19/trump-un-speech-2017-full-text-transcript-242879>
7. Remarks of President Donald J. Trump Inaugural Address (2017). *White House*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/inaugural-address-summit>
8. Loseva, I. V. (2016). *Movnostylistychni osoblyvosti politychnoi polemiky kandydativ u prezypydenty SShA (na materialii internet-dyskursu)* [Language-stylistic peculiarities of political monologue of candidates for the presidency of the USA (based on the internet discourse)]. Unpublished candidate dissertation, Lviv, Ukraine.
9. Trump's speech in Warsaw (2017). *CNN Politics*. Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/07/06/politics/trump-speech-poland-transcript/index.html>
10. Hillary Clinton's concession speech full transcript: 2016 presidential election. (2016). *Vox*. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/2016/11/9/13570328/hillary-clinton-concession-speech-full-transcript-2016-presidential-election>
11. Chetvertak, Ye. O. (2016). *Verbalizatsiia natsionalnoi identychnosti SShA v anhломovnomu politychnomu dyskursi* [National identity of the USA verbalisation in the English political discourse]. Unpublished candidate dissertation, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine.
12. President Trump's extraordinary Christmas speech (2017). *Life Site*. Retrieved from <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/jesus-birth-changed-the-course-of-human-history-trumps-extraordinary-2017-c>
13. Obama at HRC Dinner: GOP Presidential Candidates Must 'Stand Up' For Gay Soldiers (n.d.). *Think Progress*. Retrieved from <https://thinkprogress.org/obama-at-hrc-dinner-gop-presidential-candidates-must-stand-up-for-gay-soldiers-6d2f48be13b4/>
14. Nikiforova, O. O. (2013). Дискредитація противника в парламентських дебатах [Discreditation of an opponent in political debates] *Politicheskaya Lingvistika*. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/diskreditatsiya-protivnika-v-parlamentskih-debatah>
15. Popova, Y. V. Prykhodko, N. A., & Yemelyanova, Y. V. (2014). Grammatical and lexical constituent of pre-election discourse. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 19 (1), 48–51. Retrieved from <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/33923>

Received: 30 January, 2018