



Linguistic and stylistic features of translating political speeches as an element of political discourse

Svitlana Khrystiuk*

PhD in History, Associate Professor

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

03041, 15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4119-8562>

Abstract. The linguistic and stylistic features of translating political speeches, a vital component of political discourse, play a pivotal role in shaping public opinion, influencing political decisions, and reflecting the ideologies and power dynamics inherent in political processes. By focusing on the translation of political speeches, the research aimed to classify and systematise the linguistic and stylistic features inherent to this discourse, identify core terminology and types, and analyse translation strategies. This enabled a deeper understanding of how political messages are adapted across languages and how translation mediates the communication of power, ideology, and public engagement in the modern world. The research, grounded in a broad and diverse set of primary and secondary sources, employed qualitative and quantitative text analysis, comparative, discourse and pragmatic analysis, case studies, surveys, back-translation method, stylistic annotation, observation, selection, systematisation, description, classification, provided a comprehensive examination of the linguistic and stylistic features involved in the translation of political speeches. By analysing original political texts and their translations – including addresses by Presidents G.W. Bush, B. Obama, J. Biden, D. Trump, and V. Zelenskyy – the research offered insight into how political intent, rhetorical strategies, and ideological nuances are preserved, adapted, or transformed in translation. It proved that the functional specificity of political discourse – suggestive, persuasive, informative, and expressive – highlights its role in articulating national ideologies and engaging with global audiences. It is substantiated that evaluation, as a central feature, bridges emotionality, expressiveness, and affectivity, offering insights into how political messages resonate with or challenge societal values. The findings revealed that political language remains a vital medium for articulating values, shaping ideologies, and navigating the complex

Suggested Citation:

Khrystiuk, S. (2024). Linguistic and stylistic features of translating political speeches as an element of political discourse. *International Journal of Philology*, 29(2), 55-78. doi: 10.31548/philolog/2.2025.55.

*Corresponding author



interplay of history, culture, and governance. The research findings can be practically applied by political communication specialists, translators, diplomats, and international relations analysts to more accurately convey the content and stylistic features of political speeches, thereby enhancing intercultural communication and improving the understanding of political intentions globally

Keywords: political communication; translation strategies; pragmatics; political rhetoric; comparative analysis; audience perception

Introduction

Amid ongoing global instability, with far-reaching consequences, growing humanitarian emergencies, and rising geopolitical conflicts, the investigation of political communication has gained significant academic importance. Within this context, the linguistic and stylistic features of translating political speeches – an essential component of political discourse – have emerged as a significant interdisciplinary focus of academic inquiry. This area has attracted sustained interest from linguists both in Ukraine and abroad, reflecting its critical role in facilitating effective cross-cultural political communication and understanding.

Q. Al-Azzawi & A. Saleh (2021) investigated crucial issues of linguistic study, such as the linguistic features used by both candidates, D. Trump and J. Biden, in the American presidential debate as well as the extra-linguistic features used by the candidates. The authors observed that political speech differs from other forms of public address in that it reflects the speaker's position and perspectives on key political and economic matters. M. Romadlani (2021) demonstrated that the use of pronouns within political discourse is context-dependent and can function strategically to shape social dynamics between speakers and their audiences. The pronoun "I" and its related forms do more than mark grammatical roles such as subject or object; they also convey the speaker's personal stance and evaluation based on the communicative context. For instance, B. Obama frequently employed first-person singular pronouns to express sincere gratitude towards

the family, share the professional experiences, articulate carefully considered personal views, communicate hopes and commitments, and acknowledge fellow presidential candidates like J. McCain in 2008 and M. Romney in 2012.

The concept of self and others in political discourse is distinctly represented in B. Obama's speeches. The deliberate use of polarity serves to emphasise the unifying power arising from differences. Positive self-images, such as honesty, democratic values, openness, and foresight, appear to be effectively conveyed by B. Obama through the use of "I" and its variations. By using "we" and its variations, B. Obama aimed to engage the public as a strategy for sharing responsibility and fostering a sense of nationalism, unity, equality, and a collective understanding of the political situation and any future challenges they might face. Through the use of the exclusive "we", B. Obama shared political plans and commitments with the Vice President at the time, J. Biden. This approach was undoubtedly intended to calm the political climate post-election and underscore B. Obama's serious concern with a reconciliation.

Ukrainian researcher T. Ilchenko (2024) identified peculiarities concerning the translation of political speeches in the modern period. For the analysis of political speeches, the speech by UK Prime Minister R. Sunak at the Munich Security Conference and the speech by Ukrainian President V. Zelenskyy at the Joint Session of both Chambers of the U.S. Congress were selected. The study examined certain lexical expressions and grammatical constructions

characteristic of contemporary English political speeches and analysed translation transformations that can aid in finding an adequate Ukrainian equivalent. These include infinitives, modal verbs, idiomatic expressions, the passive voice, as well as translation techniques such as information omission, the use of personification, etc.

I. Dudko & V. Faraponov (2023) analysed President J. Biden's foreign policy doctrine and the advancement of U.S. assistance to Ukraine. Their research asserted that U.S. assistance not only significantly contributes to Ukraine's success in countering aggression, but also serves to strengthen U.S. strategic interests by reinforcing liberal values and the democratic international order. This ideological foundation was outlined in the J. Biden doctrine, formulated in the U.S. National Security Strategy (2022). The strategy emphasised a dual focus: supporting countries undergoing reforms and ensuring the stability and democratic development of Europe as an integral part of Western civilisation. Comparative assessments of U.S. aid and that provided by other Kyiv partners further substantiate the U.S. position as a reliable ally committed to protecting Ukraine's sovereignty and independence.

Ukrainian researcher N. Shkvorchenko (2020) outlined prevalent syntactic structures characteristic of political discourse. These include declarative sequences arranged systematically; imperative constructions (e.g., "Do not give up hope"); rhetorical questions functioning as calls to action (e.g., "What kind of peace do we seek?"); elliptical sentences that enhance emotive effect through the omission of grammatical elements (e.g., "But, in the end, to what end...?"); as well as inversion and emphatic constructions; and conditional sentences conveying promises or future-oriented commitments (e.g., "If you give me your trust, I will honour it"). The author identified several key linguistic characteristics of political discourse. The frequent use of clichés and set phrases serves to evoke established stereotypes and

emphasises the localised relevance of information, thereby facilitating comprehension. The use of evaluative vocabulary functions to influence audience perception, while terminological precision affords nuanced and sometimes novel connotations. Additionally, political discourse exhibits marked gender-specific linguistic tendencies. Female politicians typically adopt a cooperative communication style characterised by rhetorical turning points, whereas male politicians are more inclined toward a competitive style emphasising dominance and self-assertion. These gender-based distinctions manifest across various linguistic levels, including stylistic, lexical, syntactic, sociocultural, and grammatical. Thus, socio-political vocabulary refers to a broad and multifaceted body of words that differ in conceptual and functional domains, but are united from a sociolinguistic perspective into a single stream of verbalisation of events and phenomena related to the state and public life of society. This vocabulary reflects the dynamic processes of language development, evaluative and critical discourse, debates, and ultimately, the current issues characteristic of a specific society in a particular historical era.

The research purpose was to examine the linguistic and stylistic features of translating political speeches as a form of political discourse, with a particular focus on their role in mediating ideology, power relations, and public engagement across languages and cultures. The objectives were to classify and systematise the linguistic and stylistic features characteristic of political speech translation, to analyse the translation strategies that influence the preservation, adaptation, or transformation of political intent, rhetorical devices, and ideological meaning, and to explore how translated political messages are reinterpreted in ways that shape and impact intercultural communication.

Materials and Methods

The research material comprised an extensive range of scholarly works and official documents

pertaining to political discourse, translation studies, and pragmatics. It incorporated studies on the linguistic and stylistic features of political speeches delivered by prominent figures, including B. Obama, G.W. Bush, D. Trump, J. Biden, and V. Zelenskyy. To provide authentic empirical data, the wide range featured official political addresses such as Inaugural Address by President Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (2020), Barack Obama: Inaugural Address (2013), and George W. Bush: Inaugural Address (2001). Additional primary sources comprised of internet resources (Speech by the President of Ukraine..., 2022a; 2022b; We are opening a new level..., 2023; There are no signs that Putin..., 2025), and strategic documents, including U.S. National Security Strategy (2022), were also incorporated.

The scholarly component of the material consisted of peer-reviewed articles addressing a wide range of topics: critical discourse analysis, classification of political discourse types, evaluative lexicon as a characteristic of modern political discourse, the use of terminology in political discourse as a means of shaping the state's image, the nature of political speech as a type of political communication, stylistic devices in political discourse, gender-specific features of contemporary English-language political discourse, pragmatic approaches to speech analysis, the study of presupposition and politeness in inaugural addresses, challenges in translation, the peculiarities of translating political speeches in the modern era, the use of personal pronouns in American presidential discourse, lingua-rhetorical features of speeches by modern American leaders, the role of interpreters in diplomatic settings, the extralinguistic dimensions of diplomatic mediation, the exposure of linguistic imperialism, and the exploration of polarising political discourse among U.S. Congressional members with the application of large language models (LLMs).

To achieve the research objectives, various methods were employed. Qualitative text

analysis was used to identify and interpret key linguistic features such as metaphors, rhetorical devices, and repetition, as well as to analyse stylistic elements including tone and sentence structure. Quantitative analysis helped identify frequency patterns, collocations, and lexical choices, and measured translation shifts such as additions, omissions, and substitutions in a quantitative manner. Comparative analysis involved comparing source texts with their translations to identify how linguistic and stylistic features are rendered in the target language, and to evaluate translation strategies and their impact on the communicative function of the speeches. Discourse analysis was applied to examine how political ideology and intent are conveyed in translations and to analyse the audience's perception of the translated speeches.

Pragmatic analysis assessed the speech acts and how they are adapted during translation to maintain illocutionary force, investigating how politeness strategies or face-threatening acts are handled in translation. Case studies focused on specific speeches by prominent political figures and their translations, comparing translations across different languages or translators. The back-translation method involved translating the translated text back into the source language to identify shifts and changes in meaning. Stylistic annotations were used to mark the texts of political speeches for stylistic features such as rhetorical questions, metaphors, parallel structures, and hyperbole to study their translation. Additionally, observation, selection, systematisation, description, and classification were employed structurally and sequentially, observing sequential logic, climactic progression, and conciseness as well. Generalisation was used to make conclusions. By combining these materials and methods, a comprehensive study was conducted to explore the linguistic and stylistic aspects of translating political speeches within the realm of political discourse.

Results and Discussion

Political discourse serves as a crucial instrument in constructing the image of a state, employing strategies of persuasion and agitation to influence the worldview and public opinion of various audiences. A political text represents the verbal expression of processed political information, which takes into account both situational and sociocultural contexts. Within political discourse, information is conveyed either directly or indirectly and is subject to both rational and emotional evaluation. Scholarly interest in this field spans semiological, cultural, hermeneutic, and cognitive perspectives. The distinct characteristics of political texts, shaped by societal and individual factors, have enabled the identification of different types of political discourse through which the state's image is articulated.

According to A. Solodka & T. Moroz (2024), the functional specificity of political discourse is determined by its intent, which highlights the following key functions: suggestive, persuasive, informative, and expressive. The system-forming features of political discourse are characterised by a gradual nature and, depending on the type of political discourse, occupy specific positions on the scale of totalitarianism/democracy. The ability of discourse to influence recipients stems from its communicative and linguistic nature is represented by a deliberate choice of linguistic means, including the category of evaluation. Evaluation is recognised as one of the most significant aspects of human intellectual activity, acting as a factor shaping value-based worldviews. The category of evaluation correlates with the categories of emotionality, expressiveness, and affectivity. Evaluative aspects of linguistic units are evident at all levels of the language system. However, the most frequent manifestation is through the use of lexical evaluative tools, such as metaphors, comparisons, allusions, and, primarily, evaluative vocabulary, which are key to realising the primary function of political discourse.

Being an extralinguistic category, the concept of "evaluation" is reflected in the semantic structure of words as an evaluative component. At the lexical level, this component can be part of the denotative macro-component structure or its connotative aspect. Based on the mode of realisation, three types of evaluative manifestations were distinguished: functional, connotative, and pragmatic.

Over the course of political communication, a political glossary has been formed, with a small number of purely political concepts at its core. The majority of terms that make up this political glossary have been borrowed from other domains. It includes established expressions taken from the Bible (All things to all men, Eleventh Commandment, fight the good fight, Armageddon), clerical and church terms (party faithful, party elders, bleeding heart, and gray eminence), words from W. Shakespeare's works (strange bedfellows), W. Wordsworth (Happy Warrior), and T. Eliot (wasteland). There are also borrowings from the realm of sports, particularly horse racing terminology (dark horse, running mate, front runner, bolt, shoo-in), and military vocabulary (campaign, camps, boom, spoils, rally, regular, hundred days, man on horseback, war horse). The glossary of political terms also includes phrases from media jargon (off the record, authoritative sources, backgrounder, dope story, leak, plant, not for attribution), as well as terms associated with the civil rights movement (black power, white power structure, Freedom Now, backlash, We Shall Overcome, soul, tokenism, Uncle Tom, Jim Crow, segregation, stand in the doorway). There is a process of mutual penetration of words from general vocabulary into the realm of politics and vice versa.

For example, Ukraine's image is determined by the set of terms, symbols, and language used in political discourse, media, and cultural representations reflecting its identity, values, geopolitical position, and aspirations. Key elements include the following attributes (Table 1).

Table 1. Key elements describing Ukraine's image

Geopolitical Position	Eastern European Identity: Emphasising Ukraine's position as a bridge between Europe and Asia.
	Sovereignty and Independence: Terms like independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and Euro-Atlantic integration highlight Ukraine's struggle for autonomy, particularly in the context of its relationship with Russia and the European Union.
Cultural and Historical Identity	Heritage and Nationhood: Phrases such as Kyivan Rus', Cossack traditions, and Ukrainian language and culture underline Ukraine's rich historical and cultural legacy.
	Holodomor: A term central to international recognition of the 1932-1933 famine as genocide.
	Maidan Revolution / Euromaidan: Symbolising the fight for democracy and European values.
Political Struggles	War Terminology: Terms like Russian aggression, annexation of Crimea, Donbas conflict, and defence of sovereignty describe Ukraine's recent conflicts and territorial challenges.
	Reforms: Highlighting efforts like anti-corruption measures, judicial reforms, and economic liberalisation to align with Western standards.
Economic and Diplomatic Terms	Euro-Atlantic Aspirations: European Union association, NATO partnership, free trade agreement.
	Global Partnerships: Strategic partnership, international aid, and investment hub.
National Pride and Resilience	Terms like freedom, unity, resilience, and strength of the Ukrainian people emphasise the collective identity and spirit of Ukrainians in the face of adversity.
	Innovation and Progress: IT hub, digital transformation, and start-up ecosystem reflect Ukraine's modernising economy.
Modern Image	Cultural Renaissance: Ukrainian cinema, literature, and art revival position Ukraine as a growing cultural force.

Source: author's development

Accordingly, political language may be understood as a collection of verbal constructions employed within the political sphere to shape individuals' political awareness and engagement in political activities. This language manifests in various forms, including interviews, conferences, public addresses, debates, congresses, campaign posters, and legislative texts (Table 2). Political language represents a specialised mode of communication that, particularly in democratic societies, aims to facilitate the achievement of public consensus. At its core, the language of politics is grounded in values, which function as fundamental

elements of social consciousness. The quality of political language, and consequently the level of political dialogue, is closely linked to the degree of democratic development and the overall cultural maturity of a society. Language and politics are inherently interconnected; throughout periods of revolution and ideological shifts, political language undergoes significant transformation. The functions of political language are multifaceted, encompassing informational, communicative, interpretative-evaluative roles, as well as the formation of political consciousness, persuasion, control, and manipulation.

Table 2. Types of political speeches

Depending on the event or recipient	Parliamentary speeches	The main feature of this type is the opposition of concepts, such as "correctness vs. incorrectness" of an action or decision, "appropriateness vs. inappropriateness" of actions, "benefit vs. harm", etc.
	Election campaign speeches	The main feature of these speeches is the agitation of voters, persuading them to support the speaker to maintain power and their positions.

Table 2. Continued

Depending on the event or recipient	Party speeches	These are characterised by the promotion and defence of one’s own ideas.
	International speeches	These have several distinctive features. First, they are delivered at events such as intergovernmental conferences, congresses, meetings, or banquets. Second, such speeches typically do not anticipate resistance or disagreement from the audience.
	Welcome speeches	These can be characterised as having a ceremonial nature, but they are only formally related to the event’s theme. They are delivered to disseminate and popularise the speaker’s ideas and plans.
	Festive speeches	These are marked by a ritualistic and majestic tone, during which the speaker expresses commonly accepted values and beliefs. Typically, the audience of such speeches holds certain expectations of them.
	Rally speeches	The speaker addresses pressing issues in a specific field. These speeches deal with socially significant and important issues. The success of a rally speech largely depends on the speaker’s ability to engage the audience, present current issues in an unconventional manner, and inspire the audience.
	Business speeches	These focus solely on presenting “dry” facts about a specific issue and are characterised by conciseness.
Depending on the method of delivery	Apology speeches	These are relatively rare. Typically, in such speeches, a political figure acknowledges the incorrectness of their views or actions, for which they are being criticised, and offers an apology to the audience.
	Defensive speeches	These are designed to defend the speaker’s position and views, avoiding criticism and objections from the opposing side.
	Unspoken political speeches	When speechwriters prepare a speech for a politician, they usually create multiple versions of the text, as it is impossible to predict all possible scenarios the politician may face. The version of the speech that was not delivered is referred to as an unspoken political speech.

Source: author’s development

History shows that many of the world’s leading nations have made efforts to promote their languages beyond their national borders, and they continue to do so. In universities across the civilised world, law students study Roman law as the foundation of legal reasoning. Only in the 17th century, the educated community began a cautious transition from Latin to national languages supported by the establishment of the first Royal Academies that worked to develop national literary languages as tools for governance and the consolidation of their countries and nations. During the 17th and 18th centuries, Europe witnessed the hegemony of Francophonie: the French language

became the most popular, driven by its culture, poetry, drama, philosophy, art, aristocratic life-style, etc. Additionally, the French state played a prominent political role on the continent, further elevating the status of the French language. Starting from the second half of the 19th century, the leadership of the German language became evident. This was not only linked to Germany unification by the “Iron Chancellor” O. von Bismarck and diplomat’s transformation into a major power, but also to the brilliant achievements of German fundamental and applied sciences, as well as numerous inventions and discoveries. After 1945, the undeniable leadership of the English language began,

driven by Anglophonia, a status owed to the United States and its global role. Vast populations across the world have embraced English, as it truly serves as a global language. Over 90% of the world’s scientific information is disseminated in English. The English language has become the dominant language in the production and dissemination of scientific knowledge, both in higher education teaching and in academic publishing. According to E. Aydinli & Ju. Aydinli (2024), this is especially evident in the natural and fundamental sciences, where

it was estimated that 98% of all scientific articles are written in English. However, this also applies to the social sciences and humanities, although the percentage is somewhat lower and varies significantly depending on the country and discipline. In 2025, almost half of the world’s population claims one of only 10 languages as their mother tongue. According to Ethnologue 2025 report (2025), the list of Top 10 languages by number of native speakers as well as the most spoken languages in the world include (Table 3).

Table 3. Top 10 languages by number of native speakers & most spoken languages in the world

Top 10 Languages by Number of Native Speakers	Top 10 the Most Spoken Languages in the World
Mandarin Chinese – 941 million native speakers	English – 1.5 billion total speakers
Spanish – 486 million native speakers	Mandarin (Chinese) – 1.1 billion total speakers
English – 380 million native speakers	Hindi – 609 million total speakers
Hindi – 345 million native speakers	Spanish – 560 million total speakers
Bengali – 237 million native speakers	Standard Arabic – 332 million total speakers
Portuguese – 236 million native speakers	French – 312 million total speakers
Russian – 148 million native speakers	Bengali – 278 million total speakers
Japanese – 123 million native speakers	Portuguese – 264 million total speakers
Yue Chinese – 86 million native speakers	Russian – 255 million total speakers
Vietnamese – 85 million native speakers	Urdu – 238 million total speakers

Source: compiled by the author based on Ethnologue 2025 report (2025)

According to A.H. Tarish (2019), G.W. Bush’s speeches are often noted for the southern accent and frequent misuse of the English language. However, the defining moment of politician’s presidency – the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 – marked a significant shift in president’s rhetoric. Pragmatically, the discourse became centred on themes of patriotism and national recovery. These events not only shaped the content of G.W. Bush’s political messaging, but also framed the whole presidency and public image. G.W. Bush’s speeches after the attacks often drew comparisons between past events and a hopeful future, emphasising national unity and the defence of American values. George W. Bush: Inaugural Address (2001) exemplified this framing, showcased the focus on unity and protection of American ideals.

The politician stated that it was declared that defences would be strengthened to an unsailable level to prevent any perception of vulnerability. There was also a commitment to addressing the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction, with the aim of preventing future catastrophes in the new century. It was emphasised that the attacks aimed to instil fear and cause the nation to withdraw, yet these intentions were unsuccessful. The country remains resilient, with its people united and motivated to protect their homeland. Short, simple sentences were used to convey a sense of the seriousness of the situation. However, G.W. Bush continued to use sentence structures with commas to highlight dichotomies.

President G.W. Bush’s speech featured simpler sentences compared to President

B. Obama's speeches, aligning with G.W. Bush's reputation for a straightforward and unsophisticated speaking style. George W. Bush: Inaugural Address (2001), included numerous examples of concise statements, such as: "We must live up to the calling we share", "America at its best is also courageous", "We will defend our allies and our interests", "Sometimes in life we are called to do great things". Despite the abundance of simple sentences, G.W. Bush's speech also incorporated complex sentences with subordinate clauses. These structures are often more dynamic than compound sentences because they establish clearer and more specific relationships between key elements of the sentence. For instance, the president stated, "I ask you to be citizens: citizens, not spectators; citizens, not subjects; responsible citizens building communities of service and a nation of character". This blend of simplicity and complexity allowed G.W. Bush to convey both directness and depth in this rhetoric.

B. Obama's rhetorical style was notably shaped by politician's capacity to connect with audiences in the context of the Internet age. This era has not only fostered a shift toward more casual political discourse, but also produced an environment characterised by unedited, instantaneous, and often highly biased feedback. Consequently, B. Obama's language reflects the interconnectedness enabled by digital communication platforms and demonstrates politician's skilful selection of words to effectively evoke emotions appropriate to the setting and circumstances. This approach contributed to cultivating an image of B. Obama as well-liked and approachable. The President achieved this through the use of simple sentence structures alongside numerous compound-complex sentences, which underscored the informal linguistic style prevalent in Internet discourse. Moreover, this linguistic strategy served to emphasise the commonalities between B. Obama and the average American voter, fostering a sense of reliability and

inclusivity. These characteristics are clearly demonstrated in the Barack Obama: Inaugural Address (2013), which highlighted the relationship between the structure and purpose of the political message. The speech acknowledges the challenges faced by the current generation, emphasising their strength and resilience. It marks the end of a prolonged period of conflict and the beginning of economic recovery. The address conveys a sense of boundless opportunity, attributing it to qualities such as youth, diversity, openness, willingness to take risks, and adaptability. The message calls for collective action, stressing that success depends on unity and shared effort.

According to S. Balogun & M. Murana (2018), an inaugural speech is a form of discourse providing elected officials the opportunity to make promises and assure effective governance through skilful language use. In the analysed speech, D. Trump employed numerous presuppositions to demonstrate a deep understanding of Americans and the US contemporary socio-political realities. These presuppositions serve as a foundation for the various promises politician makes. They also explain the predominance of structurally simple sentences, through which the politician relies on the shared knowledge of the American audience without delving into tedious details. The speech often references prominent figures and the collective participation of millions, emphasising a historic movement and the transfer of power to the people. Additionally, there is a strong focus on the concept of national dignity, with explicit recognition of the importance of collectivism and respect for others. The rhetoric highlights intentions to foster friendship and goodwill internationally, without imposing cultural values, while aiming to strengthen existing alliances and establish new partnerships.

However, the speech contains numerous threats that could have been avoided, stemming primarily from extensive criticism and accusations. The use of defensive strategies serves to

soften the impact of criticism, making it more acceptable, yet at the same time leaves a striking and memorable impression. This supports claims by critics that the tone can come across as coarse. The argument highlights a failure to prioritise national interests, such as border security and domestic infrastructure, while benefiting other countries economically. Emphasis was placed on the need to defend the nation's borders against external threats that harm domestic industries and jobs.

J.F. Gil-Bonilla (2020) suggested that D. Trump's discourses as a businessperson and as a president on the topic of immigration differed in terms of ideological structures. Discursively, D. Trump's representation of immigrants varies according to the portrayed role. As a businessperson, D. Trump demonstrated empathy and familiarity, expressing concern through the use of inclusive pronouns and passive constructions characterising immigrants as victims. Conversely, as a president, politician positions immigrants as an out-group, excluding them from the sphere of concern and depicting them as agents exerting a negative impact on American society. It should be noted that, during the presidency, D. Trump frequently

conveyed a negative attitude towards immigrants through the use of broad generalisations. Immigrants were often characterised in a highly negative manner, being portrayed as criminals and dangerous individuals. The rhetoric focused strongly on the swift removal of these groups, with a clear distinction made between those labelled as criminals and other immigrants, such as the Dreamers, who were not targeted. This approach reinforced a strict and uncompromising stance on immigration enforcement. Moreover, D. Trump's discourse as a president is longer than as a businessperson. However, it is worth noting that despite this difference in length across periods, D. Trump, as a president, addressed many different topics unrelated to the aim of this study. In contrast, as a businessperson, D. Trump's discourse is shorter and more monothematic, delving more deeply into the topic relevant to this study – namely, the issue of immigration. After critically analysing the vocabulary, grammar, and textual structure of D. Trump's tweets addressing Middle Eastern countries, S.B. Elaf & A. Hussien (2020) identified distinct linguistic features and drew significant conclusions regarding their characteristics (Table 4).

Table 4. Results of linguistic features

Vocabulary Analysis	Grammar Analysis	Textual Structure
Lexical Selection. A new radical Islamic terrorist, TRAGEDY, have been executed, Horror, Radical Islamic terrorism, death, destruction. Interesting (irony) Certain Middle East countries. We protect the Middle East countries, violence.	Pronominal. 1. I, We, they, you. 2. Us, me.	Non-Figurative Information. A new radical Islamic terrorist, Muslim ban, Christians has been executed.
Modality (modal auxiliary verbs). Can, should, have, has, will, must.	Tense. Past, present, future.	Mention of specific target group. The shooter is white.
Hyperbole. Radical Islamic terrorist, we can't allow this horror to continue, Radical Islamic terrorism, death, destruction, suffering.	Adjectives. Radical, terrible, interesting, safe.	Power behind Discourse. Be cautious! We will remember, never, ever, threaten us, you will suffer.
Metaphor. Get smart, Muslim ban, the shooter is White, we will remember.	Punctuation. Question marks, exclamation marks, full stops.	
Repetition. Islamic radical terrorist, Islamic terrorism.		

Source: developed by S.B. Elaf & A. Hussien (2020)

Ukrainian researcher O. Kovalchuk (2021) considered lingua-rhetorical aspects of political speeches of modern American leaders and outlined the standard three-part structure of a political speech, with each section distinguished by its own set of linguistic and rhetorical tools: 1) the introductory section is directed toward the general audience and aims to establish a connection. The most frequent phrases and expressions include “Thank you for”, “I/we have some news”, “I would like to thank”, “I would like to talk about”, “Let me provide some (clear) information”; 2) the main section of a political speech is used to present and argue the politician’s perspective on the issue being addressed. To effectively achieve the communicative goals of the speech, rhetorical devices and other emotional means of expressiveness are employed. These include lexical repetitions, idiomatic expressions, literary imagery, linguistic elements conveying irony or humour, colloquial phrases and contractions, puns, etc.; 3) the concluding section of a political speech is typically divided into three parts: summary (it provides a synthesis of all the topics addressed during the speech, thereby simplifying the task for the audience), appeal (emotional and ceremonial in nature, it aims to reduce the distance between the politician and their audience), typological (designed to encourage further reflection and detailed discussion). The author pointed out that modern political speech served as a powerful instrument of political communication, enabling the exchange of views, dissemination of ideas, and exertion of influence on the audience or recipients. The effectiveness of a speech hinged on its structure and the deliberate selection of linguistic and rhetorical tools that enhanced its expressiveness, emotional resonance, and persuasive impact. The proper use of these elements is crucial not only for the success of an individual speech, but also for the broader political endeavours and career trajectory of the speaker.

J.M. Ashwaq (2023) examined the practical strategies used by American politicians to express bias in their political speeches. The study identified the specific speech acts employed to convey bias and explored how politicians make use of Grice’s maxims to achieve this effect. It also analysed the types of presuppositions present in the data, highlighted various impoliteness strategies and sub-strategies used to manifest bias, and outlined the rhetorical tropes utilised for the same purpose. Bias was defined as a preference for certain individuals or viewpoints based on factors such as religion, culture, or race, with different types of bias identified, including racial, religious, social, ethnic, sexual, and cultural. From a pragmatic standpoint, bias can be analysed through several frameworks: within Speech Act Theory as representatives (assertives), directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations; through Grice’s Cooperative Principle, focusing on types of presupposition such as existential, factive, non-factive, lexical, structural, and counterfactual; via Impoliteness Theory, including bald-on-record impoliteness, positive and negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock-politeness, and withholding politeness; and through the use of rhetorical tropes, including destabilisation tropes like metaphor and substitution tropes such as hyperbole. The study also addressed the methodological approaches to analysing the data. The researcher concluded that, in biased presidential speeches by American politicians, assertive and directive speech acts occur more frequently than other types. The maxims of quantity and manner are violated in roughly equal measure, while existential presuppositions are exploited more often than other presupposition forms. Such speeches also display negative impoliteness. Regarding the use of tropes, hyperbole appears more frequently than metaphor in these addresses.

According to J.M. Ashwaq & N. Al-Aadili (2023), pragmatics is one of the main branches of linguistics and states that speakers convey

not only words in their speech, but also actions to achieve communicative goals; it focuses on the human ability to infer meaning from specific types of speech to understand what the speaker intends and the connection between new information and previous events. Speaking is an action performed through utterances. Actions do not necessarily have to be performed physically by the speakers. Spoken words must be sufficient to accomplish the task. When people apologise, greet, inquire, criticise, invite, congratulate, or refuse, they engage in a speech act. One type of speech act that frequently occurs in conversations between individuals is commissive speech acts, which might include threat, promise, refusal, and warning. The researchers chose J. Biden's speech as the subject because it contained commissive acts. The authors outlined that the study examined the different forms of commissive acts – locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary – in J. Biden's statements, categorising them into six types: promise, guarantee, refusal, threat, volunteer, and offer. For example, J. Biden committed to fostering national unity by rejecting division between political groups. The president also pledged to work equally hard for all citizens, regardless of whether they supported the politician, demonstrating a willingness to serve the entire population. Expressions of compassion, empathy, and concern further reinforce promises that were made. Additionally, J. Biden vowed to make every effort to overcome the pandemic, showing a firm commitment through the speech acts; J. Biden expressed a commitment to bipartisan collaboration, framing it as a response to the will of the American people. By presenting cooperation as a deliberate and achievable choice, the president conveys a promise to pursue unity and urges members of both political parties in Congress to do the same. This reflects a commissive illocutionary act, as it involves a pledge to act in accordance with the public's expectations (Inaugural Address by President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., 2020).

The researchers F. Cheng *et al.* (2025) constructed a corpus of annotated tweets from U.S. congressional members and trained a BERT-based prediction model using a subset of this data annotated with ChatGPT. This study represented one of the pioneering efforts to leverage LLMs in the analysis of polarising patterns in political discourse on social media, thereby introducing an innovative methodology for investigating political communication. The trained model was applied to a dataset comprising one million congressional tweets spanning January 2020 to June 2022, enabling a comprehensive examination of sentiment dynamics and rhetorical patterns employed by U.S. lawmakers on Twitter. Through an analysis of rhetorical distribution across party affiliations, temporal contexts, and regional variations, the study has investigated potential factors contributing to increasing political polarisation and division. The findings revealed that party affiliation, geographic region, timing of political events, and lawmakers' tenure in office significantly influences the likelihood of employing rhetoric that contributes to political polarisation. Notably, polarising rhetoric was more frequently observed during critical periods, such as annual budget discussions in January or the transition of newly elected members into office. Furthermore, rhetorical styles varied across parties, with specific discourse patterns, such as scepticism toward institutional frameworks, being more prevalent among particular groups. They advance the understanding of political communication in the era of social media. To cultivate a more constructive discursive environment, it is crucial for lawmakers to prioritise transparency and actively encourage respectful engagement. Social media platforms also bear responsibility in this endeavour, particularly through enhancing content monitoring systems capable of identifying harmful rhetoric while maintaining balanced moderation practices. Moreover, equipping citizens with the tools to critically assess discourse may help mitigate the impact

of divisive narratives and foster a more informed public dialogue.

G. Kuznyetsova *et al.* (2023) emphasised the gender-specific characteristics of contemporary English-language political discourse, identifying several features of men's speeches. Such discourse frequently contained references to fundamental democratic concepts, including freedom, law, democracy, rights, equality, justice, as illustrated by B. Johnson's (Address by the prime minister of Great Britain..., 2022) assertion: "I have one message for you today: Ukraine will win, Ukraine will be free". This also illustrated the frequent use of comparative and superlative forms to heighten expressiveness. Such linguistic choices serve to create vivid imagery and emphasise the scale or intensity of events, as seen in references to perceived unstoppable military force and expectations of swift outcomes. Furthermore, such discourse was marked by a prevalence of negatively connoted lexical items, including failure, disaster, ruin, as well as by the frequent use of negative prefixes such as un-, dis-, il-, im-, in-, and ir- as in B. Johnson's (Address by the prime minister of Great Britain..., 2022) description of humanitarian intervention as "the meddling of the unwise, untutored, and inexperienced". Another particular feature was the repeated reference to the term "war", "war crime", "Battalion Tactical Groups", "armour", "military", "guns" etc. Finally, male political discourse often employed logical and connective conjunctions, including since, as, moreover, thus, therefore, consequently, however, and nevertheless, which serve to structure argumentation and maintain coherence.

Conversely, female political media discourse displayed distinct lexical patterns that set it apart from male political speech. One particular feature was the frequent use of words expressing emotions and optimism, such as hope, believe, feel, glad, love, frustrated, doubt, worry, happiness, and a bright future. This idea was reflected in a 2022 statement by L. Truss (Push Russia out..., 2022), where a vision of a world

shaped by the perseverance of free nations was outlined. Emphasis was placed on the strengthening of democracy and freedom through international cooperation in both economic and security spheres, as well as on the importance of restraining aggressors and encouraging a shift towards more just and lawful behaviour. Another feature was the use of hedging expressions, including introductory words like maybe, probably, perhaps; the verb seem; modal verbs may and might; indefinite pronouns like some, somewhat, somehow, someplace; and phrases such as a kind of, a sort of, and some kind of. Moreover, female political discourse frequently emphasises duty and resolve through the use of modal verbs. This can be seen in statements where a firm stance is communicated by expressing necessity and intention, particularly in relation to ongoing efforts and responses to international threats. Such language highlights a strong commitment to action and perseverance in achieving political and strategic goals.

An important component of effective communication with Ukraine's citizens, international community, and foreign partners is the President of Ukraine's daily video addresses. These serve a key informational role, strengthen psychological resilience, and provide moral support to people during challenging wartime. An analysis of the speeches and video addresses of Ukraine's president V. Zelenskyy (We are opening a new level..., 2023), revealed the following linguistic and stylistic characteristics: the use of repetitive words and constructions, grammatical devices addressing a generalised audience, quotations drawn from diverse textual genres, and the employment of superlative adjective forms aimed at emphasising the conveyed message. A notable feature of the President's speeches is the frequent use of repetition, which serves to reinforce the central message. Repetitive language, including words, phrases, and sentence patterns, is employed to emphasise the ideas of unity, shared responsibility, and national resilience. This rhetorical

approach highlights the strength of collective action and the role of each community in contributing to the country's stability and defence. Through such repetition, the message is made more memorable and persuasive, particularly in the context of national struggle.

For effective speech delivery, the President adopts a collective identity, aligning themselves with the audience solely through grammatical means. The use of inclusive language fosters a sense of unity and shared responsibility. By employing brief, clear sentences, the President highlights mutual achievements, resilience, and the challenges ahead. This concise structure ensures clarity and reinforces the message, allowing the speaker to successfully fulfil communicative aims. In V. Zelenskyy's speeches, the use of comparative and superlative forms of adjectives to convey a positive patriotic evaluation and emphasise the significance of Ukraine was observed, for example: "Unbreakable people of the bravest country!" (We are opening a new level..., 2023); "You are the people's deputies of the greatest state in the modern world! I am confident of this!" (Speech by the President of Ukraine..., 2022a).

It is noteworthy that the President consistently concludes these addresses with exclamatory remarks that serve a socially regulatory function. These closing statements typically convey gratitude, honour the memory of fallen heroes, acknowledge the efforts of those supporting the country, and express encouragement and well-wishing to the Ukrainian people and armed forces. Such endings reinforce unity and collective resilience while leaving a strong emotional impression on the audience. Analysis of Speech by the President of Ukraine at a meeting of the UN Security Council (2022b) – delivered amid the ongoing war in Ukraine, the imposition of martial law, and the urgent need for international support – reveals a strategic use of key lexical markers. The most frequently employed words and their variants included: "security", "law", "Ukraine", "peace",

"human", "state", "war", and "UN". The speech was opened with a logical gratitude expression for the opportunity to address the Security Council remotely. The introduction referenced the war crimes committed by Russian soldiers and officers in Bucha, an assertion reinforced at the conclusion by relevant video evidence. The speech tone was highly emotional, with its climax being a call for reforming the global security system, including proposals for the reformatting or even dissolution of the United Nations. The central theme of the address emphasised Ukraine's aspiration for peace and its readiness to contribute to global peacekeeping efforts, as exemplified by the proposal to establish a U-24 office in Kyiv. Ultimately, the speech advocated for the war end.

During this address, the President of Ukraine referenced significant historical events – including the Nuremberg Trials, the annexation of Crimea, the war in Georgia, the separation of Transnistria, the founding of the United Nations, and the downing of the Boeing over Donbas. V. Zelenskyy also invoked notable historical figures such as Joachim von Ribbentrop and Adolf Eichmann, as well as key instruments of international law, particularly the UN Charter, to support and legitimise the President's position. The speech emphasised fundamental principles such as peace, justice, and equality. The rhetorical and political strategies employed in the President V. Zelenskyy's speech serve critical functions in amplifying the emotional impact, reinforcing logical arguments, and engaging diverse audiences.

Elliptical Sentences. The use of incomplete sentences reflects urgency and emotional intensity. By omitting elements that the audience can easily infer, these sentences leave an impression of immediacy and rawness, effectively mirroring the gravity of the ongoing conflict. For instance, "...Against our people, the Ukrainian people. Against civilians..." focused the audience's attention on the human cost of aggression without unnecessary elaboration. Through

the use of elliptical constructions, V. Zelenskyy condenses the statements, directing attention not only to the actions themselves but also to the gravity of the offences committed. The deliberate omissions compel the audience to mentally complete the ideas, which intensifies the accusations and gives them a sense of urgency. This rhetorical approach keeps the focus firmly on the deeds rather than on the individuals behind them, thereby strengthening the overall impact of the message.

Repetition. Repetition reinforces key themes and makes the speech memorable. For example, the recurring phrase “Peace is needed...” establishes peace as the central demand, emphasising its universal importance to Ukraine, Europe, and the world. Similarly, listing acts of violence (“...Those who were executed...”) underscores the brutality of the conflict and evokes strong emotional responses, fostering empathy and outrage among listeners. “Today, it is as a result of Russia’s actions on the territory of my state, on the territory of Ukraine, that the most heinous war crimes of all time since the end of World War II are being committed” (Speech by the President of Ukraine at a meeting..., 2022b). The phrase “on the territory” is repeated twice in close succession: “on the territory of my state” and “on the territory of Ukraine” emphasising Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, reinforcing the violation caused by Russia’s actions. The repeated emphasis serves to highlight that these actions are not taking place in some abstract or remote setting, but within the borders of a sovereign and internationally recognised state. By enumerating deliberate acts such as besieging cities to provoke famine, targeting fleeing civilians, destroying shelters, and fostering deadly conditions in occupied territories, the speech underscores the systematic and intentional nature of the violence against the population (Speech by the President of Ukraine..., 2022b). The repetition of “deliberately” is a powerful rhetorical device, skilfully used to create a

compelling narrative. It reinforces the speaker’s argument, amplifies emotional engagement, and ensures the accusations resonate strongly with the audience.

Rhetorical Questions. By posing rhetorical questions such as, “So where is the peace for which the United Nations was created?” the speech challenges the efficacy of existing international frameworks. “Why did Russia come to Ukraine, tell me?”, “Are you ready for the dissolving of the UN? Do you think that the time of international law has passed?”, “How to stop it?”, “How is this different from what the ISIS terrorists were doing in the occupied territory?”. This technique not only criticises, but also invites introspection, urging the audience to reconsider their roles and responsibilities in the pursuit of peace. Hence, these rhetorical questions are not just stylistic – they are strategic. They confront the audience with uncomfortable truths and urge them toward institutional reform and collective responsibility. “Do you still think that you can scare us, break us, make us make concessions”. The questions imply strong answers (“No, we are not one people”; “No, you cannot scare us”), creating an emotional connection without stating it directly. Rhetorical questions serve to energise Ukrainian audiences and sympathetic listeners by invoking collective resolve; these questions foster a shared sense of purpose – suggesting that everyone listening already knows the truth.

Comparisons. By drawing parallels between the conduct of Russian forces and the atrocities committed by DAESH, a clear moral framework is established. References to brutal killings, torture, sexual violence, and the deliberate targeting of civilians evoke harrowing images of terror, underscoring the inhumanity of such actions. This rhetorical strategy situates Russian behaviour within a universally acknowledged paradigm of terrorism, thereby framing the conflict in terms that are both relatable and easily understood by the international community. This analogy positions Russian actions

within a globally recognised paradigm of terror, making the conflict relatable and comprehensible to international audiences. “This is no different from other terrorists such as Daesh, who occupied some territories, and here it is done by a member of the United Nations Security Council”. The statement equates Russia’s actions with those of extremist terrorist groups to highlight moral outrage – if terrorism is widely condemned, so too should Russia’s behaviour, despite its United Nations Security Council status. “We are dealing with a state that turns the right of veto in the UN Security Council into a right to kill”. It transforms a diplomatic mechanism into a weapon that blocks humanitarian action to undermine the legitimacy of Russia’s UNSC role as it obstructs accountability. “Geography may be different, but cruelty is the same. Crimes are the same. Use of parallel phrasing (“geography” vs. “cruelty”) underscores that regardless of location, the brutality is consistent to assert that atrocities are systematic, not isolated incidents (Speech by the President of Ukraine..., 2022).

Metaphors. The metaphor “the veto right as the right to death” powerfully critiques the structural flaws of the United Nations Security Council. It conveys the argument that the misuse of the veto undermines the UN’s foundational purpose, turning it from a peacekeeping mechanism into a tool of injustice. “Smoke from fires ... can reach other countries”. This metaphor portrays the war’s consequences as a spreading physical smoke – something foreign nations cannot escape, symbolising how conflict impacts neighbouring countries and the world. “Energy used as a weapon” V. Zelenskyy speaks of energy infrastructure being weaponised. The metaphor pivots “energy” (power, heat, electricity) into a tool of destruction, illustrating how basic utilities become instruments of suffering. “Colonialism and imperialism revived” describes certain peace proposals as echoing “colonial past”, V. Zelenskyy used a metaphor to frame them not as neutral

diplomacy, but as a throwback to coercive, exploitative world orders. V. Zelenskyy positions the “Peace Formula” as a protective structure – something like a shield or blueprint to resist aggression and maintain global stability.

Analogies. References to Syria, Afghanistan, and Libya create a broader geopolitical context, framing the Ukrainian conflict as part of a global pattern of destabilisation and conflict. This enhances the speech’s relevance to international audiences by connecting Ukraine’s plight to familiar crises, fostering solidarity and urgency. Through these techniques, the speech transcends its immediate context, becoming a powerful critique of international structures and a rallying call for collective action. It underscores the centrality of Ukraine’s struggle not only for its sovereignty, but also for the principles of justice and peace in the international order. The address delivered by the President of Ukraine V. Zelenskyy (When a murderer..., 2025) reflects a direct and uncompromising rhetoric tailored to a global audience. Delivered during a period of heightened conflict, the address exemplifies the strategic use of language to articulate a call to action, underline collective responsibility, and reinforce international solidarity. It also highlights the effective use of rhetorical and structural strategies to galvanise international action and sustain global attention on Ukraine’s plight. By combining moral clarity with an appeal to shared values, the speech transcends its immediate context, reinforcing Ukraine’s role as a key defender of democratic principles in the modern world. The main topics of V. Zelenskyy’s speech are several issues.

Moral Clarity and Justice. The speech draws a stark moral distinction between aggressor and victim, portraying Ukraine as the defender of universal values such as peace and human dignity. Zelenskyy labels the aggressor as a “murderer”, emphasising the deliberate nature of the atrocities committed. “Yes, he wants all of Ukraine – and he had wanted it not just

for four years, not just since 2014, but long before that, because he himself was shaped that way by Russian imperialism". The emphasis on "justice" frames Ukraine's fight as one that aligns with universal principles of law and order. References to the presence of Russian soldiers extend beyond Ukraine to include neighbouring countries such as Belarus, the Baltic states, Moldova, the Caucasus, Kazakhstan, and any other regions within reach of Russian forces. It is suggested that Putin's influence is limited by the reach of these military capabilities (Speech by the President of Ukraine..., 2022a).

International Cooperation. The phrase "we will respond together with our partners", "I hope, with all our partners" highlights the necessity of a united global front. This theme not only calls for continued support from allies, but also aims to bolster the legitimacy of Ukraine's cause as part of a broader international agenda. "We hope President Trump hears this – and sees how Putin is now trying to prolong even the Iranian regime's survival, just to buy more time for his own madness and the murder of thousands" (Speech by the President of Ukraine..., 2022b). **Urgency and Resilience.** The address repeatedly underscores the situation urgency, implying that hesitation equates to complicity. Simultaneously, it conveys Ukraine's resilience, asserting the nation's determination to stand firm despite immense adversity. "Separately, the National Security and Defence Council will issue decisions; they are currently being prepared. And we will provide virtually daily updates on what Ukrainian diplomats are doing to achieve our Ukrainian goals" (When a murderer..., 2025). It is also worth noting some stylistic and rhetorical features of address by the President.

Direct and Unambiguous Language. The title itself embodies directness, employing stark imagery to ensure clarity and immediacy. Such language leaves no room for misinterpretation, effectively mobilising both emotional and rational support. "Currently, this is a month of

special measures aimed at applying new pressure on Russia – on the occupier – to complicate their situation, thereby simplifying our path to peace" (When a murderer..., 2025). **Metaphors and Symbolism.** The term "murderer" is symbolic, encapsulating the perceived inhumanity of the aggressor's actions. Phrases like "we will respond" symbolise agency and resolve, reinforcing Ukraine's proactive stance. "But it is Russia that rejects peace proposals. And not just some – all of them: American, and, by the way, Chinese, European, Brazilian, African, Indian. Regardless of who says the war must be stopped, Putin does not listen. It is Putin who speaks openly to the world about which cities he threatens and which nations he claims don't exist" (When a murderer..., 2025). **Repetition.** Key concepts such as partners, justice, and response recur throughout the address, creating a rhythm that reinforces the message's urgency and importance. "Of course, we will find Ukrainian drones for every boot of a Russian occupier. Of course, Ukraine will defend itself", "Ukraine is grateful to everyone around the world who helps strengthen our defence, who supports our warriors, and all our people. We are grateful to everyone who enforces truly strong sanctions against Russia and blocks schemes that enable trade with Russia. We are grateful to everyone advancing diplomacy" (There are no signs that Putin..., 2025).

Appeals to Shared Values. The address strategically invokes universal principles like freedom, security, and justice. By framing Ukraine's struggle as integral to the preservation of these values, V. Zelenskyy aligns the country's interests with those of the international community. "Donbas has been essentially destroyed. And it was them in Moscow who once claimed they would bring protection to Donbas. What they actually brought was death – and this is the only thing they know how to deliver. Our communities in the Kharkiv region, in the border areas of our Sumy region, and in the Kherซอน region – the Russians are doing the same

thing everywhere”. Rhetorical Questions and Provocations. While the title does not contain rhetorical questions, the broader context of the speech uses provocations to challenge complacency and inspire action. “First, there will be new international measures on our part to achieve truly tangible international sanctions against Russia. We know every target for international sanctions. I have assigned separate work engaging the global corporate sector, particularly those maintaining connections of the Russian energy and defence industries with the world” (When a murderer..., 2025). It is also essential to focus on some structural features.

The address follows a clear and methodical structure. It begins with the identification of the problem, outlining the aggressor’s intentions and actions. This is followed by a call to action, urging a collective and immediate response. Finally, it presents a vision for the future by outlining a pathway toward justice and peace through unity. “We are also intensifying all sanctions-related work within Ukraine – internal efforts so that everyone who still helps Russia, cooperates with it in any way, or maintains businesses in the occupied territories – so that each such individual feels that this is absolutely criminal activity. Justice must be ensured, including through domestic decisions” (When a murderer..., 2025).

Climactic Progression. The structure builds to a climax, leading from an initial identification of the threat to a powerful assertion of collective resolve. “Second, we will allocate more resources to our drones of all types, from deep-strike drones to concrete protection against Russian boots on the frontline” (When a murderer..., 2025). Conciseness. The address is notably concise, reflecting the moment urgency while maintaining focus on its primary objectives. “We all clearly understand that the issue of Ukraine’s independence is a matter of survival for Ukrainians”, “The defence of Ukraine, the protection of our independence, and the strengthening of our sovereignty – all

of this is about saving lives. I thank everyone who stands with Ukraine! I have absolute confidence in Ukrainians” (Speech by the President of Ukraine..., 2022a).

The President of Ukraine V. Zelenskyy gave the Address to the Defence Industry Forum participants (There are no signs that Putin..., 2025) to rally international support against Russian aggression. From a linguistic perspective, the address is a well-organised piece of political communication in the ongoing war context, with segmented and enumerated key points: “First – investment and technology”, “Second – long-term resilience”. It balances formality with accessibility, ensuring clarity and impact while focusing on unity, moral responsibility, and pragmatic solutions. It concludes clear calls to action, motivating the audience to take tangible steps such as investing in defence production: “A united Europe can create a defence capability that will destroy Russia’s illusion”, increasing defence spending, cutting off support for Russia’s war capabilities as well as appealing to the world community “Our Europe”, “our joint defence capabilities”, “our shared security”, “This war is a threat to the way of life that millions in our countries value deeply”, etc. Statistics, facts and concrete details are also available in the address: “We believe that 5% of GDP is the right level”, “If every European country commits at least 0.25% of its GDP for this – and we are thankful to those countries who commit more, like the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and such a big commitment like from Germany, something quite reasonable – the chances for peace in Europe will grow”, “Our defence production potential has surpassed 35 billion US dollars”, “But around 40% of this potential lacks proper funding”.

The stylistic features of this address blend rhetorical sophistication with accessibility and urgency: “defence production”, “threat”, “sanctions”, “resilience”, “madness”, “corrupt connections”, “solidarity”, “security”, “strike drones”, “our joint defence capabilities”, “crime

against peace”, “joint”, “shared”, “together”, etc. V. Zelenskyy’s speeches demonstrated a wide range of rhetorical devices that enhance their persuasive effect. The President frequently employs repeated phrases, such as “only together can we counter this”, “this must stop”, to reinforce key messages and create a sense of urgency. Through personalisation, V. Zelenskyy addresses the audience directly with expressions like “So, dear friends!”, “please”, and “thank you”, thereby fostering a sense of closeness and solidarity. V. Zelenskyy’s discourse also makes use of parallel structures, for instance: “first – investment and technology”, “second – long-term resilience”, and “third – please make sure your countries and your companies are not helping Russia or its buddies in any way”, which lend clarity and rhythm to the arguments. Furthermore, V. Zelenskyy often relies on metaphors and vivid imagery, as in “hit the core of this aggression hard”, “keep moving forward in producing traditional weapons”, and “break every link that connects Russia with its accomplices”, to evoke strong emotional responses. The use of antithesis is evident in statements such as “Our defence potential works for peace, not for Russia’s madness”, where contrasting ideas are juxtaposed to sharpen the intended message. Finally, the politician occasionally incorporates hyperbolic expressions, exemplified by the assertion that “Every scheme that helps them build ‘Shahed’ drones...is a threat to you and to the way of life that millions in our countries value deeply”, to heighten the perceived gravity of the situation. These techniques create a compelling, persuasive, and emotionally resonant message, aligning with the speech’s purpose of rallying international support against Russian aggression.

G. Amaghlobeli (2018) outlined types of political discourses and their classification and substantiated that to effectively engage in political discourse, it is crucial to understand the type of political discourse and its distinctive features. Political discourse can be classified

based on the ideologies it seeks to promote (e.g., socialist, liberal / democratic, conservative, or totalitarian) or its subgenres (e.g., LG-BTQ+, feminist, green, religious, nationalist). Thus, discourses reflect particular ideological structures by employing specific linguistic strategies. It may also be dominant (primary) or subordinate (secondary), depending on the presence or absence of power or hierarchy. Political discourse can be defined as a deliberate act aimed at achieving specific goals in each case, and these goals are generally material in nature. In other words, the production of a particular (political) discourse is intended to articulate, defend / preserve, challenge / deconstruct certain interests.

Yu. Kuriata & O. Kasatkina-Kubyshkina (2022) described political discourse as a coherent oral or written text conveyed through both verbal and non-verbal means, whose structure and meaning are directly shaped by the context of political communication, along with pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological, and other factors. The authors illustrated the use of metaphors, personification, repetition, comparison, allusion, synecdoche, hyperbole, emotive language, balance, inversion, and rhetorical figures (such as rhetorical appeals, questions, assumptions, exclamations, and statements), as well as gradation, invective, and poetic devices. Among the latter, they highlight irony, satire, sarcasm, humour, and wordplay. The study also explores the notion of a “sustained metaphor” and emphasises the factors influencing the choice of strategies and tactics in political discourse, including the politician’s personality, their role within the political system, and the target audience to whom facts or assessments are addressed.

M. Taubaldiyev *et al.* (2024) investigated the use of terminology in political discourse as a linguistic means of representing the image of the state. According to the authors, political discourse performs vital functions within society and acts as an important channel of mass

communication that shapes public opinion. Its role in agenda-setting, persuasion, opinion formation, mobilisation, and polarisation underlines the necessity of critically assessing media messages and fostering media literacy among the public. The scholars highlighted the growing importance of political discourse as a powerful instrument for representing, defining, constructing, and promoting the state's image. It not only challenges and reshapes traditional paradigms, attitudes, and stereotypes, but also goes beyond reflecting political consciousness and circumstances, actively transforming them by influencing and shaping the positive or negative perceptions of various social groups towards real events and processes.

S.B. Elaf & A. Hussien (2020) explored the linguistic features and ideological positioning of Donald Trump by examining the use of language in tweets directed at Middle Eastern countries. The researchers applied Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis model for the study. From a lexical perspective, the analysis demonstrated that D. Trump employed a range of linguistic devices, including metaphors, repetition, hyperbole, and modal auxiliary verbs. From a grammatical standpoint, it was found that the politician frequently used the pronoun "we" to signal unity with the American people, and the politician often relied on the future tense to outline the forthcoming policies towards Middle Eastern states. The study further revealed D. Trump's use of derogatory and disparaging adjectives to convey hostility towards these countries. Textual analysis showed that the President issued threats and warnings, made figurative assertions without substantiating evidence, and strategically used punctuation, such as exclamation marks, to express anger and sarcasm. The ideological dimension of the analysis indicated that D. Trump's rhetoric was grounded in strategies of hatred, racism, fear, and intimidation, reinforcing the ideological position in relation to Middle Eastern nations.

Further, D.A. Krikun (2019) considered political communication as a type of communication in which political actors disseminated opinions and ideas to influence the recipient's views and ideological beliefs. Political speech, a subtype (such as inaugural speeches, anniversary speeches, campaign speeches, etc.), was defined as a coherent flow of speech, typically prepared in advance by the speaker, to convey information to the audience about a specific event in political life. This is done through the attributes of the subject and the recipient, the method of implementation, the comparison of monological and dialogic speech, functional load, information volume, and the statement purpose. The authors noted that, based on the subject matter, the speech could be classified as political communication, media political communication, or non-professional political communication, distinguishing between an audience that is a political actor and an audience that does not belong to institutional political entities. Relying on the opposition of "individual vs. mass", they stated that the recipient of political speech was mass-oriented. In terms of generation, political speech was classified as written speech, and in terms of reproduction, as oral speech. Based on functional load, speeches were categorised into ritual, orientation, and agonistic genres. According to the communicative goal, political speeches might belong to the group of informational, evaluative, or imperative messages, or synthesise characteristics of at least two of these. In terms of information volume, speeches ranged from medium-length texts to lengthy ones.

Y. Akgün & N. Yetkin Karakoç (2024) highlighted the vital role of interpreters within diplomatic contexts, noting that their responsibilities extend far beyond simply conveying spoken language. Their research demonstrates that diplomatic interpreters often act as discreet advisors, at times diplomatically correcting their principals or even taking responsibility for errors in order to shield their

delegation. They also serve as cultural and linguistic representatives of their countries, and may influence the flow of diplomatic exchanges – whether by shifting attention, buying time for deliberation, or managing the tone of communication. The researchers observed that it is not uncommon for interpreters to transition into diplomatic careers themselves, as their roles and hierarchical positions within delegations closely align with those of diplomats. Given the practical demands of diplomacy, they argued that interpreters who are well-versed in languages, diplomatic protocol, and cross-cultural communication can be instrumental not only in ensuring mutual understanding but also in helping to address and resolve potential diplomatic challenges.

Hence, analysed research conceptualises political communication as a strategic instrument for shaping ideological beliefs through structured and premeditated speech, oriented toward mass audiences and categorised according to its communicative purpose. Scholars emphasised the complexity and multidimensionality of political discourse, classifying it by ideological orientation and subgenre, and noting that its structure and objectives are driven by the intent to assert, defend, or contest particular interests. Furthermore, linguistic analysis have identified a range of rhetorical devices – such as metaphors, repetition, hyperbole, and evaluative language – as key tools employed to convey political messaging and reinforce ideological positions.

Conclusions

The study of linguistic and stylistic features in political discourse underscores the central role of language as a strategic tool for persuasion, ideological propagation, and social influence. The speeches of world leaders like Donald Trump, Barack Obama, George W. Bush, Joe Biden, and Volodymyr Zelenskyy exemplify varied approaches shaped by context, audience, and political objectives. For instance,

Volodymyr Zelenskyy's speeches illustrate how nuanced translation maintains rhetorical impact and ideological coherence; they reveal a sophisticated balance of emotional appeal, moral clarity, and strategic communication – positioning Ukraine as a resilient, democratic actor internationally. This research integrated qualitative and quantitative methodologies, including discourse and comparative analysis, pragmatic studies, back-translation, and stylistic annotation. These tools enabled the identification of key patterns in political translation, particularly in conveying commissive speech acts, tone, metaphors, and cultural symbols. Such strategies are essential to preserving the persuasive function of political messages across languages and socio-political contexts. Interpreters play a crucial role in mediating these messages, bridging cultural divides and supporting diplomatic communication. Ultimately, this interdisciplinary research deepens the understanding of how political language operates across cultural and linguistic boundaries, equipping both scholars and citizens with critical tools to interpret, evaluate, and engage with contemporary political narratives. The prospects for further research into the linguistic and stylistic features of political discourse may focus on in-depth analysis of political speech translation in crisis and wartime contexts, exploration of how political discourse is received in different cultures and societies, interdisciplinary approaches that integrate linguistics, political science, psychology, and communication studies as well, the use of automated tools and artificial intelligence in political discourse analysis. Thus, it can contribute not only to the theoretical advancement of political linguistics and translation studies, but also to the improvement of intercultural communication practices and political translation in an increasingly globalised world.

Acknowledgements

None.

Funding

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] Address by the prime minister of Great Britain Boris Jonson to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2022). Retrieved from https://www.rada.gov.ua/en/news/News/top_news/222489.html.
- [2] Akgün, Y., & Yetkin Karakoç, N. (2024). The different aspects of diplomatic mediation: The extralinguistic motives of having an interpreter in the diplomatic settings. *İletişim Ve Diplomasi*, 12, 75-89. doi: 10.54722/iletisimvediplomasi.1488687.
- [3] Al-Azzawi, Q.O., & Saleh, A.K.A. (2021). [Power in American presidential speeches: A critical discourse analysis](#). *Psychology and Education*, 58(5), 4063-4076.
- [4] Amaghlobeli, G. (2018). Types of political discourses and their classification. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 3(1), 18-24. doi: 10.31578/jebs.v3i1.117.
- [5] Ashwaq, J.M. (2023). Commissive speech act in Joe Biden's selected speech. *Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities*, 30(12(2)), 185-194. doi: 10.25130/jtuh.30.12.2.2023.19.
- [6] Ashwaq, J.M., & Al-Aadili, N.M. (2023). The pragmatics of bias in American political speeches. *Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities*, 30(6), 60-81. doi: 10.25130/jtuh.30.6.2.2023.24.
- [7] Aydinli, E., & Aydinli, Ju. (2024). Exposing linguistic imperialism: Why global IR has to be multilingual. *Review of International Studies*, 50(6), 943-964. doi: 10.1017/S0260210523000700.
- [8] Balogun, S., & Murana, M.O. (2018). Language in political discourse: A pragmatic study of presupposition and politeness in the inaugural speech of President Donald Trump. *Bulletin of Advanced English Studies*, 1(1), 64-76. doi: 10.31559/BAES2018.1.1.6.
- [9] Barack Obama: Inaugural Address. (2013). Retrieved from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/01/21/inaugural-address-president-barack-obama>.
- [10] Cheng, F., Zili, H., & Xiaoqiang, C. (2025). Exploring polarizing political discourse among U.S. Congressional members with large language models. *Journal of Systems Science and Information*, 13(1), 102 -115. doi: 10.21078/JSSI-2024-0086.
- [11] Dudko, I., & Faraponov, V. (2023). President Biden's foreign policy doctrine and advancing US assistance to Ukraine. *American History & Politics*, 1(15), 9-24. doi: 10.17721/2521-1706.2023.15.1.
- [12] Elaf, S.B., & Hussien, A. (2020). [Critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's tweets addressing the Middle Eastern countries](#). *International Journal of Future Generation Communication and Networking*, 13(2), 407-414.
- [13] Ethnologue 2025 report. (2025). Retrieved from <https://www.ethnologue.com/insights/ethnologue200/>.
- [14] George W. Bush: Inaugural Address. (2001). Retrieved from <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/inaugural-address-52>.
- [15] Gil-Bonilla, J.F. (2020). Critical discourse analysis of Trump across time. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, 16, 1-20. doi: 10.2478/sm-2020-0001.
- [16] Ilchenko, T. (2024). Peculiarities concerning the translation of political speeches in the modern period. *Young Scientist*, 1(125), 37-40. doi: 10.32839/2304-5809/2024-1-125-22.
- [17] Inaugural Address by President Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (2020). Retrieved from <https://ua.usembassy.gov/inaugural-address-by-president-joseph-r-biden-jr/>.
- [18] Kovalchuk, O. (2021). Lingua-rhetorical aspects of political speeches of modern American leaders. *Current Issues of Humanities*, 42(1), 189-195. doi: 10.24919/2308-4863/42-1-25.

- [19] Krapyya, Y.V., & Krikun, D.A. (2019). Political speech as a type of political communication. *Transcarpathian Philological Studies*, 2(11), 42-45. doi: [10.32782/tps2663-4880/2019.11-2.7](https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2019.11-2.7).
- [20] Kuriata, Yu.V., & Kasatkina-Kubyshkina, O.V. (2022). Stylistic devices in political discourse. *Scientific Notes of Ostroh Academy National University, Philology Series*, 13(81), 27-30. doi: [10.25264/2519-2558-2022-13\(81\)-27-30](https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2022-13(81)-27-30).
- [21] Kuznyetsova, G., Zinchenko, O., Snikhovska, I., Denysevych, O., & Velyka, A. (2023). Gender peculiarities of modern English-language political discourse. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(6), 298-302. doi: [10.5430/wjel.v13n6p298](https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n6p298).
- [22] Push Russia out of whole of Ukraine. (2022). Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-61251698>.
- [23] Romadlani, M.M.I. (2021). Personal pronouns in American presidential political discourse. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 6(1), 201-215. doi: [10.21462/ijefl.v6i1.356](https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v6i1.356).
- [24] Shkvorchenko, N.M. (2020). [Linguistic and gender peculiarities of English political discourse](https://doi.org/10.2478/2020.0001.0001.0001). *Analele universitatii din Craiova. Seria: Stiinte filologice. Llingvistica*, 1(2), 398-416.
- [25] Solodka, A., & Moroz, T. (2024). Evaluative lexicon as a characteristic of modern political discourse. *International Science Journal of Education & Linguistics*, 3(2), 96-106. doi: [10.46299/j.isjel.20240302.11](https://doi.org/10.46299/j.isjel.20240302.11).
- [26] Speech by the President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelenskyy in the Verkhovna Rada. (2022a). Retrieved from <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/vistup-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelenskogo-u-verhovnij-74737>.
- [27] Speech by the President of Ukraine at a meeting of the UN Security Council. (2022b). Retrieved from <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/vistup-prezidenta-ukrayini-na-zasidanni-radi-bezpeki-oon-74121>.
- [28] Tarish, A.H. (2019). US presidents' political discourse analysis: George W. Bush and Barack Obama. A pragmatic approach. *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, 16(1), 128-134. doi: [10.1515/RJES-2019-0016](https://doi.org/10.1515/RJES-2019-0016).
- [29] Taubaldiyev, M., Kulmanov, S., Amirbekova, A., Azimkhan, Y., Zhonkeshov, B., Utemissova, G., & Ospanov, Y. (2024). Terminology in political discourse as a means of language representation of the image of the country. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 186-198. doi: [10.32601/ejal.10117](https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.10117).
- [30] There are no signs that Putin wants to stop this war – address by the president to the defence industry forum participants. (2025). Retrieved from <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/nemaye-zhodnih-oznak-togo-sho-putin-hoche-zupiniti-cyu-vijnu-98609>.
- [31] U.S. National Security Strategy. (2022). Retrieved from <https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf>.
- [32] We are opening a new level of interaction between communities of Ukraine and communities of partner states – speech by Volodymyr Zelenskyy at the international summit of cities and regions in Kyiv. (2023). Retrieved from <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/mi-vidkrivayemo-novij-riven-vzayemodiyi-mizh-gromadami-ukray-82373>.
- [33] When a murderer says he wants to kill, we take that accordingly, and we will respond together with our partners – address by the president. (2025). Retrieved from <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/koli-vbivcya-kazhe-sho-hoche-vbiti-mi-sprijmayemo-ce-vidpovi-98565>.

Мовні та стилістичні особливості перекладу політичних промов як елемента політичного дискурсу

Світлана Христюк

Кандидат історичних наук, доцент

Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України

03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4119-8562>

Анотація. Лінгвістичні та стилістичні особливості перекладу політичних промов, що є життєво важливою складовою політичного дискурсу, відіграють ключову роль у формуванні громадської думки, впливають на політичні рішення, відображають ідеології та динаміку влади, притаманні політичним процесам. Зосереджуючись на перекладі політичних промов, дослідження мало на меті класифікувати та систематизувати лінгвістичні та стилістичні особливості, притаманні цьому дискурсу, визначити основну термінологію та типи, а також проаналізувати стратегії перекладу, що дозволило глибше зрозуміти, як політичні повідомлення адаптуються в різних мовах і як переклад опосередковує комунікацію влади, ідеології та громадської активності в сучасному світі. Дослідження, що ґрунтується на широкому та різноманітному наборі первинних та вторинних джерел, з використанням якісного та кількісного аналізу тексту, порівняльного, дискурсивного та прагматичного аналізу, тематичних досліджень, методу зворотного перекладу, проведення опитування, стилістичного анування, спостереження, відбору, систематизації, опису, класифікації, забезпечило всебічний аналіз лінгвістичних і стилістичних особливостей перекладу політичних промов. Аналізуючи оригінальні політичні тексти та їхні переклади, включаючи звернення президентів Дж. В. Буша, Б. Обама, Дж. Байдена, Д. Трампа та В. Зеленського, дослідження дало змогу зрозуміти, як політичні наміри, риторичні стратегії та ідеологічні нюанси зберігаються, адаптуються чи трансформуються в перекладі. Доведено, що функціональна специфіка політичного дискурсу – суттєва, переконлива, інформативна та експресивна – підкреслює його роль у формуванні національних ідеологій та взаємодії з глобальною аудиторією. Обґрунтовано, що оцінка, як центральна риса, поєднує емоційність, експресивність і ефективність, пропонуючи розуміння того, як політичні повідомлення резонують із суспільними цінностями або кидають їм виклик. Результати дослідження показали, що політична мова залишається життєво важливим засобом для вираження цінностей, формування ідеологій та орієнтування в складній взаємодії історії, культури та управління. Результати дослідження можуть бути практично використані фахівцями з політичної комунікації, перекладачами, дипломатами та аналітиками міжнародних відносин для точнішого відтворення змісту та стилістичних особливостей політичних промов, що сприятиме ефективнішій міжкультурній взаємодії та кращому розумінню політичних намірів у глобальному контексті

Ключові слова: політична комунікація; стратегії перекладу; прагматика; політична риторика; порівняльний аналіз; сприйняття аудиторії