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# INTRODUCTION

Concept draws not only linguists’ attention but also is a subject of discussion among psychologists and philosophers. The famous linguist V. Maslova defines aconcept as “mental forming; partially verbalized cultural idea, which includes meaning, cultural connotation, imagesand value meaning” [21].

J. R. Biden’s political career started in the 70s of XX century and now he is the 46th President of the USA, the representative of the Democratic Party [44]. Nevertheless, there is no specific research on the usage of the concept of DEMOCRACY in his political speeches. Therefore, the verbalization of the concept of DEMOCRACY and defining the components of this concept in several speeches prompts the practical study.

**The topicality** of the research lies in the conformity to general geopolitical events in the world, the importance of the political phenomenon of democracy in the USA and in the need to figure out the perculiarities of usage of the concept of DEMOCRACY in political discourse.

**The aim** of our master’s work is to analyze the components of concept of DEMOCRACY in J. R. Biden’s political speeches. To achieve this aim we have to solve the following tasks:

* to study the notion of concept, its peculiarities and structure;
* to explore the nature of democracy as a political system;
* to single out the peculiarities of a political speech;
* to define what language units verbalize the components of the concept of DEMOCRACY in J.R. Biden’s speeches;
* to define what component of concept prevails in J.R. Biden’s political speeches.

**The object** of research are the political speeches of J. R. Biden.

**The subject** of research is the verbalisation of the concept of DEMOCRACY in the speeches of the president of the USA.

**The material** of our master’s work is constituted of 5 political speeches of J. R. Biden.

**The methods**of this research are presupposed by the task and the aim of this investigation: *definition approach* to define the semantic structure of a core of a concept; *conceptual analysis* to identify the means of verbalization of concept; *discourse analysis* to study the implementation of concept DEMOCRACY in American political discourse; and *quantative analysis* to find out the number of cases, where the concept of DEMOCRACY was used and the percentage of usage of each component.

**The novelty**of the master’s work lies by the attempt at classifying the components of the concept of DEMOCRACY, used in J. R. Biden’s political speeches and figuring out the predominant one.

**The theoretical value**  defined by its contribution to cognitive linguistics (the analysis of components of a concept within the same type of discourse), political studies (the analysis of theconcept of DEMOCRACY in presidential speeches).

**The practical value** of the research is proved by contribution to English lexicology (“Vocabulary”, “Synonyms”), stylistics (sections“Functional Styles”, “Stylistical Devices”) and special courses in discourse analysis.

The **discussion** of the research paper’s results took place at two scientific conferences: “Modern foreign language education: philological and linguistic didactic studies” at Nizhyn Mykola Gogol State University on 21.10.2022 and have applied for “Modern education: experience and innovation” at T.H. Schevchenko National University “Chernihiv Colehium” on 29.03.2022, the documents submitted.

**The publications**include the following contributions: “Models of nomination of the DEMOCRACY CONCEPT in speech of J. Biden”[66] and “The verbalization of the CONCEPT of “DEMOCRACY” in Remarks of J. Biden to the Ukrainian Rada” –article[67].

**The structure**of the work includes the introduction, 2 chapters with conclusions, general conclusions, a bibliography and a resume.

**In the introduction** the topicality, the object, the subject, the aim, the tasks, the methodology and the material of the research are determined.

**The first chapter** “The foundation of the study the concept in political discource” focuses on the definition of the concept, its nature and structure, political speech and its peculiarities, democracy and its characteristic features.

**In the second chapter** “Verbalization of the concept of DEMOCRACY in political speeches”is dedicated to the analysis of the concept of DEMOCRACY in five political speeches of J.R. Biden and defining their components.

**The general conclusion** deals with the results of this investigation and its evaluation.

**The Bibliography**of our master’s work comprises 73 theoretical sources, 4 dictionaries and 5 illustrative sources.

# CHAPTER 1.THE FOUNDATION OF STUDY THE CONCEPT IN POLITICAL DISCOURCE

The term concept is used in a number of disciplines. Not only philologists but also psychologists and philosophers explain the way we percept this world. In the paper we are going to consider this term from different perspectives,  look at it closer from the linguistic point of view and consider the way this term is interpreted in the branches of linguistics: in linguoculture and cognitive linguistics. In addition, we are going to find the difference between the terms of *concept* and *meaning* and illustrate the connection between these two notions. Next, we are going to consider the structure of the concept, describe its components and the approaches to studying the concept structure. Conceptsare widely used in political discourse to influence the audience subconsciously. That is why we are going to look at the concept in political discourse to define what role it plays there. In the paper we will look at the notion of political speech, will consider its features, modes of persuasion and will look at Aristotle’s way of assuring people and the way scientists of the XXth century did it.

1.1 Definitions of concept

Different definitions of *concept*can be divided into linguistic, philosophical, psychological, metaphoric and complex.

The first definition to be considered is the **linguistic** one, according to which concept is a theoretical entity which stands for the meaning of a word [28, p.55]. This notion is claimed to be associated with other conceptsand with particular actions possible to be carried out by the individual, who maintains the concept . For instance, if an individual has a concept of a table, he knows what a table is and what it is not. He has a rule in his mind on how to differentiate an object that is a table from other objects. In addition, any verbalized concept must be stated in terms of connections to other concept . For example, if the concept is expressed by the word *table*, it must be stated in the terms of its relation to the concept , verbalized by the words *bed*, *chair*, *wardrobe*, *nightstand*, *shelf*, *desk*, *sofa*, *armchair* etc. These ties can be related to different groups. For instance, a table and a wardrobe are of big size. A shelf and a wardrobe are used as containers for different kinds of items. It is a division according to the functional purpose. From this perspective, in order to understand any concept we need to formulate the following :

1. A rule to specify the words, which are regarded as examples of the concept [28, p.55].
2. Specify the connections between one group of concept and the other one [28, p.55].

**Philosophical definition of the concept**. Philosophers claim that the concept is the method of holding together the mind, the manner of classifying the means of thinking, a place of thought for things or characteristics in the world. Philosophers mainly speak about the concept as a way to understand the world clearer and deeper. In both philosophy and logic, the term “ concept” is correlated with the term “meaning” [39].

**Psychological definition**. According to Lieto A. the concept is represented as “experience a person has concerning a particular object”. For example, a concept of a house is represented by the previous experience with an actual house [53].

**Metaphoric definition.** is rather popular among Russian linguists. There are two notions of metaphoric concept. The first notion is used to explain the actual meaning of a phrase, which is used metaphorically. And another notion is used to describe a person's cognition. Though both of the notions are involved in explanation, they have only a common metaphoric instrument [59, p.37].

**Complex definition of the concept**. According to E. S. Kubryakova, who suggested this definition, the concept serves as “a functional and meaningful unit of memory, of the conceptual system and lingua mentalis, of the worldview, reflected in human psyche” [70, p.37].

As we can see, many spheres studying humans and human language (psychology, philosophy, and linguistics) operate the term of the concept. They have much in common and show the connection between mind, language, objects and emotions, though, each of the definitions specify the term differently. In our paper we stick to the complex definition of E. Kubryakova, as we are interested not only in concept but also in human consciousness reflected in it.

1.1.1. The term of the concept in linguistics.A number of different branches of linguistics, such as cognitive linguistics, stylistics or linguoculture use the phenomenon of the concept in their studies.

Philosopher Anselm (1033-1109) was the first to introduce the term “concept”. In the Latin language the word *conseptio* has various meanings: a connection, code, system; warehouse; signing legal acts; seeds receiving; a sentence [42]. Linguists don’t have one common idea of how to define the concept. M.Poluzhyn states, that “a concept is a unit that preserves and forwards information about reality. It is an ethno-cultural group of words and a basic mental phenomenon that expresses the natives’ cognitive consciousness” [25].The linguist Z. Otarbekova claims, that a concept is “a small item of the ideal consciousness and experience of native speakers” [42].

According to Professor V. Maslova, “a conceptis a semantic unit that has linguo-cultural features and characterises speakers of any chosen ethnoculture. While reflecting an ethnic mindset, a conceptmarks the ethnic language world view and serves as the so-called brick to build “the house of our being” [22, p.10].

The conceptappears in the process of constructing information about objects and their features. This information may include both the knowledge of the real situation in the world and information about imaginary worlds [22, p.10]. In other words, it is everything an individual knows, supposes, guesses, imagines about objects in the world.

The whole cognitive process of a human is an activity, which gives an opportunity to orientate in the world. S. Potapenko claims, that “cognitive process is connected with the necessity to understand and differentiate objects” [28, p.61]. The conceptis used for this type of operation. M. Holodnaia explains in her paper that “to figure out the concept, both perceptual separation of certain features and actions with objects are essential, as well as their final goals, assessment of these actions etc.”[40, p.95]. But taking into consideration the role of these factors scientists still can’t answer the question “How do conceptappear?” They only speak about the formation of meanings in general in our minds [40, p.96]. M. Holodnaia states, that ”leading feature of this notion is that in contact with external influence it can show the whole mental space that is organized in a particular way” [40, p.96].

Some lexicologists, including Ye. S. Kubryakova, strongly believe that we should consider the term concepts, which are represented in one word as the simple ones and those, which are represented in the phrases and sentences as the complicated ones[70, p.50]. Other scientists, like S. Schifler and S. Steel state that “it is possible to consider certain conceptas simple ones if they have particular semantic features, which can be defined after the component analysis” [54]. One more group of linguists state that the analysis of lexical systems of a language may lead to controversial units, which A.Wierzbicka defines as “primitives” (including *nobody, nothing, thing, place etc*.)[70, p.50]. Due to these “primitives” it is possible to describe the further vocabulary of the language [70, p.50].

Still, there is a view, shared by most of the linguists: the part of the conceptual information has ways of expressing it in speech, whilepart of this information has other reflection in psyche [70, p.59].Ye. S. Kubryakova suggests the following example in her paper: we understand the difference between a *peony* and a *rose*, but not due to different features or structure, we don’t find them different conceptual units. The idea is that we differentiate these flowers because we differentiate the images of them in our memory and the concepts in this caseare given on the image level [18, p.70].

In the article, dedicated to nature of concept, N. Tatsenko describes the structure of concept as “a complex mental representation created by causally related elementary representations, which were formed after a human interconnects with the environment” [39]. In other words, the concept appears as an image, but, due to associations, turns from a sensual image into a mental one. This way of formation of mental representation of knowledge about the world allows us to consider the concept as an “absorbing structure” [11, p.150], which involves different aspects of knowledge and experience, including *worldview, rational, emotive and culturological*[39]*.*

In short, concepts are inseparable parts of our cognition. Every time we percept information, concepts are deeply involved in this process. They appear in our minds after we interact with objects or phenomena therefore we are able to differentiate objects and classify them. And due to the concepts, we can characterize a person's experience.

1.1.2. Concept as a cognitive unit.Scientists state that concepts create an informational base of thinking or a certain conceptual framework of consciousness, which gives an opportunity for further process of studying reality. They represent a so-called fund, which includes the resources for thinking and speaking activities [15].

Language is understood as an integral element of the cognitive system of a person and it reflects cognitive processes in our minds and it is the main instrument used to express an idea [39].

According to Y. Bondarenko, language gives access to the hidden cognitive world of a person, the structure of their consciousness, it provides the decoding of concepts, its material embodiment in nominative units following the pattern: reality – invariant images – abstract notions (concepts) – its verbalization [5, p.37].

As a unit of understanding the world, the conceptmay have different levels of information saturation, but always stays integral [32]. It can enrich, change and reflect human experience [32]. According to A. Wierzbicka, “the conceptvaries from *minimal concept*to *maximum concept* depending on the level of cognition of an object “[32].

Some scientists find the conceptscompletely verbalized, others – partially verbalized. I.Sternin and V.Karasik stated that the concept doesn’t necessarily have a connection with a word, or any other language means of verbalization [12, p.201]. It can be verbalized or not [12, p.201]. It depends on the communicative relevance of the concept. When it is necessary, some conceptcan be verbalized by different language means: lexical, syntactical, phraseological etc. [12, p.201]. That is why whether the conceptis verbalized or not, it does not define its existence in our minds as a unit of cognition. Some of the conceptsexist in our minds, but will never be verbalized.

Professor N. Boldurevdifferentiates conceptsaccording to the level of generalization and figure out a number of types [4, p.36]. The main nine types are the following:

1. Concrete – sensual images*.* These are the images of physical objects, which we have in our minds ( e.g. a particular house ) [4, p.36].
2. Image – a generalised sensual image of different objects and phenomena (e.g. any house is a building with the roof and walls) [4, p.36]. Image reflects a number of the most visible features of an object or phenomena [4, p.36].
3. Scheme – a so-called cognitive pattern of an object, which has a special character, like similar shape, the trajectory of moving etc. (e.g. a square with a triangle above it will remind us of a house) [4, p.36].
4. Meaning – a concept, which includes general, essential features of an object or even the aim of usage (e.g. a house is a tough building, where people live) [4, p.36].
5. Prototype – a categorical concept, which allows us to imagine a representative of a particular category, like stereotypes, ideals, typical examples etc. [4, p.36; 7, p.154]. It is how we imagine a perfect worker, perfect parents, for example. Due to prototypes people categorize the entire object in the world and make up the attitude to this object [4, p.36].
6. Propositional structure. The most widely used means of conceptual organization of our knowledge [4, p.36]. In the majority of situations we can figure out the agent (a person who acts), a patient (a person, who is the object of action), instrument (the means of action), goal or cause (the reason of the action), beneficiary (a person, for whom the action is done) etc. [22, p.70;15]. As a result, we have a certain model of behaviour in a particular field of our experience [4, p.36].
7. Frame. It is an extensive concept, which includes a number of components and is a so called set of information about a particular situation (e.g. a house: a door, a mat, a waiting room etc.) [4, p. 36].
8. Scripts. It is a number of actions, events or episodes developing within a certain amount of time in a certain succession [4, p.36 ;7, p.156]. In other words, we can call it a dynamic frame (e.g. the episode in the frame *house:* cleaning the house, or house party etc.).

In addition, frames, scripts and proposal structures which refer to the same type of structural conceptsmay have the similar structure [7, p.157; 4, p.37]. According to Yu. Karaulov, any frame may be represented with the help of proposal structure [13, p.107;15].

1. Gestalts. It is a conceptual structure, the integral image, that includes both emotional and cognitive components of our perception [4, p.37]. It is regarded as a result of coherent perception of a situation. It can be explained as the primary level of cognition process, like general basic knowledge [15;4, p.37]. For example, only people, who work as teachers can understand all the processes and components of this profession (preparation for the lessons, conferences, the algorithm of assessment, professional development, communication with administration of the educational establishment etc.).

On the other hand, it can also be regarded as the highest level of cognition, when a person has a system of knowledge about particular object or phenomena [4, p.37;15]. For instance, when the person has a concrete image of a house, has its scheme, they undersatand what the house serve for, they have typical examples of houses in mind etc. As a result, concrete, frame, proposal levels are closely interrelated in person’s thinking process and speech [4, p. 37].

There are two theories on how the nature of conceptsemerged: *the theory of inner concepts* and *the theory of gradual acquisition of a concept and further development of it* [29, p.193].

This disagreement is connected with the fact that acquisition of particular essential experience, the knowledge about the world arises from a number of features of a human, and the information, which we can consider as natural (for example, orientation in space and time) is fundamentally a result of acquired long-term experience of mankind [29, p.193]. In addition, one and the same conceptmay be verbalized by different language phenomena: lexical, grammatical, phraseological, textual, etc. [29, p.193].

Interpretational field of every conceptis a *conceptosphere.* It is caused by the nature of the field. N. Tatsenko states in her research, that “the main feature of the concept is that it is non-isolated, in other words, connection with similar structures of knowledge”[39].Concepts are established and interpreted on the “background” of other structures of knowledge and take different levels in the conceptosphere. Its semantic fragments are characterized by varying degrees of generalization [39].

According to N. Tatsenko, “any conceptis the result of two tendencies: pursuit of reflection of the dialectics of the world, in other words to reflect the world as it is and the desire to construct the world in order to subordinate it to the will of a human and to imagine the world that is simpler, more rigid and more determined to the extent that is necessary and sufficient enough to solve the practical issues “[39].

The leading feature of the conceptis emotiveness of meaning and its evaluation [1]. But the conceptcan cover a number of units and it “masks” under these units and can be realized in them [17, p.197].

According to A. Wierzbicka, conceptsare ideal entities, which are formed in human consciousness:

1. from its sensitive experience – “perception of the reality with the help of sense organs “[68, p. 20];
2. from person’s intellectual operation with objects, which exists in consciousness – these operations build new concepts [68, p.20];
3. from individual learning of the meaning of lexical units, which are understood by a person [68, p.20].

Language is one of the means to formulate conceptin human cognition. To build a concepteffectively, it is not enough to use only language. We must include sensitive experience or have some physical connection with the object or phenomenon. Only this complex connection with entities allows us to build good conceptin our minds. Though conceptinclude the material component, they still have ideal character. They serve as complex abstractions. At the same time, they are the products of reflected reality in human consciousness [19, p.25;60]. If we consider the conceptas an ambivalent mental notion, which has two aspects – psychological and lingual – scientists branch it in the following way: in psyche it is an object of human nature, the image, which embodies some representations of a person about the world, arises from the culture [25;19, p.25]. Moreover, it is a prototype or an idea of derived notions. In the language the concepthas a certain name, as the reality is reflected directly in consciousness, but through the language. The ideal conceptexists only in our psyche in accordance with absolutely different mental formations [25;19, p.25].

Conceptsare managed in our consciousness by the units of a universal substantive code, which have sensitive character [25;19, p.25]. Universality of this substantive code is connected with the idea that every native speaker has it. However, as it reflects the subjective sensitive experience of an individual, it is individual for every person[60]. For instance, the concept“school” is coded with the image of his/her teacher for one student, with the image of the class for the second student and with the image of the desk for the third one. The unit of universal substantive code is the most stable part of a concept, which has a natural image [25]. The image that consists in the unity of substantive code can be casual, irrelevant for the particular concept[12, p.201]. For example, if we take a concept“teacher”, the conceptfeatures like *a human, an educated person, an adult* are in the core, while the features like *strict, kind, experienced, a person, that has children* are further from the core. They are not that essential, but are common for the conceptof teacher.

We can come to the conclusion that every concepthas 2 aspects – psychological and lingual. They appear as a unit of substantive code, which serves as core. It gets further conceptual features, which increase the value of the concept. The conceptisn’t only about language, but about sensitive experience. They serve as complex abstractions.

1.1.3. Concept and meaning.The modelling of the world by consciousness demonstrates the contrast between the logical and linguistic, i.e. the concept and meaning. Linguists and cognitive scientists consider the *concept* and *meaning* as completely equal terms. According to Ye. Selivanova, “*meaning* is a part of the *concept*and its core structure, a sum of integral features within one class. The conceptincludes metaphorical, emotive, imagery information” [34, p. 422]. This leads to a contradiction between the number of meanings of lexical units in language and speech: in language, the meaning is identical to the concept, in speech it is represented only as a current fragment of the concept. Concerning this issue, we may speak about the possibility of figuring out not only the denotative component within a conceptbut the connotative component as well (emotions, subjective attitude etc.) [33].

Scientists define *meaning* as artificial symbol construction, which serves as additional cultural means to organize understanding [18, p.80]. The *meanings* entrench a standard content of signs and lingual expressions recorded in a paradigmatic sense [24]. Hence, the conceptis a linguo-cognitive unit, while *meaning*– a lingual unit. The conceptas generalized, abstract knowledge about the reality is so-called pattern in cognition. The conceptisn’t equal to meaning, it directly connects the sign and the object it denotes [24]. The difference between verbalized conceptand meaning can be illustrated with the help of different approaches to analyse the content of a language sign. Despite the fact that semantic analysis of a certain word identifies its points of convergence with its conceptual analysis, their goals are different [18, p.85]. The aim of semantic analysis is to explain the semantic structure of the word, identifying the denotative and connotative meanings, while the conceptual analysis is a search for the general concepts, which have the same sign and define this sign as known cognitive structure [18, p.85].

Although conceptsare typically not equivalent to meaning, they play three important roles in constructing it:

1. Conceptsestablish reference. As a result, weak association (when a referent needs only to have a weak connection to a typical situation in a word’s conceptto become valued as the word’s meaning in some situation) and restricted discrimination make universal meaning irrelevant to most normal conversation [32, p.106].
2. Conceptsprovide ‘running commentary’ about referents. As an entity is accepted as a referent in a specific situation, a specialized frame from the comparable typical situation provides running commentary about this entity, i.e. referent [32, p.106].
3. Conceptsestablish domains of reference. Generic situations establish domains of reference when speakers introduce them in a conversation, thereby designating entities within them as potential referents [32, p.106].

We can come to the conclusion that the conceptis a wider term, than meaning. It is a more generalized and abstract notion about reality which is mainly based on associations. We can say that meanings are connected with definitions of the words, strict independent explanation of the word, while conceptalways depends on our attitude to the notion, associations and feelings. Still, they are interdependent, as meaning remains a part of the concept.

1.1.4. Concept in linguoculturology.The notion of the conceptis basic for such a branch of linguistics as linguoculturology. The culture forms and structures the thought of a linguistic personality, language categories and concepts. Studying the culture through language isn’t a new idea. A. Blukner, V. Ivanov, V. Toporov, N. Tolstoi and many other philologists wrote that the language is the most valuable information about the world and a person in it [21, p. 18]. According to the Polish anthropologist E. Bartiminsky, culture is not just science, related to linguistics, but a phenomenon and only by analysing this phenomenon we can comprehend the secrets of a human as well as the secrets of language and text [21, p.18; 25].

The conceptis a term that also serves as a basic unit for the notion of “worldview”. According to the linguist Y. Stepanov, the basic concept(constants) exist consistently, they have such essential features as deep historical “roots” and traditionalism. The spiritual culture of any nation usually consists of the operations with these concepts[37, p.45]. Though, according to S. Proskurin, the term “key concept” is a meaningful and structural constant of culture [31, p.4]. The famous linguist I. Zykova considered cultural conceptas one of the key conceptsof any culture [10, p.61].

In linguoculturology the key conceptsare called basic units of the “worldview”, which have the existential significance for both, the separate lingual personality and for the linguocultorological community. The key conceptsof culture include such abstract notions as dignity, fate, sin, law, freedom, motherland, moral, consciousness etc. [21, p.41].

According to D. Lyhachev, conceptsappear in our consciousness, not only as hints to possible meanings, but as some feedback on previous language experience in general[20]. It can be lyric, scientific, social, historical experience etc. Every person has his individual cultural experience, which gives him knowledge and skills that defines the variety of meanings of a word and the variety of concepts of these meanings, or their poorness [20].

When we interpret any concepts, we must take into consideration the individual experience of a person and evaluate how wide this cultural experience is. The concepts, verbalized by a person, consists of objective and subjective components. As a result, any concepts is an individual image and generalization at the same time.

Linguoculturologists figure out narrow and broad definitions of a *linguoculturological concept.* According to the narrow, formal definition, a *linguaculturological concept* is a semantic entity standing behind words, and has no one-word equivalent in translation into other languages[12, p.12].And according to the broad, meaningful definition, concepts is any cultural scene, which has ethnical specificity regardless of its significance to the national character. The cultural senses belong to the linguaculturological concepts in its broad meaning [12, p.12].

Taking into consideration the previous information, we can claim that the concepts is also a cultural phenomenon, which reserves and produces the cultural information. It is a basic notion, which helps to build effective concepts and it allows us to value the individual experience of a person or even the experience of nations.

1.1.5. Concept structure.Linguists have different views on the structure of the concept. S. Vorkachev and V. Karasik state, that linguocultural must be treated as the structure, which includes three components (notional, image and value-oriented)[32, p.201]. According to V. Maslova, there are5 layers of CONCEPT:

1) Explanatory dictionary definition (nucleus)[22, p.81].

2) Concept etymology[22, p.81].

3) Field definitions in specialized dictionaries [22, p.81].

4) Possible meaning extensions and idioms [22, p.81].

5) Individual concept perception manifested by an individual, a representative of a certain linguistic culture [22, p.81].

Z. Popova and J. Sternin have a different point of view on this issue [26, p.60]. According to these linguists, any concept has the core – a prototype unity (it includes the biggest number of sensitive features and is common for a small group of people or for one person), basic layers (they are different in the level of abstraction and sequentially follow each other) and interpretational field of the concept (including the evaluation and interpretation of the core by national, group or individual cognition)[26, p.60].

Both Z. Popova and J. Sternin find the connection between the core of a concept and sensitive image, which represent a concept in an individual cognition [26, p.60]. The basic layers are explained as a number of conceptual features, which are associated with basic semantic features of the word. Interpretational field is formed by evaluation, conclusions, coded in phrasal units [26, p. 60].

In addition, Z.Popova and I. Sternin figure out three main components: imaginative component, information content and interpretation [26,60]. Imaginative component includes taste, smell, sound, haptic and metaphoric images, which, according to N. Tatsenko, “allow to see the connection between the worldview and the way the representatives of a particular culture interpret the reality” [61]. “Due to imaginative component the concept acquires a particular meaning and, as a result, becomes entrenched in cognition “[61]. Information content of the concept correlates with the number of definitions of the main word in a concept [61]. As a rule, it has few cognitive features, which denote certain features of an object or phenomenon and are the foundation for the concept [61]. Interpretation includes cognitive features, which show general information [61].

Y. Stepanov figures out 3 components of the concept structure:

1) the main actual feature, that is known to every representative of the culture;

2) one or several additional secondary features, actual only for certain groups of the culture;

3) inner form of the concept, that can’t be accepted in everyday life and is known only to professionals. Still, this form defines the sign form of expressing the concept [36, p.511].

H. Slishkin tries to agree to the model of Stepanov with widely accepted linguoculturological explanation of S. Vorkachev and V. Karasik. He refers all three components to the notional component. Though, his theory has been much criticised, as components in Y. Stepanov’s approach include not only notional, but also image and value-oriented information, in other words, everything that makes it a part of culture – etymology, modern associations, evaluation and so on [8, p.71].

We stick to the idea of S. Vorkachev and V. Karasik. They explain this approach in the following way: the notional component is factual information about the word, definition in the dictionary with all the features. Image component is ethnocultural specific of the concept, which is usually specific for particular cultures or peoples. It is represented with metaphors, which keep the concept in cognition [8,80]. Value-orientated component – images, entrenched in the language of a people; these are the images which serve to express the concept like prototypes, stereotypes, symbols, etc. [32, p.216]. S. Vorkachev separates notional and value-orientated components. He defines the notional one as everything in the concept, that isn’t metaphorical and doesn’t depend on meaningful characteristics of its own name [8, p.80]. He refers to semantic description of syntagmatic and paradigmatic connection of the word which defines the concept, synonyms and antonyms of this word, its etymological analysis [8, p.80].

This approach can be explained in the following example of *home*. The core of the concept *home* was formed from the definition in Cambridge dictionary – the house, apartment, etc. where you live, especially with your family[71].In our example,the notional component of the concept home is *apartment, house, place for living*. As it includes only factual information about the object and is common for different cultures. Image component contains the traditional features found in the people’s cognition: family, warmth. concept *home* can be explained in relation to the values entrenched in the society. We can suggest, that home is the embodiment of love, support, hope etc.

To sum up, we can see that concept isn’t an integral unit. Its structure consists of several components, like notional, image and value-orientated. Therefore we can explain one and the same concept from different perspectives. In addition, linguists don’t have a common approach to define the components of concept structure.

1.2. Characteristics of political speeches

A political speech is the type of communication, which has the aim to share particular ideas in order to influence political views. As a rule, it is delivered by politicians to the addressee who is mass.[16;23].

1.2.1 The notion of political speech.Political speech is prepared in advance for political performance, which contains positive or negative estimation of social tendencies, justification of certain political views or decisions, commentaries on some facts, agenda or perspectives [14, p.52; 6]. Political speeches can be given by political leaders of countries, by deputies in the Parliament, ministers or leaders of political parties [23; 38].In the case of parliament political speech, the public person has the purpose to persuade the audience to follow certain ideas. To reach this goal effectively the author gives reasonable arguments, original ideas and even unexpected suggestions. As a rule, the speech is emphatic and fast, it must stick to a particular “frame” of norms and etiquette [14 p.52;6]. Aristotle figured out 3 types of speeches : political, solemn and judicial. He claimed that giving political and solemn speeches an orator might appeal to the listeners’ heart and mind. In his works he stated that the truth and justice were stronger than their antagonists [3, p.211]. F. Prokopovich followed his idea and claimed that the main criterion in evaluation of the speech must be productivity and impact [30, p.70].

I.Korshunova figures out the parliamentary, pre-electoral, party, celebratory speeches [14, p.52]. O. Sheihal in English presidential discourse figures out the following ceremonial genres: inaugural/ farewell address, Christmas speech, toast/meal speech, jubilee/anniversary speech/ remarks on certain occasion [41, p.326]. In addition, there is “Saturday radio address”, when the President of the USA makes a nationwide speech on the radio, speaking to the country on various topics.

Within the political discourse linguists figure out presidential discourse[38]. They refer here to the following genres: party program, manifest, a message from Presidents about the condition in the country, command and report[14, p.52]. Presidential discourse also includes the interviews and press conferences, which help the president to express their position and describe the further steps in development for the citizens [14, p.52].

I. Butova figures out four types of information in political speeches [6]. These are:

1. Cognitive information, that is characterized with objectivity and density (on the syntactic level). This information gives the objective, real knowledge about the real world [6].

2. Appellate information – appeal to certain actions, or to avoid doing them [6].

3. Emotive information that is characterized with subjectiveness. This type of information is used to transfer particular feelings[6].

4. Aesthetic information[6].

To sum up, we see that political speech is complex performance. It demands thorough and detailed preparation of the text, as the words must be chosen carefully. They have great influence on the audience on both cognitive and emotional levels. There are different types of political speeches, which depend on the orator and the aim of the message.

1.2.3. Modes of persuasion. As it has been mentioned, the aim of political speech is to persuade the audience or even impose some ideas. To reach the goal, orators use different tools during preparation and giving the speech. Usage of certain strategies allows orators to establish connection with their audience.

Effective speech represents the message, which has the sense for a listener and transfers the orator’s ideas[38]. For example, comedians get the result of their performance, when the audience laughs, while politicians get the result of their speech when the audience applauds and votes for them in elections. Live performances are often inspiring, they satisfy needs of a particular historical period of time [35, p.100]. For instance, the phrases like “I have a dream”, or “ask not what your country does for you, but what you can do for your country” are well-known examples, which are used for centuries.

Clichés are one more effective tool of influence on the audience. Politicians often use the phrases, typical for political discourse, to create the illusion for a listener that a politician is deeply involved in politics [45, p.166]. In other words, a politician, who uses well-known clichés, phrase combinations, like “for the sake of democracy”, “break the law”, “our predecessors” , “fulfill the promise” will be treated as a real professional and will have more chances in elections.

We have already mentioned the famous Greek philosopher Aristotle. He laid the basis for rhetoric. Later it became an important part of European education from Roman times until the nineteenth century [64]. He studied this discipline analytically and came up to the conclusion that rhetoric can be defined as the ability to see the accessible means of persuasion in any given case. Aristotle conducted the research in Athens. According to D. Demidrogen, “Aristotle observed people who made attempts to persuade others with their performances in law courts and the government. It allowed him to emphasize three so-called tools, or factors, which help a speaker to persuade the audience successfully. They are ethos, pathos and logos”[64]. They are also called rhetorical devices that determine the speaker’s appeal to the audience. Nowadays linguists also use the Aristotle’s theory in analyzing different types of speeches, including the political ones.

**Logos** (rational appeal) – the appeal to the intellect or the reason [3, p.203]. “In order to appeal to the rational side of the audience, the persuader must assess their information-processing patterns. Aristotle advised persuaders to use syllogistic arguments (enthymemes) in which the major premise was already believed by the audience” [64]. In other words, to make the speech persuading, the orator must use solid, honest and valid arguments. The main means of argumentation in logos are realized by usage of rhetorical examples and logical reasoning.

**Pathos** (emotional appeal) – the general mood of the speech and its ability to raise particular emotions [3, p.203]. “Aristotle’s appeals to pathos were psychological appeals; they relied on the receiver’s emotions. At first the speaker has to evaluate the mood of his audience and then choose the tone to raise right emotions”[64]. To do it the orator must have special skill that is called empathy; today it is called emotional intelligence (EQ). “Aristotle cited some virtues like justice, generosity, courage, gentleness and wisdom as pathos or appeals to emotion. Many of these virtues were tied not only to emotional persuasion or pathos but to ethos as well” [64]. In other words it focuses on how different emotions are triggered by language and then channeled within the minds of the audience.

Linguists separate the pathos of a speaker (his/her personal feelings) and pathos, which is realized by the language means and the audience is impressed by the text itself [3, p.201]. This pathos depends on the quality of language means, metaphors, choice of the words, unlike the first type, when the impression depends on the way the orator presents his/her ideas, his/her artistic skills, voice and sometimes even appearance.

Pathos is the most prototypical genre in political discourse. It is a public performance that is an effective tool to reach the confession of the leader position and its demonstration [14, p.52].

**Ethos** (ethical appeal) refers to the character the speaker wished to present[3, p.205]. It could be defined as the “charisma and the credibility of the speaker”[64]. “It concerns the esteem in which the speaker is held. If the speaker is a respected person, who is a professional in the field, he will be credible”[64]. For example, if a speaker declares that he studies the subject he is going to give a speech about, the audience will trust him more and will accept his further speech more seriously.

Aristotle paid special attention to ethos. He said about this mode of persuasion the following: “Of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word there are three kinds. The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker; the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind; the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself. Persuasion is achieved by the speaker’s personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible.... his character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion he possesses” [64; 3, p.211].

Aristotle wasn’t the only person who studied modes of persuasion. The knowledge of this topic can be profitable in different spheres, that is why many scientists, including linguists, studied this issue.

Carl Hovland with his team conducted the research about persuasion at Yale. They studied the effectiveness of propaganda films during the war. Their goal was to discover the laws of persuasion. In the XXth century the media started their fast development that is why the issue of persuasion became rather essential for the majority of European countries[64]. As a result, people started searching the ways to make their commercials seem reliable for people. It led to deeper and more systematic studying of persuasion. During the Second World War the accents shifted. “The role of persuasive media became even more important and political leaders made the most of it. The main aim wasn’t to make people buy the products and service, but to trust and follow the ideas”[64]. “Charismatic leaders such as Hitler, Mussolini, Roosevelt, and Churchill had demonstrated how entire societies could be powerfully manipulated through skillful persuasion....the effective persuader was reaching mass audiences in unprecedented numbers and kinds, made possible by the new media” [64].

The Yale group studied the effect of variables in persuasion[64]. The scientists treated the rhetorical variables as independent variables and to check what effect they have on attitude change. The research on persuasion focused on the features of communication source (communicator) and had the goal to define the influence of these features on communicator’s persuasive endeavours [64]. The scientists tested the following characteristics: credibility, experience, sympathy, similarity to the audience.

Carl Hovland and his teammates Janis and Kelley claimed that the goal of this program was “developing scientific propositions which specify the conditions under which the effectiveness of one or another type of persuasive communication is increased or decreased” [64].As a result, they have proved that all the suggestions were right.

To sum up, persuasion has been a rather important linguistic topic for media and politics. It has been used as a tool to influence people and direct them. Aristotle started studying modes of persuasion and it has been attracting scientists’ attention up to now. Modes of persuasion are really a useful tool for a political orator to impose his ideas and assure the audience to follow his ideas.

To conclude, the quality of a speech significantly depends not only on the process of delivering the speech but also on the way the speaker prepares it , what words he uses to assure and impress the audience. In order to appeal to them the speaker is sure to use logos, pathos, ethos and clichés, which are common for the topic of the speech.

1.3. The notion of democracy

Democracyis a term of Greek origin that is made up with two words:*demos*, which means *people* and *kratein*, that means *to rule* or *govern*[62, p.4]. It is possible to interprete “democracy” as: *Government of the Majority* or *Government of the People*[63]. The basic ideas and principles of democratic society are known to derive from Athens in 5th century BC [57].

1.3.1 The definition of democracy.The term of democracy is familiar to most of people and is widely used in political discourse. Though, sometimes politicians distorted the meaning of this word to justify their totalitarian politics. Nevertheless, T. Landman calims, that “the idea of democracy was saved and spread in many developed countries.It is generally accepted, that democracy is a form of control, that is based of popular self-determination, when all the decisions a made cooperatively or mutually”[51]. Still, this interpretation of democracy is quite broad and needs some additional specifications. The additional features added to the main idea of *democracy* cause a number of debates.

1. **Procedural definitionof democracy.**This explanation of *democracy* was described in Robert Dahl’s work *Polyarchy* [46]. He used two terms: *contestation*, which “presumes the legality of opposition, the opportunity to challenge the officials, the protection of freedom of speech, fair election and solid political bureau system”; and *participation*, which “includes the principle of popular control, that ensure the protection of suffrage” [46; 51].

**2. Liberal definitions.** The adherents of these definitions retain concerns about Dahl’s two bacis principles – contestation and participation, though it expends the idea of rightprotecting [51]. Liberal definitions operate with two other terms: *institutional dimension* and *right dimension*. Institutional dimension presumes the idea of “popular domination as well as the idea of responsibility and subordination”. Leaders must have limited power; all the citizens must participate in the election to make a political leader a real representative of a social group [51].” Right dimension is supported with the rule of law and comprise the civil and political rights of citizens, property rights of citizens and business as well as minority rights” [51].

**3. Social definitions.** These definitions are quite close to the liberal ones. They maintain its right dimension and institutions [51]. Though, social definitions enlarge the list of rights which must be protected; among other rights there are social and economic rights [51].

As we can see, these definitions have much in common, as all of them contain the ideas of peaceful competition, and participation (in different forms)[50]. They also suppose “the protection of rights of different social groups, according to their race, gender (women or minorities, for example)” [51]. Still, these definitions differ, as procedural definitions identify minimum exigency and demands for encouraging participatory competitive politics. “For liberal definitions the political, civil rights and minority rights are in the focus, as their aim is to protect people who may suffer from the power of majority” [51]. Making decisions collectively is in focus for social definition that is why they require special protection for social and economic rights. Dr Todd Landman describes these definitions as “thick” and “thin” explanations of *democracy*[51]*.*

To conclude, democracyis an old term, which is used to describe the way of governing, different from monarchy or totalitarianism, when the power belongs to people, but is realized through elected representatives. In democratic society both the citizens and the elected officials have their duties and rights, that maintain a “rule of law” and is a guarantee for people that their rights will be defended. The main features of democracy are widely known, but there are also definitions which expend the definitions from different perspectives.

1.3.2 Basic ideas of democracy.Sometimes people use the term of freedom and the term of democracy as synonyms. Though democracy supposes the principles of freedom and protects it, it would be a mistake to equate these two terms. “People living in a democratic society are so-called guardian of their rights and freedom”[51].

The scientist and co-editor of *Journal of Democracy* Larry Diamond tried to figure out the key elements of democracy:

**1.The government must be chosen through free and fair elections**. It means, that people, who “are the highest form of political authority”, can criticize all the elected representatives; can watch the quality of their work [47, p.263; 23]. “Political leaders, in their turn, must obey and respond to all people’s suggestions. Citizen must actively participate in politics and civic life“ [47, p.263].Elections must be hold regularly, where citizens vote “free of limitation and violence”[47, p.263].

**2. Citizens must take part in politic and civic life**. It means that the citizens must be not only aware of all the public issues, but be members of political parties and civil organizations. Still, it is forbidden to make people participate in any organization [23]. Voting is one of the most important duties of all the full-ages citizens. Moreover, Larry Diamond emphasizes, that it is essential, that women take part in politics (vote and be the candidates) and civil society [23;47, p.263].

**3. Human rights of all citizens must be protected.** That means, that “everyone has a number of rights, which can’t be taken away, including the right to choose the religion, the right to enjoy your culture even if you are a minority, the right to say something or not to say something, the right to protest against the actions of the government, the right to move about the country or leave it, the right to choose the organization to be the member of any organization“ [47, p.265]. However, everyone must obey the laws and respect the rights of others [47, p.265].

**4. Laws must be applied equally to everyone**. He called it “a rule of law”. It means that everybody must obey the laws equally, including the president and officials, nobody can avoid punishment, but everybody charged with a crime may demand fair, public trial [23].“Nobody can be discriminated according to the religion, culture, race or gender; be imprisoned arbitrarily”[47, p.266].

According K. Milford’s paperdedicated to Karl Popper’s life and views on democracy, K. Popper opposed democracy to tyranny and dictatorship[50, p.57]. He emphasized, that “the main advantage of democratic society is that people can control their political leaders directly but not through the revolution”[50, p.58;57]. K. Milford suggests that his views were grounded on the fact, that there are a number of variants of democratic[50, p.58]. The dominant variant is, as he named it, *direct democracy –*when every citizen has an opportunity to make decision in their country and does it actively and directly, unlike *representative democracy,* when the power belongs to people, but political decisions are made indirectly, by elected officials[50, p.58; 57].

To conclude, we may claim a country to be a democratic state under certain conditions. It is a state, where people choose their representatives through fair elections, but also participate in civic life on their own, the state must provide all the citizens with the algorithm of right protection and all of the citizens must be treated equally when it comes to punishment for breaking a law, for example. Due to these basics people can build the democratic society, which enables people to control the officials without revolutions.

1.3.3. The key principles of democratic state development.A country that chooses the democratic way of development must consider a number of key aspects in organization of society, where it is necessary to stick to certain norms. These are the aspects, concerning rights, laws, elections, power etc.

1.3.3.1. Fundamental rights and fundamental freedoms.Human rights are inseparable part of democracy and “the evolution of human rights can continue only in democratic society”[63, p.5]. “It is vital for such society to separate the power for judiciary to be completely independent and treat the ordinary people in the same way they treat the authority”[63,5]. The process of justice must be a triangle, which includes Human Rights, Separation of Power and democracy[63, p.5].

Human rights are regarded from three main angles [2]:

**1. Civil and political rights**. They protect people from violation of their rights by government, different organizations or just ordinary people [2]. These rights guarantee all the citizens that they can “freely participate in different organizations as well as in political parties and can’t be taken away from these organizations due to discrimination”[63, p.5].

**2. Socioeconomic and cultural rights.** They protect people’s right to “satisfactory living conditions and minimum living wage, that guarantee survival of a person” [2;63, p.5]. They also include the right to education, as everyone needs special training not to starve [2].

**3. Solidarity rights**. They include the right of a person to be equally treated and not to be discriminated by other citizens of government [2].

Human rights are used in two main aspects: the rights, grounded on precise principles and values; freedoms and rights provided by law [2]. The basic concept for this is the idea, that all human rights are available for each citizen, as all of them are humans [2]. Still, it would be a mistake to say, that any legal right can be applied as a human right. The idea is that legal right is that one, which is recognized and designed by law [2]. If anyone breaks this law, they will ought to pay a fine or other form of financial compensation. These rights serve not only for humans, but also different organizations or corporations and even animals [2].

In short, human rights are an inseparable part of legal rights , but legal right is much more extensive entity, which includes a number of different groups of rights.

1.3.3.2. Elections.Fair elections are a foundation of democracy. There are two types of electoral law – active and passive [63, p.6]. “People, who have the right to vote, use their active electoral law, and those, who are elected, use their passive electoral law”. Still, we can’t qualify every State as a democratic one, where the elections are carried out [62, p.6]. “Only competitive elections can regulate the democratic legitimization of the public authority. So, the legitimizing criterion will be contrasting in comparison with non- competitive elections”[69, p.27]. There are some requirements for the elections to be called democratic:

1. “Citizens must have the right to choose from a number of candidates or parties”. People must decide on their own if they want to use the right to vote or not [63, p.6]. “Candidates must have an opportunity to participate in the elections without limitations”[63, p.6]. Citizens must choose those candidates, who, in their point of view, are the most suitable for the position according to their views and values, this function is called “delegating political representation” [69, p.28].

2. “Votes of all the citizens must be treated equally and must have the same value despite people’s social class, origin, sex, religion, language or political convictions”[63, p.6]. “Electoral outcome must depend only on the decision of voters” [69, p.27].

3. “There must be no opportunity for anybody to know for which candidate or party a person voted. Everybody has to be sure that his choice is a secrete”[63, p.7].

4.”Elections must be transparent and public” [63, p.7]. It means, that every citizen has a right to be present at the counting of the votes [63, p.7]. Moreover, “every citizen has a right to watch the whole process of voting, follow people inserting their ballots into the ballot box and watch the calculation in the end, that will be later shared out”[63, p.6].

5. Elections must take place regularly. “There must be a real shift of power and division into officials who are in power and their opponents”[69, p.27].“All the citizens must be warned about the elections in advance. In this way the time will be defined and people will have the right to remove this time frame from office”[63, p.8]. “The results of the election must represent the whole population, that is why it is impossible to exclude any of the group”[63, p.8].

6. “The results of the elections are final, that is why they must be accepted by everyone as legitimate”[63, p.8]. “If the decision, which is made during election, is legal, it can’t be revoked or cancel and can’t be changed in any way but for re-election” [69, p.28].

1.3.3.3. Rule of law.Rule of law has developed over centuries and is connected with historical development. It has caused the “appearance of liberal democracies and their fundamental modes of sovereignty and legal system” [43, p.191].

Now the *rule of law* is understood as “a concept that represents the governing authority of law over governmental action and individual behaviour” [43]. There are basic principles and a course of actions in *a rule of law*, which provide everybody with the freedom and allow to take part in political life [63, p.9]. In addition, there is the right to a “free development of an individual personality”[63, p.9].

State of Law procedures depend on to some basic canons. There is a short explanation of them:

“*Independence of the judiciary*” is entrenched in the Constitution of every developed country [63, p.9]. In other words, judiciary is completely independent from the legislative and executive power. In this way “magistrates can do their job without any pressure and completely individually”[63, p. 9]. In their turn, the judiciary must have the power over legislation and administrative action [43, p.191]. Though, this power is sure to “be limited with the right for judicial review over the actions, it will establish their conformity with the law” [43, p.191].

*Security Right* is another basic canon of the *rule of law.* It states, that every action of a State should be “predictable and quantifiable”[63, p.9]. All the citizens must be aware of the aims of the actions the government take, of their duties and rights as well as of everything that is forbidden to do [63, p.9]. Nobody may be punished without appropriate reason, moreover, “laws mustn’t be subsequent (act post factum)”[63, p.9]. Moreover, all the laws must be “alleged and publicized in a proper way; they must be rather stable, it isn’t acceptable if the law change too frequently” [43, p.192].

In addition, *authority must obey the laws.* Any government may take actions only within the limits, defined by the parliament majority [63, p.9]. “The government can’t take any actions, which aren’t supported by the law, which in turn can be made juridical only on the ground of democratic principle”[63, p.9].

The control proposed by the court must provide the opportunity for the administration to stay with what is defined by laws; it is the principle, which is called *justifiable condition of the administration*[63, p.9]. If any citizen find the action of the government or their representatives unfair, he can “encourage the judiciary in order to protect his rights and demand the validation of the incriminated operation”[63, p.9].

1.3.3.4. Separation of powers.The separation of power is widely known as a “constitutional dogma that distributes government into independent institutions, which are responsible for operating with separate functions”[49]. The universal system distinguishes government into executive (the power, that implements laws), judicial (the power, which construes laws) and legislative (the power, that makes laws) brunches [49]. The idea of separation of power is based on confrontation of these branches, when the rights and duties of one brunch are controlled by the other ones[2].

Separation of power is an essential canon of democratic society, because:

1. It allows tofigure out the functions and responsibilities in the main state organs [2].

2. It allows the state organs to control each other on a constitutional base [2].

3. It allows to fight effectively corruption and overuse of power [2].

As a rule, the Constitution of a country dictates how the State power is distributed among different organs and what specific responsibilities they have [63, p.10].

Usually there are two distinct types of government systems:

1. *Parliamentary regime,* when “the government derives from the elected parliament, while the government can be appointed by the parliament”[63, p.11]. The government deals with documents to propose a law, but they do not decide anything till the bills aren’t passed [63, p.11]. The opposition plays an important role at the parliament, as it is an additional means of control of the power [63, p.11]. So, the parliamentary regime represent the idea that “both parliament and the government must cooperate in their work”[63, p.11]. Parliamentary system has enough power to get the President out of his position if the legislature gives him “no confidence vote”[69, p.32]. Unlike the presidentialism, which “is grounded on devision of legislative and executive branches of power”, parliamentary government is based on a fusion of them [69, p.32].

2. *Presidential regime*, when “executive and legislative branches of power are distinguished at institutional level as well as in the particular exercise of the authority”[63, p.11]. One of the biggest advantage of this regime is the highest level of stability in comparison with countries with the parliamentary regime [69, p.32]. The United States of America is believed to be the best representation of this type of regime [63, p.11]. There the President (executive power) and the Congress (legislative power) get their positions through separate elections. By the way, in the USA “the President is elected by Electoral College while in many countries the chief executive is chosen by popular elections”[49]. Still, the popular elections in each state have almost “decisive sense”[49]. “None of the members of the government may be a member of American Congress”[63, p.11]. The President is elected for a particular period [49]. Unlike the parliamentary regime the Congress can’t get the President out of his position, even if he broke a law and must get punishment. In his turn, “the President can’t disband the Congress and can’t make projects of the laws. Political parties don’t have much power under these conditions”[63, p.11]. In most cases presidential regime suppose the impeachment, but this possibility isn’t used really often, moreover, it “doesn’t considerably affect the situation because of its exceptional character”[49].

Though none of these regimes is ideal or infallible, E. Turan states, that in both cases “the power doesn’t belong to one person and or a small group of officials, as it usually lead to overuse of power”[63, p.11].

1.3.3.5. Social organizations and pluralism.Democratic pluralism is “a scheme of social order and administration” [9, p.52];[63, p.12]. To be a democratic pluralistic country means to protect individual rights, economic, political civil rights as well as property rights [54, p.9].

In E. Turan’s article, dedicated to the issue of pluralism, he explains, that “pluralism is grounded on contentious questions, which lead to discussion and its conclusion must be built on the concession. These concessions must satisfy all the participants, all the members of the groups” [63, p.12].The democratic pluralistic state supposes to have fair, regular, free elections. This kind of state should also have a number of independent intermediary groups which would “conglomerate and articulate the state authority” [54, p.9]. According to O. Putilina, these groups also “must adequately and efficiently govern people in decentralized manner but not to overburdening the economic and society”[9, p.52; 54, p.9]. In addition, these groups “must get together freely and then – actually participate in a formal competition for the right to govern people and impact their social and political lives”[54, p.9]. It can be a group not only on politic point, but also on religious, economic or ethnic one [9, p.52; 54, p.9].

Unfortunately, all the demands above are difficult to stick to in the reality. In fact, some groups may become more influential than others even in a completely plural society [54, p.1]. It often happens that the competition doesn’t occur in a simple, easy and natural way. That is why the State uses some means to distinguish all possible disadvantages in the competitions and to find the possible resolutions [54, p.9]. For instance, the authority can give some additional aid for a group, which can become a representative of a group of people, who share common interests, but isn’t competitive [54, p.9]. These actions are vital, as it allows to keep pluralism efficient.

Oguz Hamsioglu, Erol Turan and Sefa Cetin refer to famous book of A. D. Tocqueville “Democracy in America” in their article “ Pluralism and democratic thefoundations and challenges”[63, p.15]. The author studies how the most developed and evident forms of democratic elements which were applied. A. D. Tocqueville emphasizes the essential role of associations in America [63, p.15]. They are formed to develop commerce, morality, public safety and religion [63, p.15]. According to A. D. Tocqueville “In democratic countries, a science of association is the mother of the science; the progress of all the rest depends upon the progress it has made” [62, p.13]. He also emphasized, that if the country lacks associations, the authority, which powers alone, may become “dangerous”. On the other hand, he states, that “associations can’t have more power, than the government has, as it may lead to “the verge of anarchy[62, p.30].

1.3.3.6. Political parties.Pluralism isn’t only about groups, which represent people of common interests, it also about groups, which want to get a post, they are political parties. There are four visible characteristics of a political party: an official organization takes part in electoral contestation, has the represents in parliament, government involvement [52, p.448]. If the organization has at least two characteristics out of these four, it can be called a political party [52, p.448]. Jan- Erik Lane and Alexander M. Preker in their article “Political parties, coalitions and democracy” figure out the following features of a political party:

1) A political party is non-profit organization [52, p.449].

2) The aim of a political party is “to get votes in an election in order to gain a political position or become a member of voting body”[52, p.449].

3) “It is a leader of a party, who defines the ideology, interests and the direction of a party. He also selects the candidates and formulates the lists of party members” [52, p.449].

4) As a rule, rich people or members of the party may become sponsors of a political party [52, p.449].

5) “The success of a party in the elections depends not only on the voters, but on the quality of program and candidates”[52, p.449].

1.3.3.7. Populists.As a rule, populists are the main enemies of democratic pluralism [56]. Some scientists, like Jan-Werner Muller state, that “populists are not merely involved in a political struggle against the establishment, but in a moral struggle in which they invoke the morally pure “people” to disqualify the legitimacy of any competing political claims” [56].

Nadia Urbinati analyzing Donald Trump’s inaugural address in her article wrote the following: “A populist majority installs itself in power not as a temporary winner but as if it were the right winner, with the mission of bringing the ‘forgotten’ and ‘true’ country back” [65]. That is why we may call them anti-democrats and anti-pluralists.

As a result, when populists get the power, we can see clear clues of anti-pluralism. “The authority starts clamping down other political parties, especially their opponents (they even may be jailed)”[62, p.15].“Populists try to restructure the electoral laws, pay special attention to minority and protect their rights and try to politicize the judiciary”[62, p.15].

The basic theory, underlying the term of “respect for pluralist institution” is that the constitutions of countries, which are believed to have well-established democracies, guarantee equal and clear access of the plurality of civil voices into politics [62, p.16].

1.3.3.8. Public opinion and freedom of media.The concept of public opinion appeared due to the development of democracy, based on the idea that the government must take into consideration the viewpoint of governed [2]. It is possible to define public opinion extensively as the expression of convictions and ideology; it is the result of life experience and, sometimes, peer pressure [2]. If to speak about public opinion in the terms of state relationships, E. Turan claims, that“public opinion reflects the ideas and criticism of social groups. It is also means to take control over the politicians (at least to some extent)“ [63, p.15].

To form public opinion people must know what is happening in their country and particularly in politics. Television, radio, newspapers, magazines and internet provide the society with a great amount of information; they all are called mass media [9,p.81;63, p.16]. Hence, the communication between state and society is often occurs with the help of media. Politician parties often encourage mass media to post their projects or declarations [9, p.81;63, p.16]. Nowadays the democracies do not suppose the direct connection, but the media communication. And in the context of democracy, free media plays an important role [63, p.16].

According to F. Bowan, freedom of press is regarded as “an inseparable part of the relation between democratic society and the state” [62, p.238]. Talking about freedom of media we must regard the freedom of information and the freedom of speech. “Freedom of speech is regarded as a basic right, which is taken for granted in developed countries. At the social level this freedom guarantees that people have the necessary information to take part in civic life. Freedom of information is a vital part of free media, as free circulation of information (especially if it is about the government) is a vital condition for press to be the “forth power”, or, as it is often called “ watchdogs on behalf of democracy” [55, p.237].

Additionally the term of “freedom of expression” is used in the context of freedom of media. J.Muller explains it as“a multidimensional right which allows people not only to express their opinion, but to search, obtain and share information”[56, p.125]. So, the freedom of expression is treated as “the most lawful of the modern rights it is also considered to be the main freedom in social awareness and one of the biggest issue in the ongoing public debate”[56, p.125].

To sum up, democracy is a complex notion, which includes a number of principles. If the state is called a democratic one, it must provide the society with fundamental rights and fundamental freedom – ensure people, that their property will be defended, that they will be able to participate in any organization if they have a wish etc. The state must also guarantee the rule of law – everybody must be treated in the same way and the punishment in the case of crime commitment will be equal to an official and to an ordinary citizen. Moreover, the powers must be separated into legislative, judicial and executive branches not to allow the officials arrogate the whole power and rule on their own. There must be democratic pluralism for different religion, social groups to have the representatives and defend their interests. There also must be different political parties, but they mustn’t be populists. Finally, the state must take into consideration public opinion, which in its turn, must be freely spread. So, the media must have enough freedom to speak about all the issues.

# Conclusions to Chapter I

Concept is an object of interest among linguists, psychologists and philosophers. Linguists consider a concept as a semantic unit, which has particular linguo-cultural features and can characterize a speaker with regard to their ethnoculture.Concept includes everything an individual knows, supposes, and imaginesabout a particular entity or object. After a person gets sensitive experience interacting or has some intellectual operations with certain objects,concepts appear in their conciosness. From the linguistic point of view, conceptisn’t equal to meaning, as meaning is a lingual unit, while concept – is a linguo-cognitive one and it connects the sign with the object it denotes. Linguists have not reached an agreement on verbalization of concet – if it must be necessarily verbalized or not, it may depend on the communicative relevance of a concept. Concerning a structure of a concept, scientists have not reached the agreement here either. In the paper we follow the idea of S. Vorkachev and V. Karasik, that a concept includes notional, image and value-oriented components.

Conceptsare often used in political speeches. A political speech may be a parliamentary, a pre-electoral or celebratory, while a presidential speech may be a Christmas speech, anniversary speech, inaugural, farewell address and remarks on certain occasion. A political speech may include cognitive (objective) information, appellate information (appeal to actions), emotive (subjective) information and arsthetic information. In order to enhance the message speakers often use pathos or clichés. Strong, persuasive speeches include logos (rational appeal), pathos (emotional appeal) and ethos (ethical appeal).

Politicians in their speeches often use the concept of DEMOCRACY. There are different definitions of democracy: procedural, liberal and social. But all of them involve right dimesions and separation of power. The democratic society is based on fundamental rights and fundamental freedom, it has fair elections, is based on rule of law it also implies separated power, pluralism and freedom of media.

The preparation of a speech plays a crucial role, if a speaker wants to impress his audience. To achieve this aim the speaker must follow five steps of rhetoric: invention, disposition, style, memory and delivery.

Democracy can be representative (when political decisions are made indirectly, by elected officials) and direct (when every citizen has an opportunity to make decision in the state and does it actively and directly).

# CHAPTER 2. VERBALIZATION OF CONCEPT OF DEMOCRACY IN THE POLITICAL SPEECHES

To analyze the conceptof DEMOCRACY in J.Biden’s political speeches we have used conceptual analysis. It has been done to identify the paradigms of the concept and to describe their conceptual spheres: the components, which are included in the mental fields of these concepts. His speeches appeal to three levels of the concept of DEMOCRACY: notional, image, and value-oriented components. The image component is connected with sensorimotor experience and is represented with the words: *people*, *voters*, *government.*The language units, used to verbalize the concept of DEMCRACY on image level contain ideas fixed in the language, these are internal forms of words that serve to express the concept "thought images".The notional component of the concept of DEMOCRACYis used in the word combinations where the head word is represented by the given noun, while the dependent word, which is either an adjective or a pronoun, specifies some aspect of the notional component of the concept.Itis represented with the noun *democracy*.  The value-oriented component is connected with the notions, which are entrenched in cognition as valuable ones. They are represented by the words *equality, human rights, freedom/liberty, justice, unity, sovereignty*

2.1. Remarks to the UA Rada.

In the remarks to the Ukrainian Rada J. Bien uses the term *democracy*and its derivatives 12 times. There are 6 examples of usage of this component of the concept. They illustrate the countries, which follow the democratic way of development.

The notional component is represented here with the noun *democracy.*J. Biden means here a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them [73]. He persuades the audience that representative democracy is a key to unite people, who differ ethnically, speak different languages, and have different priorities. In a state with representative democracy, they all have an opportunity to influence their countryand, as a result, realize themselves as a part of this “machine”: ”*And they molded that unwieldy machine into a united* ***representative democracy****, where people saw themselves as Americans first and citizens of their region second*”(4) .

Speaking about *a single democracy* J. Biden uses metonymy to say about asocial condition of classlessness and equality [71]. He emphasizes that democracy, equality, and corruption are inconsistent. And there is no country, which can be called a democratic one if “the cancer of corruption is prevalent” there: *“But I can tell you, you cannot name me* ***a single democracy*** *in the world where the cancer of corruption is prevalent. You cannot name me one”*(4).

Using the word *democracy* in direct meaning, J. Bidenspeaks about a country in which power is held by people who are elected [71]. It coincides with the definition in the dictionary, so we can claim that it is a representation of the notional component of the concept. Here he continues the idea of the previous quote, that every country, which is claimed to be a democratic one, must fight any manifestation of corruption:*“Senior elected officials have to remove all conflicts between their business interest and their government responsibilities.****Every other democracy*** *in the world – that system pertains”*(4).

The notional component of the concept of DEMOCRACYis represented 3 times in the derivative form of the noun democracy–*democratic:*

J. Biden speaks here about Ukraine, a country ruled by democratic values and rights. In this example, we have factual information about the adjective, and it coincides with the definition in the dictionary: upholding or favouring democracy or the interests of the ordinary people [72] so that it is a representation of the notional component. J. Biden tries to support Ukrainians and their wish to change the situation and build a democratic country. He calls them the founders of democratic Ukraine, emphasizing that they will be the first to see a new Ukraine – a country, which protects the interests of ordinary citizens: “*If you succeed, you will be the founders of the first truly free,* ***democratic, united Ukraine****. An awesome responsibility, but what an incredible, incredible opportunity to serve your country*”(4).

J. Biden speaks about democratic nation in direct meaning and we may claim that it is a representation of a notional component. Using this phrase he speaks about the perspective to build a nation, which is based on the idea that everyone should have equal rights and should be involved in making important decisions[72]. J. Biden continues the idea of the previous quote, trying to support Ukrainians and their wish to fight for the better: *“Each of you has an obligation to answer the call of history and finally build a united,* ***democratic*** *Ukrainian* ***nation*** *that can stand the test of time”*(4)*.*

The phrase *democratic governance* is also used in direct meaning and is an example of a notional component. The president speaks here about an inseparable part of a country – governance. If it is democratic, the country will also be democratic. We may claim that the word *democratic* in this phrase coincides with the definition in the dictionary:upholding or favouring democracy or the interests of the ordinary people [72] and can be referred to a notional level of the cocnept: “*So Ukraine must be strong enough to choose its own future, strongly. Strong defensively. Strong economically. A strong system of* ***democratic governance***”(4).

Joe Biden also uses this concept in symbols, specific for particular people. We can see 2 examples of the value-oriented component of the concept of DEMOCRACY. They illustrate the connection between democracy and values, entrenched in Americans’ minds.

We may claim that *democratic institutions are* an example of a value-oriented component, as it refers to the notion of rights and justice, which are entrenched in people’s cognition as valuable ones. These notions serve as the symbols of a democratic and independent country, which is a value for any nation: “*Don’t misunderstand that those of us who serve in other* ***democratic institutions*** *don’t understand how hard the conditions are, how difficult it is to cast some of the votes to meet the obligations committed to under the IMF*”(4).

J. Biden uses the ontological metaphor *death knell for democracy*, namely DEMOCRACY IS PERSON. The president wants to emphasize the value of fighting against “exploitation and corruption”. Using this metaphor he explains that tolerance to corruption is inconsistent with democracy. If people allow it to happen in their country, it will lead to the end of democracy there. In order to enhance his message emotionally, J. Biden uses the symbol of death, familiar to Christians – both Americans and Ukrainians – death knell. This image raises negative emotions in human minds, as it is heard with the causes of a person’s death. As a result, they realize that a person may kill another one and corruption does the same to democracy. This is a representation of a value-oriented component, that is represented through the symbol of the *death knell:* “*And if the people resign themselves to exploitation and corruption for fear of losing whatever little they have left, that would be the* ***death knell for*** *Ukrainian* ***democracy***”(4).

In this speech we can also see the realization of the image component of theconcept of DEMOCRACY in 4 examples. They illustrate the support of America and the whole Europe to Ukrainian democratic development, the way Ukrainians fulfilled their rights through the democratic revolution and also they illustrate the process of building the democratic society.

J. Biden uses the ontological metaphor DEMOCRACY IS EXPERIMENT. Democracy is represented as an entity, people can conduct an experiment on. Speaking about the support of Europe and proper development in a democratic way, J. Biden tries to support Ukrainians:*“It is no exaggeration to say that the hopes of freedom-loving people the world over are with you because so much rides on your* ***fragile experiment withdemocracy succeeding****”*(4)*.*

Speaking about the American experience, J. Biden uses one more ontological metaphor: DEMOCRACY IS ENTITY. Here he explained what incomplete democracy can lead to: “American Civil War, which nearly tore our still young country asunder”. So, in order to avoid any conflicts, the process of “building” a democratic country must be complete.So, the audience accepts democracy as a product of work, which demands time and effort. The democracy in this example is regarded as a result of a process – a construction. That is why we may claim, that it is a representation of the image component of the concept:*“But our union remained imperfect, our* ***democracy incomplete****. Seventy years later we went through a second testing during the American Civil War, which nearly tore our still young country asunder”*(4)*.*

Two more examples of the image component of the concept are represented in a derivative of the noun *democracy*–*democratic*.

J. Biden uses metaphoric epithet *democratic success*, speaking about future Ukrainian achievements. He wants to emphasize that the whole Europe supports Ukraine and expects this country to become successful due to democratic reforms. At the same time, it means that Ukraine will become a successful country in a democratic, fair way: *“You have the united support of Europe – Western, Central, and Eastern Europe – all invested in your* ***democratic success*** *because your success goes to the heart of an enduring commitment to a Europe whole, free, and at peace”*(4)*.*

In this speech J. Biden uses one more metaphoric epithet *democratic revolution* to emphasize that people fulfilled their rights having changed the political situation in the state: *“But as history tells us and shows, and as we know, Ukraine’s leaders proved incapable of delivering on the promise of* ***democratic revolution.*** *We saw reforms put in place only to be rolled back. We saw oligarchs uninterested in change ousted from power only to return* ”(4).

To sum up, the notional component of the concept of DEMOCRACY prevails in this speech. It is used to speak about countries, which stick to democratic principles. J. Biden also frequently uses the image component of the concept of DEMOCRACY to appeal to particular emotions and represent the idea of democracy and its principles better. He also resorts to a value-oriented component to create a proper image of democracy and its “enemies” on a subconscious level..

2.2. Inaugural address.

In the inaugural address, J. Bien uses the word *democracy* and its derivatives 10 times. In this speech J. Biden uses image component 5 times to illustrate the connection between the Democrats’ victory in the election and the democratic development, to encourage the citizens to defend democracy and to show the contrast between democracy and violent protests.

The president uses an image component of the conceptof DEMOCRACY*,* to assure the citizens, that his s victory in the elections is the beginning of the democratic development of their country. J. Biden, with his words, makes people be happy not for the victory of another politician, but for the better future of America. He draws the parallels between him and democracy and verbalizes the concept of DEMOCRACY through the image of a candidate, who achieves a great success, victory in the quote: *“Today, we celebrate the* ***triumph*** *not of a candidate, but* ***of a cause, the cause of democracy****”*(1).The concept of DEMOCRACY is also regarded as a ruler, who gets control or influence in the quote: *“And at this hour, my friends,* ***democracy has prevailed****”*(1).

To assure the audience, that democracy needs to be protected by the citizens, to emphasise the vital role of democracy in developing a country J. Biden uses the ontological metaphor DEMOCRACY IS ENTITY*“The will of the people has been heard and the will of the people has been heeded. We have learned again that* ***democracy is precious****.* ***Democracy is fragile****”* (1).*“This is a time of testing. We face* ***an attack on democracy*** *and on truth. A raging virus. Growing inequity. The sting of systemic racism. A climate in crisis”*(1). It is a representation of the image component of the concept of DEMOCRACY. J. Biden emphasizes, that democracy is weak, preciousand fragile.

To show the value of democracyin the audience’s minds and create an impression that he is a democratic president, unlike his opponent – D. Trump. He reminds the audience about the protests against democratic elections [55].The insurrection was really violent, according to the democratic party [55]. Such barbarity isn’t an act of democracy, but an attempt to kill it –*to stop the work of democracy*. J. Biden contrasts democracy to violent protest, condemning the pro-Trump supporters: *“And here we stand, just days after a riotous mob thought they could use violence to silence the will of the people,* ***to stop the work of our democracy****, and to drive us from this sacred ground”*(1).

The inaugural speech contains 5 examples of value-oriented component of the concept of DEMOCRACY. They illustrate the connection between democracy and valuable notions for American society.

J. Biden uses parallel constructionto equate the notion of democracy to America. He appeals to the American audience, for whom their country is an immense value. Equating democracy to the USA, the president creates a solid associative connection between these two notions. As a result, the idea that praising democracy is praising their motherland entrenches in the audience’s minds. In addition, J. Biden equates democracy to hope, which is also a notion that represents the value-oriented component. As well as any nation, Americans hope for the better for their country. Using such a comparison, J. Biden creates an impression that future democratic development is what they hope for, as it is the best alternative for the USA. Moreover, he verbalizes the concept of DEMOCRACY using such notions as *hope, renewal* and *resolve.* Here he mainly appeals to his voters – people, who supported him in the election. After D.Trump’s governance when the democratic party got power in the country, it was time for change. And J. Biden emphasizes that it will be a democratic change. People, who weren’t satisfied with the politics of the Republic party, got the idea that everything will be different and they will finally reach their goal of a democratic country: *“This is* ***America’s*** *day. This is* ***democracy’s day.*** *A day of history and* ***hope****.Of* ***renewal*** *and* ***resolve****”*(1).

Using parallel constructions J. Biden puts democracy on a par with the notions of *hope*, *truth,* and *justice,* which are also representatives of the value-oriented component: *“That* ***democracy and hope, truth and justice****, did not die on our watch but thrived”*(1).

In this speech J. Biden equates democracy to the right, which is a representation of a value-oriented component. Rights for Americans, as well as other nations, that seek democracy, are of great value. The right to dissent peaceably is one of the basics of a democratic society. By the way, he again mentions America in this example, putting it in one row with democracy and rights. In this way, J.Biden creates associative connections within these notions :*“That’s* ***democracy****. That’s America. The* ***right*** *to dissent peaceably, within the guardrails of our Republic, is perhaps our nation’s greatest strength”*(1).

Though J. Biden calls unity an *elusive thing in a democracy*, he still defines it as an inherent part of democracy. *Unity* is a representation of the value-oriented component. It is also an immense value for the American nation. The president says it to emphasize the significance of democracy for the future of America :*“To overcome these challenges – to restore the soul and to secure the future of America – requires more than words. It requires that most elusive of things in a* ***democracy: Unity. Unity****”*(1).

J. Biden uses parallel constructions equating democracy to the Constitution and America. These are the symbols of sovereignty and justice, which are the representation of the value-oriented components. The constitution is an immense value for Americans, as it guarantees their rights and freedom. A promise to defend democracy is equated to a promise to defend the Constitution inspires faith in his auditory’s minds. At the same time, America is another value for Americans as well as any other motherland for any nation. So, the patriotic feeling is what J. Biden appeals to in this statement :*“I will defend the* ***Constitution****. I will defend our* ***democracy****. I will defend* ***America****”*(1).

To sum up, in the inaugural address J. Biden uses value-oriented and image components of the concept of DEMOCRACY to appeal to American citizens, raise patriotic feelings, engage them to protect democracy, and give hope and promise, that his governance will lead the country to a democratic future.

2.3. Remarks on America’s place in the world.

In the remarks on America’s Place in the World J. Biden uses the term *democracy* and its derivatives 12 times. The speech contains one example of notional component of the concept of DEMOCRACY. It illustrates the society with a democratic system and countries, which follow the democratic way of development.

J. Biden speaks abouta Summit of democracy. It is a summit of countries, states, etc. with a democratic government. It is the summit of democracy because these are the representatives of democratic countries. That is why we may state that the term is used in direct meaning: *“All this matters to foreign policy, because when we host the* ***Summit of Democracy*** *early in my administration…”* (3).

There are 7 examples of image component of the concept of DEMOCRACY*,* which illustrate that democracy needs the defence and the leaders of democratic countries are powerful enough to protect it, and to illustrate the vital role of free press and credible electionsin democratic system.

In this speech J. Biden verbalizes the concept of DEMOCRACY through the image of elections as an inseperable part of a democratic state. That is why this is an image component:*“There can be no doubt: In a* ***democracy****, force should never seek to overrule the will of the people or attempt to erase the outcome of* ***a credible election****”*(3).

Using the metaphor DEMOCRACY IS WAR he encourages the sitizens to protect democracy:*“...the American people are going to emerge from this moment stronger, more determined, and better equipped to unite the world in fighting to* ***defend democracy****, because we have fought for it ourselves”*(3).

J. Biden uses the metaphor DEMOCRACY IS ENTITY to appeal to his audience and encourage them to continue protecting democracy. Using this metaphor J. Biden emphasizes that democracyis something weak and it needs to be protected: *“American leadership must meet this new moment of advancing authoritarianism, including the growing ambitions of China to rival the United States and the determination of Russia to* ***damage and disrupt our democracy****”*(3).

Then he verbalizes the idea, that democracy protection isn’t only citizens’ task and puts the responsibility for defending democracy on officials:*“…When we host the Summit of Democracy early in my administration to rally the nations of the world to* ***defend democracy*** *globally, to push back the authoritarianism’s advance…”*(3).

Using the metaphor DEMOCRACY IS BUILDING, J. Biden assures the audience that building democracy is a difficult process, but still, in the case of a failure, it is possible to start from the beginning and restore it:*“As I said earlier this week, we will work with our partners to support* ***restoration of democracy*** *and the rule of law, and impose consequences on those responsible”*(3).

The structural metaphor DEMOCRACY IS LIVING ORGANISM is also represented in the phrase “*muscle of democratic alliances”*.It is used to assure the audience that democratic alliances have power and are strong enough. Even if the muscles are “*atrophied over the past few years*”, they are possible to rebuild, according to J. Biden. In this way, the American president appeals to his audience and makes the idea that democratic leaders are powerful enough to restore the democracy entrenched in their minds:*“I’ve spoken with the leaders of many of our closest friends [...]to being [begin] reforming the habits of cooperation and* ***rebuilding themuscle of democratic alliances*** *that have atrophied over the past few years of neglect and, I would argue, abuse”* (3).

In the example above, J. Biden uses two metaphors. The first one is POWER IS LIVING ORGANISM, meaning democratic countries, which have political muscles to enforce human rights. And the second metaphor, used in this quote is POLITICAL POWER IS BUILDING, as the speaker speaks about is as something, possible to rebuild and modify, so this case is a two-step metaphor.

One more metaphor used in this speech is an ontological one DEMOCRACY IS PERSON. It is a representation of the image component of the concept, as democracy is verbalized through the image of press: “*We believe a free press isn’t an adversary; rather, it’s essential.  A free press is essential to* ***the health of a democracy****”*(3).

J. Biden uses a value-oriented component of the concept of DEMOCRACY 3 times in these remarks.They illustrate the connection between democracy and values, entranched in people’s cognition.

The president enumerates the values associated with the precious notion, such as democracy, rights, freedom and law, which are entrenched in American society. In this way, he shows that American democracyis a real one. In the remarks on America’s place in the world, he tries to create an image of America as a role model for the countries, seeking democratic development:*“That must be this – we must start with diplomacy rooted in America’s most cherished* ***democratic values****: defending freedom, championing opportunity, upholding universal rights, respecting the rule of law, and treating every person with dignity”*(3).

J. Biden opposes here the American values and the China’s ones, putting democratic values, as well as security and prosperity in contrast to China’s economic exploit. Still, the orator assures his audience that their country and their democracyare strong enough to force it back: *“And we’ll also take on directly the challenges posed by our prosperity, security, and* ***democratic values*** *by our most serious competitor, China. We’ll confront China’s economic abuses; counter its aggressive, coercive action; to push back on China’s attack on human rights, intellectual property, and global governance”* (3).

The president enumerates the civic values (peace, security, sovereignty, integrity of the territory, tolerance and respect) in his speech: *“Today, I’m announcing additional steps to course-correct our foreign policy and better* ***unite our democratic values*** *with our diplomatic leadership”* (3).And he speaks about it in detail:

1. The value of peace and security: “*Our military footprint is appropriately aligned with our foreign policy and national security priorities. It will be coordinated across all elements of our national security…”* (3), “*We’re also stepping up our diplomacy to end the war in Yemen – a war which has created a humanitarian and strategic catastrophe*”(3), “*We are ending all American support for offensive operations in the war in Yemen, including relevant arms sales*” (3).
2. The value of sovereignty and integrity of the territory: “*We’re going to continue to support and help Saudi Arabia defend its sovereignty and its territorial integrity and its people*”(3).
3. The value of being defended: “*We offered safe havens for those fleeing violence or persecution. And our example pushed other nations to open wide their doors as well*” (3).
4. The value of tolerance and respect: “*You know, we’ll ensure diplomacy and foreign assistance are working to promote the rights of those individuals, included by combatting criminalization and protecting LGBTQ refugees and asylum-seekers*” (3).

J. Biden puts democratic values in one row together with domestic values. Equating these values, the president appeals to his audience’s feelings and symbol of home, entrenched in American society. It is done to simplify the image of the president’s administration and make it more familiar to the audience : “*So, with your help, the United States will again lead not just by the example of our power but the power of our example.  That’s why my administration has already taken the important step to live our domestic values at home – our* ***democratic values*** *at home*”(3).

To sum it up, J. Biden uses notional, image and value-oriented components of the concept of DEMOCRACY in remarks on America’s place in the world. It is done to indicate the idea of democracy and democratic development in countries, to assure the audience of the power of world leaders and their ability to protect democracyand democratic values, and, finally, to appeal to people’s feelings through the usage of symbols.

2.4. Acceptance speech.

In the acceptance speech, J. Biden uses the concept of DEMOCRACY and its derivatives five times.The notional component of the concept is used four times and illustrates the members of supports of the Democratic party.

J. Biden speaks about democrats as people, supporting a particular party in the USA [70] that coincides with the definition in the dictionary. People who support the democratic party are put in opposition to those who support republicans or those who support none of them. Here he uses it to show the diversity in the unity of Americans: *“****Democrats****, Republicans and independents. Progressives, moderates and conservatives. Young and old. Urban, suburban and rural. Gay, straight, transgender. White. Latino. Asian. Native American”*(2).

The word *democrat* here is used in the direct meaning – member or supporter of the democratic party [72]. J. Biden refers himself to this party, making a remark, that he will improve the lives of all the citizens despite their political preferences: “*I ran as a proud* ***Democrat****. I will now be an American president. I will work as hard for those who didn’t vote for me – as those who did*”(2).

The meaning of the word *Democrats* in the following examplecoincides with the definition in the dictionary and signifies a member or supporter of the democratic party [70]. It is used as a contrast to the members of the Republican party in order to criticize their conflict, which harms the democratic development of the country: *“Let this grim era of demonisation in America begin to end – here and now. The refusal of* ***Democrats*** *and Republicans to cooperate with one another is not due to some mysterious force beyond our control. It’s a decision. It’s a choice we make”*(2).

The president again uses the noun *Democrats*to show the contrast between two parties, but, unlike the previous example, the aim here is to unite them, and encourage the members of these parties to join J. Biden in making choice in favour of the democratic future: *“They* [American people] *want us to cooperate. That’s the choice I’ll make. And I call on the Congress –* ***Democrats*** *and Republicans alike – to make that choice with me”* (2).

The image component of the conceptis used one time and it illustrates the necessity to protect democracy.

J. Biden speaks about democracyas a vulnerable entity using the ontological metaphor DEMOCRACY IS ENTITY to introduce the notion of DEMOCRACY as an something, that needs to be protected. In this part of the speech, the president speaks about the hope the citizens put on him and on the government. Using the metaphor here, J. Biden assures the audience, that he is aware of the necessity to defend democracy: *“The battle to save the climate.*[...]*The battle to restore decency,* ***defend democracy*** *and give everybody in this country a fair shot”*(2).

To sum it up, in the acceptance speech, J. Biden uses the notional component to indicate himself as a follower of the democratic party and its values, appealing to the supporters of this party as well as the Republican one to encourage them to stand for America together. And he also uses the image components of the concept of DEMOCRACY to show that democracy needs to be protected by the president.

2.5. State of the Union address as prepared for delivery.

In the remarks of J. Biden – State of the Union address as prepared for delivery – he uses the concept of DEMOCRACY and its derivatives 7 times.

The notional component of the concept is used 2 times in the speech and illustrates the members or supporters of the Democratic party. First of all, it is represented by the word *Democrat*. The word *Democrats* is used in direct meaning – members or supporters of a democratic party [72]. In this example, J. Biden addresses his audience by emphasizing that all of them are American despite their political preferences: “*Tonight, we meet as* ***Democrats,*** *Republicans and Independents. But most importantly as Americans”*(5).

The orator also uses the word *Democrats* together with the word *Republicans* in order to unite both parties in achieving the common aim – the safety of their neighbourhood: “*I ask* ***Democrats*** *and Republicans alike: Pass my budget and keep our neighborhoods safe*” (5).

In this state of the union address, the president implements the image component of the concept 3 times.It illustrates the contrast between democracy and autocracy, and the fact, that the number of countries, which choose the democratic way of development is raising.

The speaker appeals to his audience through the usage of two metaphors in one sentence: structural and orientational. The structural metaphor DEMOCRACY IS WAR is represented in the phrase *battle between democracy and autocracy*. This metaphor has the following components: democracy has an army –the supporters, purposes – right domination for democracy, weapons – right protection, enemy – autocracy etc. It is done to show the opposition between the two notions: democracy and autocracy and emphasize the extent of this confrontation, equating it to the battle between troops. The idea of battles is entrenched in people’s cognition and, due to this fact, they easily realise how deadly autocracy is for democracy. The orientational metaphor is given in the phrase *democracies are rising*  where rise is the upward movement[69]. The president usesthis metaphor to appeal to his audience and assure them, that the development of democracy continues in the world and more and more countries choose a peaceful, democratic, secure future. These two metaphors are used in one sentence: *“In the* ***battle between democracy and autocracy****,* ***democracies are rising*** *to the moment, and the world is clearly choosing the side of peace and security”* (5).

The third representation of image component of DEMOCRACY is implemented by the metaphor DEMOCRACY IS WAR in the phrase *citadel of democracy* where the noun *citadel* indicates a fortress used to give people safety in case of an attack [73]. In this way, the president emphasizes that Congress defends democracy and all the decisions they are going to take will be based on democratic values: *“My fellow Americans – tonight, we have gathered in a sacred space – the* ***citadel of our democracy*** [Capitol]*”* (5).

In this speech the value-oriented component of the concept of DEMOCRACY is used 2 times. They illustrate the connection between democracy and values, entranched in Americans’ cognition.

The noun *Democrats* is used together with the noun *Republicans*, which is the opposite party to the first one, in order to show the support of both of them. In this way, the president claims that Ketaji Brown Jackson is a really good professional, as former judges of both opposite parties believe her and decided to nominate her for this position. In this case, the value-oriented component is introduced by the words *judges*, who are the symbols of justice: *“Since she’s [Ketanji Brown Jackson] been nominated, she’s received a broad range of support from the Fraternal Order of Police to former judges appointed by* ***Democrats*** *and Republicans”*(5).

Using the phrase *save democracy*, which is a case of structural metaphor DEMOCRACY IS WAR, the speaker appeals to the following values, entrenched in the Americans’ minds: freedom, liberty, and fairness. They are put on a par with a notion of democracy. J. Biden creates the idea that saving democracy is protecting the values of freedom, liberty and fairness. In this statement, he gives hope for a better future to the citizens, and emphasizes that, despite all the difficulties, his party will protect American values, including democracy: *“To protect freedom and liberty, to expand fairness and opportunity. We will* ***save democracy****”* (5).

To sum it up, in the state of the union address as prepared for delivery, J.Biden uses the notional component of the concept of DEMOCRACY to identify the supporters of the democratic party and speak about their unity with the republicans despite the political opposition; image component of the concept of DEMOCRACYin order to show the audience, that it is spread all over the world and to show how huge the confrontation between democracy and autocracy is; and, finally, the president uses the value-oriented component of the concept to associate it with the values, common for all the Americans and let his audience rely on the Congress, as a defender of democracy.

# Conclusions to Chapter 2

We have analysed 5 political speeches of J.R. Biden and found 46 cases when the speaker uses the concept of DEMOCRACY. Notional component of the concept of DEMOCRACY prevails in Remarks to the Ukrainian Rada ( the president uses it in 54.5% of usage of this concept) and Acceptance speech ( where he uses it in 80% of the cases. In State of the Union as prepared for delivery J. Biden uses image component of the concept in the majority of cases (42.9% of general usage of this concept). In Inaugural address image and value-oriented components are used equally. In general, in all five speeches J.Biden preferably uses image component (41.52%), notional component takes the second place (34.28%) and value-oriented component is used the least number of times (24.2%).

Apparently, it is caused by the specifics of speeches and their aims. Notional component of the concept of DEMOCRACY is implemented almost in all the chosen speeches. It is mainly used to denote particular countries or people, who belong to a Democratic party. If the speaker has a goal to appeal to his audience’s feelings, raise the patriotic spirit, he uses orientational, ontological and structural metaphors to achieve his aim. It makes him use image and value-oriented components of the concept of DEMOCRACY. We may see, that J. Biden often appeals to Americans trying to assure them, that democracy must be defended, that constitution will work only if the society will be democratic. The president also tries to assure Americans that they can rely on him, as he will defend democracy and America. He also uses the concept of DEMOCRACY speaking to Ukrainians in attempt to assure them, that democratic way of development is the right one and that America will support Ukraine in achieving their goal – democratic society.

# GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Having analyzed the concept of DEMOCRACY in J.R. Biden’s political speeches we have come to the following conclusions.

The conceptincludes everything an individual knows, supposes, and imagines about a particular entity or object and appears after a person gets a particular experience, interacting with an object.

There are different ways to structure the concept; one of them is S. Vorkachev and V. Karasik’s, which involves notional, image and value-oriented components.

One of the forms of politicians’ interaction with people is a political speech. It usually includes cognitive, appellate, emotive and aesthetic information. Strong, persuasive speeches include logos (rational appeal), pathos (emotional appeal) and ethos (ethical appeal). The orator must also remember about clichés to make his/her audience trust him/her.

Democracy is a political system, which obligatory involves right dimensions and separation of power. Democracy can be representative and direct.

In five political speeches J.R. Biden uses the conceptof DEMOCRACY 46 times. Among them, image component prevails – 41.52% of general usage. It is connected with sensoriomotor experience and is represented through the ideas fixed in the language, internal forms of words, which serve to express the concept through images. The image component of this concept is verbalized by such language units: *a ruler, a candiadate, elections, people, revolution, the Capitol, press.* Notional component of the concept of DEMOCRACY is used in 34.28% of cases. It is used in the word combinations where the head word is represented by the given noun while the dependent word, which is either a pronoun or an adjective, specifies some aspects of the notional component of the concept. This component isusedto denote members of the Democratic Party and countries, which have democratic society and are verbalized by such language units*: democracy, democrats, the summit of democracy* etc. Value-oriented component is used in 24.2% of general usage of the concept. It is represented through the symbols, and ideas, which are valuable in people’s cognition: *fairness, right, freedom, truth, hope, institutions,* *Constitution etc*.

In the chosen speeches, J. Biden uses ontological and structural metaphors to reach different aims and appeal to different feelings of his audience. The President uses the structural metaphor DEMOCRACY IS WAR to verbalize both image and value-oriented components of the concept of DEMOCRACY. The ontological metaphor DEMOCARCY IS ENTITY emphasizes that democracy needs to be protected, encourages the audience to defend it and assures, that the president together with other officials and representatives of democratic countries is strong enough and ready to defend democracy. The ontological metaphor DEMOCRACY IS PERSON is used to emphasize the vital role of free press and to warn the audience, that tolerance to corruption is inconsistent with democracy. In order to assure the audience, that democratic leaders are powerful enough to restore the democracy J. Biden uses the metaphors DEMOCRACY IS LIVING ORGANIZM and DEMOCRACY IS BUILDING. On the other hand, he uses the metaphor DEMOCRACY IS EXPERIMENT and DEMOCRACIES ARE RISING to show, that democracy is developing well.

Speaking to his citizens and to Ukrainians J. Biden uses the symbols “death knell” and “home”, which are rather close for cognition of both American and Ukrainian peoples. He assures them, that domestic values are inseperable part of the democratic values and the Congress is strong enough to protect them. Moreover, he warns his audience that some actions or inaction can inevitably lead to the fail of democratic development.

The prospects for future research are viewed in the analysis of the conceptof DEMOCRACY in political speeches of other officials of the USA or the UK.
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# РЕЗЮМЕ

Концепт–це функціональна, значуща одиниця пам'яті, відображена в психіці людини.Він часто стає об՚єктом дослідження філологів та науковців у інших сферах. Політики у своїх промовах часто використовують концепти, щоб донести певну ідею до авдиторії.

У цій магістерській роботі ми проаналізували 5 політичних промов Дж. Байдена та виділили 46 випадків використання концепту ДЕМОКРАТІЯ й визначили його компоненти: поняттєвий, предметно-образний, або ціннісний.

У досліджених промовах превалює предметно-образний компонент концепту. Він представлений такими мовними одиницями: *elections, Capitol, people, alliances, press*. Поняттєвий компонент концепту відображений іменниками та прикметниками у прямому значенні, а саме: *democracy, democrat, democratic*. Ціннісний компонент використовується найрідше. Він втіленийтакими мовними одиницями: *truth, freedom, hope, justice, right*.

Вибір компонента концепту залежить від мети промовця. Завдяки концепту ДЕМОКРАТІЯ Дж. Байден апелює до патріотичних почуттів своєї авдиторії, спонукає її ставати на захист демократії та запевняє, що слідуватиме демократичним цінностям протягом свого президентського терміну.

**Ключові слова:** демократія, концепт, поняттєвий компонент, образний компонент, ціннісний компонент, політична промова.

# RESUME

Concept isa functional and valid unit of memory of the mindset, reflected in human psyche. It is a frequent object of study among lingusists and other scientists. Politicians often use concepts in their speeches to convey a particular idea to their audience.

In this master’s work we have analyzed five political speeches of J.R. Biden, have singled out 46 examples of the concepts DEMOCRACY and defined its components: notional, image or value-oriented.

Image component of the concept DEMOCRACY prevails in these speeches. It is represented by such language units as *elections, Capitol, people, alliances, press*. Notional component is represented through the nouns and adjectives in direct meaning: *democracy, democrat, democratic*. Value-oriented component is used in the least number of cases. It is represented by such language units as *truth, freedom, hope, justice, right*.

The choice of component of the concept DEMOCRACY depends on the speaker’s aim. In the analyzed speechesthe concept DEMOCRACY appeals to audience’s patriotic feelings, encourages them to defend democracy and assures them, that the leader will follow the democratic values during the presidential term.

**Keywords:** democracy, concept, notional component, image component, value-oriented component, political speech.