

---

3rd Central & Eastern European LUMEN International Conference  
New Approaches in Social and Humanistic Sciences | NASHS 2017 |  
Chisinau, Republic of Moldova | June 8-10, 2017

# New Approaches in Social and Humanistic Sciences

---

## A Pragmatic Approach towards the Presidential Address for the New Year

Valentina CIUMACENCO

<https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.nashs2017.12>

How to cite: Ciumacenco, V. (2018). A Pragmatic Approach towards the Presidential Address for the New Year. In V. Manolachi, C.M. Rus, S. Rusnac (eds.), *New Approaches in Social and Humanistic Sciences* (pp. 137-152). Iasi, Romania: LUMEN Proceedings.

<https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.nashs2017.12>



3<sup>rd</sup> Central & Eastern European LUMEN International Conference  
New Approaches in Social and Humanistic Sciences |  
NASHS 2017 | Chisinau, Republic of Moldova | June 8-10, 2017

## A Pragmatic Approach towards the Presidential Address for the New Year

Valentina CIUMACENCO<sup>1</sup>

### *Abstract*

*This paper outlines the distinctive attributes of some presidential addresses offered on the occasion of New Year's Eve. The article contains both theoretical and empirical parts. First we enumerate a number of general aspects that are characteristic to any political speech broadly speaking, then we contrast these with the results obtained from our discourses analysis applied to Romanian and Moldovan presidential speeches. A special focus has been placed on the argumentative structure, lexical traits, and the use of various types of modalization/modulation.*

**Keywords:** *presidential address, discourse analysis, argumentation, discursive structure, modality.*

### **Preliminaries**

Politics is seen as a struggle for power and in this struggle politicians try to communicate their plans and policies by providing evidence, persuading the electorate to act in their favor, and convincing them to vote for their plans and thoughts. In this process, language as a social practice and the lifeblood of politics plays a significant role, because it is mainly through the social practice of language that politicians construct their identity, negotiating their way through speeches, debates and interviews, and making structurally stable social relationships. Linguistic manipulation is typical of political discourse, and politicians have learned well to obtain power through “the oratorical art of manipulating language for persuasive ends” [1].

---

<sup>1</sup> Free International University of Moldova (ULIM), Chisinau, [vciumacenco@ulim.md](mailto:vciumacenco@ulim.md)

<https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.nashs2017.12>

Corresponding Author: Valentina CIUMACENCO

Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the conference



L.Vesnic-Alujevic has argued that persuasion has four interdependent elements including: the speaker, the audience, the message and the way the message is conveyed. [2] Rhetorical devices are tactics intended to engage emotions, shape meaning, and influence the message to be remembered and endorsed by the audience. Using a rich and wide range of rhetorical strategies, leaders take their audience attention. The language of leadership is constituted through the combined effect of diverse rhetorical strategies. [3] The current research was conducted with the aim to investigate the rhetorical and persuasive linguistic devices employed in the political speech through the perspective of modality.

The bulk of the research on modality has been concerned with what modality does in terms of qualifying the proposition. Over the last decade, also other layers of analysis have become prominent within the field. It is now generally accepted that modality as stancetaking has, in addition to its qualificational function, well recognized interactional, textual and rhetorical functions, such as persuading, manipulating, challenging, confronting, accepting, encouraging the flow of discussion, creating cohesive texts. [4]

This paper focuses on the analysis of a particular type of political discourse: the Presidential Address for the New Year, in the theoretical frameworks of classical rhetoric and discourse analysis, with the aim of demonstrating the argumentative character of this type of discourse and highlighting some of its communicative and pragmatic peculiarities.

This research was conducted based on the pragmalinguistic approach and the qualitative interpretation of the data obtained from the application of comparative method and critical analysis. The object of the empirical part of this article includes four speeches delivered by two Moldovan presidents Nicolae Timofti and Igor Dodon addressed to the nation in 2015 and 2016 respectively, and two other Romanian presidential addresses delivered by Emil Constantinescu in 1999 and Ion Iliescu in 2002, which will be abbreviated according to the name of the respective authors, as PANT, PAID, PAEC and PAII.

The criteria on which the corpus was built are the following: representative forms of political discourse have been chosen; the value of political discourse in a certain socio-political context; the importance of modal markers in speech; various spatial and temporal parameters; different political ideologies; the visibility of speeches on Internet. The option for those four presidents is on a purely random basis. It has been chosen presidential messages addressed by different authors with the purpose to detect both recurring and variable elements of it.

## Theoretical domain of argumentation. Modern research directions.

The concept of argumentation tends to represent today a general theoretical resource, the pretext of highly heterogeneous researches in methodological terms: neoclassical rhetoric, linguistic, pragma-dialectical, logic of natural language, contributing to the descriptions of corpora dictated by the particularities of texts. [5 p358] Starting from the premises of classical rhetoric and of traditional logic, the pragmatics of argumentation focused on several research directions: pragma-dialectics, the analysis of argumentation in conversation, linguistic pragmatics, the socio-psychological pragmatics, natural logic etc. Over time, there has been a movement of emphasis from argumentation as a discursive phenomenon of linguistic competence to the understanding of argumentation as an interactive discursive activity, with the observation that the actual object of study has evolved from the syllogistic discourse (classical Greek approaches) to short paragraphs (new rhetoric), two sentence statements (AWL - theory of argumentation within language) [5p354], or monological argumentative speeches. [5 p360]

Regardless of the methodological eclecticism of the studies, the object of research remains the argumentative speech, a complex language act that implies a **linguistic dimension**: besides a succession of logical operations and thinking processes, it is a set of linguistic means (lexical choices with argumentative orientation, sentences linked through connectors, topoi, assumptions, inferences), a **communication dimension**: it refers to an audience and cannot be dissociated from the communication situation, a **dialogical and interactive dimension**: it must adapt to the audience, a **discursive-typological dimension**: it is a social institutionalized discursive genre, a **stylistic dimension**: it resorts to style's effects and figures of speech to impress the audience and a **textual dimension**: it is a textual construct based on binding processes that determine its development. [6 p31]

From a social and psychological perspective, the act of argumentation is defined as “a set of techniques (conscious or unconscious) of legitimating beliefs and behaviors that seek to influence, transform and strengthen the beliefs and behaviors” while, for linguists, argumentation is considered “the construction of a discursive representation belonging to an enunciator (...) who intends to change the representation of an interlocutor on an object of a given discourse”. [7 p62]

Linguistic approaches oscillate between considering it as a primary value of the language [8] or as a complementary value to the descriptive-

informative dimension of the language [9 p121], basing in essence on the relation between reasoning and its linguistic expression, by highlighting the illocutionary aspect of the act of argumentation. For some authors, argumentation is reduced to a theoretically limited combination of logical-linguistic processes that appear to be independent of psychology or history. [10 p38] If for Dutch school argumentation is a dialogic process of solving verbal confrontations, for French theorists O. Ducrot and J.C. Anscombe, the argumentation study focuses on the projective capacity of utterances, namely, their argumentative orientation materialized at the level of expression, through argumentative operators and pragmatic connectors. [8]

In the field of Romanian research, the extensive studies dedicated to the argumentation lie in the continuation of the French tradition of discourse analysis, with an emphasis on the argumentative operators and connectors [11] or the tradition of discursive logic, following the Toulmin's argument model [12].

### **Political discourse, presidential speech.**

It is widely accepted that the rhetorical elements of political discourse refer to persuasion, being parts of a more complex approach - social interaction: "politics is `talk` or human interaction. Such interaction may be formal or informal, verbal or nonverbal, public or private but it is always persuasive, forcing us consciously or subconsciously to interpret, evaluate and act". [7] Inevitably, the political discourse also has an action dimension. In terms of Aristotle, "the purpose of politics is not knowledge but action", being temporally oriented towards the future, judging in relation to the past, and praising or blaming the present actions. [13] Under these circumstances, the analysis of language or of political discourse requires an interdisciplinary approach: linguistic, rhetorical, political marketing, communication, social psychology, and political science, being at the same time a discourse that is historically and culturally contextualized.

In the last half of the twentieth century, linguistics took enormous strides, largely through the realization that language must be seen as an innate part of all human minds. From a linguistic perspective, the study of political discourse has seen an unprecedented extent over the last decades, often found in researches devoted to textual/discursive typologies (J.M. Adam, D. Maingueneau) [14, 15] in speech analysis (A. Reboul and J. Moeschler) [16] or in cognitivist approaches, with emphasis on conceptual metaphors in American presidential speeches (G. Lakoff, A. Cienki). [17, 18]

From the methodological point of view, in the European research area prevails statistical, lexicometric approaches in discourse studies, focused on word frequency analysis in political discourses, especially in the presidential speeches. Either being focused on the speeches of a single president: Fr. Mitterrand [19], either from the diachronic perspective or comparative analysis of the speeches of several French presidents: J. Chirac, Fr. Mitterrand, Ch. de Gaulle, G. Pompidou, V. Giscard d'Estaing [20]; Royal and Sarkozy [21], these lexicometric studies have highlighted real lexical 'profiles' of various heads of state: Ch. De Gaulle - the "guide," with the preference for words like *peuple*, *L'État*, *Algérie*, G Pompidou - the "humanist," opting for words like *civilization*, *bonheur*, *individu*, V. Giscard d'Estaing - "educator in a context of economic crisis of France" who preferred to use frequently *emploi*, *énergie*, *pétrole*, *problème*, or Fr. Mitterrand, heavily involved in the speech through pronominal forms of I st person sg., but also with a very high frequency of the word *Europe* in his speeches.

In the Romanian cultural space, the political discourse is approached through the prism of political communication (C. Sălăvăstru, A. Stoiciu) [22, 23], of the language and politics relation (R. Zafiu) [24], but also from pragmalinguistic's point of view, various genres of political discourse have been analyzed, as conferences and press statements of political leaders (L. Hoarță Cărăușu) [25], parliamentary debates (L. Ionescu – Ruxăndoiu) [26], presidential TV debates (R. Haineș, A. Niculescu- Gorpîn). [27, 28]

Unfortunately, there have been no substantial study devoted to the Romanian or Moldovan presidential speech, as a whole, or to a particular presidential mandate, perhaps due to the fact that there is no systematized text corpora, accessible to researchers, those several electronic format texts on Internet are insufficient for a large-scale study.

Generally speaking, the political discourse is less intended for the transmission of information, having as global specific instrument the argumentation and as outcome the persuasion, as was mentioned above:

“Political discourse always addresses the audience, more precisely, *its action*. In the name of achieving this goal, the entire discursive edifice is built around the argumentative strategy”. [29 p238]

## **New Year presidential address as a genre of political discourse. General features.**

Analyzing the New Year presidential address as a kind of political discourse it is necessary to note that it is characterized by its ritualistic nature

first of all. Ritual genres include inaugural address, anniversary speeches, traditional speeches of politicians, which are primarily focused on the ideas of integration and unity of the people. Such speeches are always distinguished by their emotional overtones, since their main purpose is the impact on audience. Ritualistic nature of the New Year address is explained also by other features: newsworthiness (namely, a special reason for this speech is a solemn event); temporal localization (television or radio broadcasting is usually conducted annually in a strictly fixed time); and a fixed form.

**The enunciation scene**<sup>2</sup> is composed, in this case, of an **englobing scene**: political discourse, a **generic scene**: New Year presidential address, and a **scenography** that includes a **chronography** and a fixed **topography**. At the same time, the enunciator enters a monological discourse (written text to be televised - read in front of the cameras), in a cultural setting dictated by the type of audience, being forced to conform to cultural and moral values of their own nation, that will always control the choice of premises.

In political discourse analysis, most studies are situated in the general framework of critical discourse analysis (CDA), aiming at uncovering the hierarchical social relationships and hidden political intensions. Quite a lot of research has been done on political talk shows, news interviews, and election campaigns. However, a comprehensive survey of mainstream discourse study journals and paper collections shows that the study of festival messages delivered by political leaders is a scarcely explored area. Some of the contributions found are C. Sauer's [31] article on Christmas messages, who investigated the multimodal quality of Christmas messages on TV by several heads of European states, by using a functional-pragmatic and semiotic approach. Other related researches are: C. Pineira-Tresmontant's [32] article on the New Year's Messages of the King of Spain, Juan Carlos, from 1975-2000, C. Biris's [7] paper on Romanian presidents, A.R. Alikberova et al. [33] on the material of Chinese President Hu Jintao and Xi Jinping.

---

<sup>2</sup> These terms are borrowed from D. Maingueneau: „La *scene d'enonciation* integre en fait trois scenes, que je propose d'appeler *scene englobante*, *scene generique* et *scenographie*. La scene englobante correspond au type de discours, elle donne son statut pragmatique au discours: litteraire, religieux, philosophique... La scene generique est celle du contrat attache a un genre, a une *institution discursive*: l'editorial, le sermon, le guide turistique, la visite medicale... Quant a la scenographie, elle n'est pas imposee par le genre, elle est construite par le texte lui-meme: un sermon peut etre enonce a travers une scenographie professorale, prophetique, etc.”. [30 p82-83]

All these studies have highlighted that New Year messages do form an independent genre because of their shared communicative functions, relatively fixed generic structure (formal opening/ salutation at the end of the year, evaluation, appeal to past events and an analysis of the present situation, *peroratio*: what to do in the future and a traditional farewell: congratulations, wishes), and salient lexical-grammatical features.

Starting from the following functional definition of the argumentative discourse: “through an argumentative discourse it is intended to influence the opinions, attitudes, behaviors of an interlocutor or a target audience, making a statement (conclusion) to be credible and acceptable, which, through various ways, it is based on another (argument / information / reasoning)”. [9 p112], we can assume that the presidential messages are inherently argumentative speeches. A series of features make us to notice a considerable similarity of it to a preach text: preexisting ethos endowed with institutional authority and dominated by persuasive intent, strong intertextual markings, oscillation between solemn and accessible, but also continuity (it is included into a series of sermons / messages of a single author: priest or president) and cyclicity.

The New Year's presidential message thus becomes a predictable speech, a synthesis of elements of political culture, of the fundamental myths of a nation, and of the most important events from the past and present. At the same time, the presidential message is not a prototypical political discourse because of the multiple constraints to which it is subjected: **the context of performance** (it does not allow for a strictly political, ideological discourse), **the short duration**, **the fixed structure**, and **the institutional authority** of the enunciator. The mandatory construction of the presidential message on a *doxa*<sup>3</sup> makes it a discourse with "expected" elements: facts, truths and universal values in sociological terms.

Although it has the same key function of any presidential message: defining the social reality, the New Year address characterized as a "weak" political text, relatively free of doctrinal elements and full of personalized elements, but without being completely free of ideologies<sup>4</sup>, which appear in

---

<sup>3</sup> We understand by *doxa* both discursive assemblies, social discourses, but also particular logistic-discursive forms: topoi, ideas, stereotypes: "Le savoir partagé et les représentations sociales constituent donc le fondement de toute argumentation". (6 p99)

<sup>4</sup> The term is borrowed from M. Angenot: "Nous appelons *ideologeme* toute maxime, sous-jacente à un énoncé, dont le sujet circonscrit un champ de pertinence particulier (que ce soit la *valeur morale*, le *Juif*, la *mission de la France* ou l'*instinct maternel*). Ces sujets sont déterminés et définis uniquement par l'ensemble des maximes ou le système idéologique leur permet de figurer. Leur statut opinable s'identifie à la confirmation d'une représentation sociale qu'ils permettent d'opérer. Si les lieux les plus généraux attirent le plus volontiers notre attention, il y



certain paragraphs with a strong connotation, such as those relating to history or traditions, because the discourse must resonate with a certain way of the world, of the reality's representation.

## **New Year presidential address as “weak” argumentative discourse. Results and Discussions.**

According to Ch. Plantin, the quality of an argumentative discourse is judged by two criteria: the effectiveness and the truth:

“La norme argumentative est l'efficacite: le discours *bien argumente* est celui qui fait bien faire, qu'il s'agite de faire faire, et non pas de faire croire. Les categories de la persuasion, de la verite, de la croyance ou de la conviction sont ici subordonnees aux problematique du faire”. [35 p19]

”La norme argumentative este la verite. L'argumentation assure la conversation et la decouverte du vrai”. [*ibid*]

Looking at the analyzed speeches from our corpus in the light of these criteria, we find that we are facing some argumentative discourses with reduced effectiveness, on the one hand, because of the quality of the arguments: subjective-evaluative premises (the year X was good / hard etc., we had a good/bad governance etc.), purely factual arguments, which are not selected from the immediate sphere of interest of the audience<sup>5</sup>, uncertain illocutionary effect (due to the moment of enunciation), and on the other hand, because of its argumentative structure, which is excessively simplified: conclusion - inferences - premises, probably due to the duration restriction.

A New Year presidential address is built in a similar order: a conclusion (a prosperous year is ending) – *because*: factual arguments - premises: government measures. In most cases, an evaluative judgment (the positive balance at year-end) is factually justified by political measures and actions, the shift from conclusion to premises being made through a series of arguments rather than by inferences. The premises of this type of speech are explicit in most cases because they are part of a more complex social act, that of legitimation.

---

a neanmoins un interet indeniable a l'examen de lieux plus particuliers qui prevalent dans diverses societies et qui permettent de les caracteriser”. [34 p24]

<sup>5</sup> It is considered that public opinion is mainly concerned with family, job, quality of life, and less with the actual political actions or economic outcomes, tending to have a simplified or stereotyped picture about politics. Consequently, it is very unlikely that anyone would have followed all the political evolutions throughout the year in order to validate the punctual arguments of political nature.

In turn, arguments and argumentative judgments are evaluated on the basis of three criteria, in terms of material correctness: the criterion of *veracity* - the arguments are evaluated by real judgments, the criterion of *sufficiency* - there are sufficient arguments to substantiate the thesis, and the criterion of *acceptability* - the arguments are accepted by the audience. [12 p239]. If we relate the arguments put forward by the presidential addresses to these criteria, we will notice that the criterion of acceptability is usually not met: the argument of an effective governing act, beneficial one from economic / political / social point of view is usually contestable, as not being a "necessary truth" on one hand, or one shared by the whole community, on the other hand, aspect, by the way, also admitted by the enunciators:

*"The year 2015 has shown that the natural enthusiasm that we have gone through in terms of European integration achievements must be transformed into concrete actions of public climate reinvigoration, of corruption eradication, including political one, and elimination of society division". (PANT)*

*"I wish with all my heart that these expectations would be achieved. To a great extent, the welfare and happiness of the citizens depend on the country's governing, it depends on those who have the obligation to maintain the economic growth, ensure social cohesion, develop villages, roads, agriculture, and the country". (PAID)*

*"Not all Romanians enjoyed the fruits of economic growth this year. For many of you the cost of public services, food and medicine makes the holidays to be less happy and your life much harder. In many regions of the country, the life of people in our villages is still difficult". (PAII)*

*"But we cannot talk about progress without considering the neediest among us. The retired persons, families with many children and jobless ones". (PAEC)*

Addressing a universal audience, the presidential message must select those facts from the reality that are known and accepted by everyone, but which also legitimize, at the same time, the political decisions of a government. This desideratum is quite impossible to achieve because there are no facts to which the audience can react favorably (given its sociological heterogeneity) and be accepted from a political and ideological point of view, fact that is impossible in a democratic society, which presupposes the plurality of opinions. In solving these contradictions, one will opt for commonly accepted arguments and for attenuation by *pathos* elements

addressed to those segments of the audience that might react unfavorably to certain arguments.

This study reveals that although the argumentative value of the utterance prevails over informative value of the New Year addresses, this type of discourse includes less elements of strong argumentation: the absence of argumentative operators and the low repertoire of topoi attributes this genre of discourse to "weak" argumentativeness [7].

The structure of the messages is modified by abandoning the argumentative strategy and by the option for desiderative-volitive modalization of the statements: *I want to address them; I wish you health; my wish is ...; I wish with all my heart that ...*, even though the "canonical" opening and closing formulas are preserved. Maybe the "weak" argumentativeness of the New Year presidential addresses has prompted this strategy change, by which the message is better suited to the context of the enunciation and the audience.

The presidential speech analysis conducted so far (lexicometric and rhetorical) has revealed, as expected, the predominance of some key words such as *homeland, country, nation, people*, etc., and the presence of constant references to topics such as *history* and *tradition*, the intention to continue work for the common good / homeland, the evocation of historical figures or the emphasis on the importance of the presidential institution.

Presidential New Year's addresses offered by the analyzed presidents are no exception to these peculiarities, they share common use of key words: *Republic of Moldova, citizens of the same country - Moldova, native country, loved ones and close relatives* (PAID); *country, our fellow citizens, our people* (PANT), *Romania, a prosperous Romania, this country, your country, the people, the nation, the Romanians, the Romanian people, the generations of Romanians, our ancestors* (PAEC) or *the Romanian nation, citizens of Romania* (PAII).

Topicalization is always in favor of the present and of the actions to be taken in the future:

*"Now our thoughts go towards the coming year, 2017. It is like a new page that we are going to open and from which we expect good things and happy changes".* (PAID)

The negative constructions are used only when an exception to the argument is signaled, being employed rather with the intention of encouraging:

*"Let us continue the European path, not to distort it by pompous statements".* (PANT)

*“Let's not forget that our nation was glorified through diligence and kindness”.*  
(PAID)

*“It is not an easy task and that is why I call on all responsible political forces, the social partners, civil society, to assume their responsibilities and to work together for the success of these projects”.* (PAEC).

References to the present may be negative, as noticed in the case of PAEC and of PAID, possible because the president's job is to think about those policy measures that are intended to improve the situation. In the rest of the text, positive references appear which, through position of preeminence, emphasize the idea of action in the service of the people:

*“We have managed to avoid each of these dangers and have been able to take every opportunity to affirm ourselves and defend our national interest”.* (PAEC)

*“We want to increase the efficiency of the central and local government. Civil servants have the duty to serve the public interest, to show professionalism and efficiency for the benefit of citizens”.* (PAII)

Perlocutionary acts are mostly indirect in the addresses under analysis:

*“If we take things seriously and with responsibility, we will succeed in having stability, and a government with full powers”.* (PANTI)

*“The life of each of us in the new year will change for the better if we love our native country, if we respect each other, if we take care of our loved ones”.*(PAID)

*“We need to be aware that only working more efficiently and smarter, more sustained, we will live better”.* (PAII)

*“The future that opens its doors to us tonight belongs to those who believe in honor, respect, to those who refuse to lie and deceive, to those who refuse to be lied and stolen. It is a future of well-thought, well-done and well-paid, be it a peasant, a worker, an entrepreneur, or an intellectual”.* (PAEC)

It is about a so called filter of efficiency [5]. In this case, because the simple statement does not entail the performance of the actions, the festive communication and situational context diminishes the attention of the receiver, the effect is obtained and by the attenuation of the performative verbs through the use of modal markers. The sequence of relative forms is

also used for the restriction of action, imposing conditions for success. The performance of speech acts indirectly corresponds to a politeness strategy, because the symbol of authority in a state should address to the nation on equal basis, and of course because this type of discourse implies rather invitations that requires response and not action itself.

The use of construction with an epistemic modal adverb (of certainty), *desigur* (*certainly*), anticipates possible counter-arguments in an imagined dialogue:

*“Of course, we still have a lot to do together so that all of our state institutions work the way we want”.* (PAEC)

In Emil Constantinescu's address, these constructions of epistemic modality of certainty expressed by modal verbs or adverbs are very frequent:

*“Certainly, this symbolic boundary of the calendar finds the mankind under a rapid change, and the meaning of this change is a positive one”.* (PAEC)

*“I firmly believe we will be at the height of the history of the third millennium. I believe in a prosperous Romania built on the welfare and happiness of each of us”.* (PAEC)

The epistemic modal „*poate*” (English equivalent - *maybe, probably, possibly*) is used to close a key passage of the speech, emphasizing a speculative-evaluative judgment:

*”This sentiment of security is the greatest gain of this end of the century and millennium. Maybe too big to see it. Maybe too close to feel it. Maybe too deep to enjoy it”.* (PAEC)

The deontic modality is characteristic for the New Year address of the Romanian president I. Iliescu and Moldovan president N. Timofti:

*“It has not been easy for us so far, but we are obliged to consolidate and continue these positive tendencies from the economy and the society’s life”.* (PAII)

*“We have to be aware that only working more efficiently and smarter, more sustained, we will all live better. Citizens of Romania have every right to aspire to more prosperity and happiness for themselves and their families”.* (PAII)

*“The entire political class must bend the ear to your wishes. The Year 2015 has shown that the natural enthusiasm that we have gone through in terms of European path achievements must be transformed into concrete actions”.* (PANT)

The comparative of superiority is quite often used by the president I. Iliescu as it can be noticed from the above examples, but it also characteristic for president I. Dodon address who preferred to use it in a direct relationship with exhortative statements in which the urge to act is indirectly suggested by volitive modals:

*“Direct voting made this function more legitimate and more responsible”; “I wish the coming year to bring you more joy, more achievements, more warmth from the close ones”; “Let us be more understanding and generous with each other”. (PAID)*

## Conclusions

In the case of the analyzed addresses, we observe the same polarization that divides the president's speech into two different axes: past and future, from a historical perspective marked by imagologic stereotypes: the tumultuous, heroic past: "of resistance against great empires" (PAEC); political one: "I wish that disappointments and failures have remained in the past ..." (PANT); prosperous future: "I hope very much that the coming year, 2017, will be for all our people a year of peace and well-being" (PAID); vs. recent difficult present-past: "we are now finishing a very hard year and a troubled decade" (PAEC); "as it was, with good and evil, with ups and downs, with loss and gain" (PAID).

A “maniheist” orientation, on an axis of pluses and minuses from the act of governing arranges the address of president Ion Iliescu, in which two lexical series are developed: the one of success/ achievements, *with encouraging economic prospects, consolidated economy, new foreign investments* etc., and that of failure, with the succession of "necessities", built through a series of action nouns and infinitive forms: *to increase the people welfare, strengthening the social solidarity, duty to serve the public interest, to prove professionalism and efficiency, maintaining the rule of law*, etc.

The New Year presidential address proves to be a type of political discourse whose schematic structure is canonical, in which the argumentative strategies with explicit or implicit premises preserve the epideictic character, in which arguments are permanently developed or evaluated, the counter-arguments being very rare, persuasion by arguments remains, thus, a characteristic feature, regardless of the enunciator. It is a discourse of legitimation and credibility, organized on a simple metadiscursive scheme: the evaluative judgment argued by bringing facts. Although we are talking about a fixed structure discourse, the following developments on a modal scale have been identified: deontic and civic

orientation (in case of PANT and PAII), epistemic and aesthetic orientation (PAEC) and the perspective of changing the "tradition" through a desiderative -volitive speech (in case of PAID).

Although the political argumentation should observe certain norms, it has the freedom to assume all social areas, being extremely varied from contents point of view, the speakers who use it, the ideologies that are promoted, or the audience for which it is intended.

## References

---

- [1] Azizullah M, Zohreh R. & Eslami F. Exploring rhetorical discursive practices of Rouhani's presidential campaign and victory of his prudence and hope key: a discourse of persuasion. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. [Internet]. 2017 (cited 2017 Apr 21). (1). 161-182. Available from: [file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/15410-15099-1-PB%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/15410-15099-1-PB%20(2).pdf)
- [2] Vesnic-Alujevic L. Communicating with voters by blogs? Campaigning for the 2009 European Parliament elections. *Discourse & Communication*. 2011.5 (4). pp. 413-428
- [3] Charteris-Black J. *Politicians and rhetoric: The Persuasive power of metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 2011. p. 370
- [4] Cornillie B, & Pietrandrea P. Modality at work. Cognitive, interactional and textual functions of modal markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*. [Internet]. 2012 in feb. (cited 2017 May 19). Available from: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00665337/document>
- [5] Plantin Ch. Argumentation studies and discourse analysis: the French situation and global perspective. *Discourse studies*. 2002. 4 (3). pp. 343-368
- [6] Amossy R. *L'argumentation dans le discours*. Paris: Armand Colin; 2006. p. 275
- [7] Biriş G. Mesajul prezidențial de anul nou-discurs argumentativ „slab”. [New Year presidential message – “weak” argumentative discourse]. *Discurs, Limbaj, Context, Societate*. Universitatea din Craiova. 2010. pp. 61-78
- [8] Ducrot O, & Anscombe JC. *L'argumentation dans la langue*. Bruxelles: Pierre Mardaga. 1983. p. 184
- [9] Adam J. M. *Textele. Tipuri și prototipuri*. Texts. Types and prototypes. Iași: Institutul European; (2009). p. 262
- [10] Robrieux J. J. *Rhétorique et argumentation*. Paris: Armand Colin. 2010. p. 267
- [11] Tuțescu M. *L'argumentation*. București: EUB. 2005. p. 424
- [12] Sălăvăstru C. *Teoria și practica argumentării*. [Theory and practice of argumentation]. Iași: Polirom. 2003. p. 416
- [13] Aristotel. *Retorica*. [Translation by Andreiș C, Maței Ș. București:IRI; 2004. p. 464

- [14] Adam J. M. La linguistique textuelle. Introduction à l'analyse textuelle des discours. Paris: Armand Colin. 2005. p. 234
- [15] Maingueneau D. L'analyse du discours et ses frontières. Marges linguistiques. 2005 May. [cited 2017 Apr 14]. No.9. pp. 64-75. Available from:[http://www.revue-texto.net/Parutions/Marges/00\\_ml092005.pdf](http://www.revue-texto.net/Parutions/Marges/00_ml092005.pdf)
- [16] Reboul A, & Moeschler J. Pragmatique du discours. De l'interprétation de l'énoncé à l'interprétation du discours. Paris:Armand Colin. 1998. p. 220
- [17] Lakoff G. Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify the Gulf War. 1991 Jan. [cited 2017 Mar 18]. Available from:  
<https://georgelakoff.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/metaphor-and-war-the-metaphor-system-used-to-justify-war-in-the-gulf-lakoff-1991.pdf>
- [18] Cienki A. Metaphor in the "Strict Father" and "Nurturant Parent". Cognitive models: Theoretical issues raised in an empirical study. Cognitive Linguistics. 2005 Jul, 16 (2). pp. 279- 312
- [19] Hubert T, & Labbe D. 1990. La répartition des mots dans le vocabulaire présidentiel. Mots. 1990. 22 (22). pp. 80-92
- [20] Mayaffre D. Paroles de president. Jacques Chirac (1995-2003) et le discours présidentiel sous la V<sup>e</sup> République. Paris: H. Champion. 2004. p. 291
- [21] Boicu R. Dezbateră electorală televizată. Royal și Sarkozy în finală. [TV election debate. Royal and Sarkozy in the final round]. București: Ars Docendi. 2012. p. 353
- [22] Sălăvăstru C. Discursul puterii. [The discourse of power]. Iași: Institutul European. 1999. p. 358
- [23] Stoiciu A. Comunicarea politică. Cum se vând idei și oameni. [Political communication. How ideas and people are sold] București: Libra. 2000. p. 278
- [24] Zafiu R. Limbaj și politică. [Language and Politics]. București: Editura Universității. 2007. p. 285
- [25] Hoarță Cărăușu L. Strategii argumentative în discursul politic românesc actual. [Argumentative strategies in the current Romanian political discourse]. Analele Universității „Ștefan cel Mare”. Seria Filologie, A. Lingvistica. 2007. XIII (1). pp. 23-32
- [26] Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu L. Perspectivă și modalizare în discursul politic – studiu de caz.[Perspective and modalization in the political discourse]. Limba română: teme actuale. Actele celui de-al 8-lea colocviu al Catedrei de Limba Română. Univ. din București. 2009. pp. 271-277.
- [27] Haineș R. Televiziunea și reconfigurarea politicului. Studii de caz: alegerile prezidențiale din România din anii 1996 și 2000. [Television and the reconfiguration of politics. Case Studies: Romanian presidential elections from 1996 and 2000]. Iași: Polirom. 2002. p. 298
- [28] Niculescu-Gorpin A. De ce Eu? Pronumele personale în discursul politic. [Why I? Personal pronoun in the political discourse]. Limba română: teme actuale. Actele celui de al 8-lea Colocviu al Catedrei de limba română. Univ. din București. 2009. pp. 333-343.



- [29] Neșu N. Specificul strategiei argumentative în discursul politic. [The specific of the argumentative strategy in the political discourse]. Dacoromania [Internet]. 2002-2003 [cited 2017 May 18]; VII - VIII: 231-238. Available from: [http://www.dacoromania.inst-puscariu.ro/articole/2002-2003\\_17.pdf](http://www.dacoromania.inst-puscariu.ro/articole/2002-2003_17.pdf)
- [30] Maingueneau D. Ethos, scénographie, incorporation. Amossy R. 1999. pp. 75-100.
- [31] Sauer C. Christmas messages by heads of state: Multimodality and media adaptations. Fetzer A.& Lauerbach G. E. (eds.). Political Discourse in the Media: Cross-cultural Perspectives. 2007. pp. 227-273
- [32] Pineira-Tresmontant C. Persuasion ou tradition, la communication du roi d'Espagne. Boix Christian ed. 2007. pp. 175-203
- [33] Alikberova A.R., Vukadinovich S. I, & Nurmieva R. R. New Year Address as a genre of political discourse: political and linguistic research (on the material of Chinese president Hu Jintao and Xi Jinping). Journal of Sustainable Development. 2015. 8 (5). pp. 80-85.
- [34] Angenot M. Présupposé, topos, idéologème. Études françaises. 1977. 13(1-2). pp. 11-34
- [35] Plantin Ch. L'argumentation. Paris:Seuil. 1996. p. 93

### **Corpus:**

New Year Address by President of the Republic of Moldova, Nicolae Timofti, December 31, 2015. Available from: <http://www.presedinte.md/rom/presa/mesajul-de-revelion-al-presedintelui-nicolae-timofti>

New Year Address by President of the Republic of Moldova, Igor Dodon, December 31, 2016. Available from: <http://presedinte.md/rom/presedinte/video/page:13>

New Year Address by President of Romania, Emil Constantinescu, December 31, 1999. Available from: [http://old.presidency.ro/pdf/date\\_arhiva/6407\\_ro.pdf](http://old.presidency.ro/pdf/date_arhiva/6407_ro.pdf)

New Year Address by President of Romania, Ion Iliescu, December 31, 2002. Available from: [http://old.presidency.ro/pdf/date\\_arhiva/4543\\_ro.pdf](http://old.presidency.ro/pdf/date_arhiva/4543_ro.pdf)