

UDC81'42=811.111

**“THE SPEECH THAT STUNNED EUROPE”:
VERBAL EFFECTS
PRODUCED BY U.S. VICE PRESIDENT
J.D. VANCE’S 2025 ADDRESS IN MUNICH**

Serhiy Potapenko

*Kyiv National Linguistic University,
73, Velyka Vasylkivska Str., Kyiv, Ukraine, 03150
serhiy.potapenko@knlu.edu.ua*

Vasyl Andriyko

*Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman,
54/1, Beresteysky Prospect, Kyiv, Ukraine, 03057
andriyko_vasyl@kneu.edu.ua*

The paper applies the “transforming the idea into effect” procedure to explain the mismatch between the European media negative impressions of the U.S. vice president J. D. Vance’s 2025 speech in Munich and his intended idea of *shared values*. This procedure reveals that negative verbal effects are triggered by three types of cognitive linguistic structures. They comprise morphosyntactic constructions, treated as unity of form and meaning entrenched in the human mind, different degrees of their textual salience, their link to image schemas positioning humans relative to the environment. It is found that the vice president’s speech falls into two – cumulative and accusing– sections. The former picks faults with European leaders posed as the target of the speaker’s compulsion to stop their blocking the population’s freedom of speech. The accusing section portrays the European leaders as the source of democracy crisis and confrontation with the population.

Key words: verbal effect, “transforming the idea into effect” procedure, morphosyntactic construction, salience, image schema, speech, U. S. vice president J. D. Vance.

Introduction. The speech by J. D. Vance, the American vice president, delivered at the security conference in Munich on 14 February 2025, has triggered mixed reactions in Europe as the media headlines suggest. The vice president and his address are characterized by the noun *blast*, e.g. *JD Vance’s blast at Europe* [4], by the adjectives *blunt*, e.g. *JD Vance Delivers Blunt Statements* [3], and *blistering*, e.g. *Vance turns on European allies in blistering speech* [18]. Those headlines express negative assessment of the speech: the noun *blast* denotes strong criticism [11], i.e. remarks that say what you think is bad about someone or something [14]. Besides negative emotions are evoked by the adjectives *blistering*, referring to very critical remarks expressing anger and disapproval [12], and *blunt* with the meaning of speaking in

an honest way even if this upsets people [13], while *upset* refers to somebody unhappy and worried [16]. The appeal to emotions also underlies the headlines with the verb *stun* defined as to surprise or upset someone [14]. The verb's strong emotional appeal results in its use to characterize J.D. Vance's speech from three perspectives: the addresser's, e.g. *JD Vance stuns Munich* [22], the address proper, e.g. *The Speech That Stunned Europe* [17], the audience's, e.g. *European leaders, media stunned* [2].

The overall impression of the speech is summed up by the negative construction '*not acceptable*' in the headline *Pistorius: Vance speech 'not acceptable'* [7].

Consequently, **the research question** of this paper is how the verbal effects of J. D. Vance's address trigger the negative attitude of the European media.

Methodology. The analysis of verbal effects, produced by J. D. Vance's 2025 address in Munich, draws on the "transforming the idea into effect" procedure. It reveals how a belief named in the beginning of a speech transforms into verbal effects, i.e. practical outcomes, created by cognitive linguistic means. With this in mind, the paper focuses on the mismatch between the negative impressions of the speech outlined in the introduction above and the reasonable main idea of *shared values* announced in the first lines of the vice president's address.

The procedure of "transforming the idea into effect" draws on three cognitive linguistic structures contributing to the creation of the impressions a speech produces: morphosyntactic constructions, figure – ground alignment, and image schemas.

Morphosyntactic constructions are perceived by the addressee as any fixed combinations of form and function or form and meaning entrenched into human long-term memory [8, p. 4–5]. The constructions are represented by a number of linguistic units belonging to the morphological and syntactic language levels, namely by words, morphemes, idioms, syntactic structures [8, p. 9]. Being memorized by language users as fixed entities referring to stable relations, morphosyntactic constructions produce more impact on the addressee than word combinations concocted on the spur of the moment. Structurally, the constructions are divided into two principal elements: substantive, with a stable phonological form, and dependent, or schematic, representing a slot which can be filled in with variable elements [8, p. 5]. In the constructions *all of us* and *all of our countries*, the substantive element is expressed by the pronoun *all* with the preposition *of* while the schematic, i.e. changeable, slots are filled in by the pronoun *us* and the nominal construction *our countries*. With respect to their structure, constructions are divided into Subject – Predicate, prepositional, subordinate; from the perspective of their meaning, they fall into modal and transitive; from the viewpoint of their function, they can be naming [1, p. 72].

The textual role of some constructions in creating verbal effects is subordinated to the figure-ground alignment underlying the perception of physical objects. In this opposition, the figure is viewed as the most salient entity in a given configuration while the ground has secondary prominence [20, p. 128]. In a speech, the figure is associated with the beginning of an utterance and can be regarded as an attraction position since it draws the attention of the addressee to particular content while the ground can be considered as a keeping position aimed at holding the addressee's attention. This study relates the figure to the fronted linguistic elements, occurring in the subject position of an utterance, while the ground coincides with

the predicative elements of a sentence, e.g. *And, you know, one of the things that I wanted to talk about today is, of course, our shared values* [17]. In the cited utterance, the attraction position is filled in by the subject group of the main clause and the subordinate clause attached to it: *one of the things that I wanted to talk about today is*. The ground is represented by the predicative construction *our shared values*.

The next step of revealing verbal effects consists in using image schemas, i.e. preconceptual mental structures constituting the basis of the human conceptual systems [6, p. 180] since they model the simplest – organism-environment – interactions [10, p. 19]. With respect to the relations between the body and the environment, the 27 initial image schemas [9, p. 127] can be grouped into five sets: bodily, perceptual, spatial, kinetic, and those for force.

The bodily schemas split into FAR – NEAR, LEFT – RIGHT, FRONT – BACK, UP – DOWN. Perceptual schemas, representing images obtained from a varying distance, fall into MASS – COLLECTION – COUNT – OBJECT. Spatial schemas are divided into OBJECT – SURFACE – CONTAINER – CONTENT. The kinetic schemas, differing in the location of the initial and final points of motion, comprise PATH, CIRCLE, and VERTICALITY. The schemas for force represent the relations of source, vector and target in terms of COUNTERFORCE, ENABLEMENT, ATTRACTION, COMPULSION, BLOCKAGE, DIVERSION, DISABLEMENT, RESTRAINT REMOVAL [9, p. 46].

Image schemas as preconceptual embodied structures underlying meaning can explain varying semantics based on three and more semantic elements. It additionally reveals that relating verbal effects to figure and ground is only applicable to characterizing utterances comprising two constituents while actional statements require a division into three positions: attracting, keeping and nudging. The units in the attracting position are meant to draw the addressee’s attention to a particular referent, in the keeping position they support the addressee’s grabbed attention characterizing the source of activity while the nudging units are supposed to alter the receiver’s behaviour in a predictable way without forbidding any option [21, p. 8], e.g. *We may disagree with your views, but we will fight to defend your right to offer it in the public square* [17]. In the first clause *We may disagree with your views* the attraction position is filled in by the pronoun *we*, representing the source of COUNTERFORCE, defined as two equally strong centres colliding face-to-face with the result that neither can go anywhere [9, p. 46]; the keeping location with the predicate *may disagree* refers to the force vector; the nudging option is filled in by the construction *with your views*. Similarly, in the clause *we will fight to defend your right to offer it in the public square* the attraction is filled in by the inclusive pronoun *we*, uniting those present as the source of activity; in the keeping position the predicate *fight* holds the addressee’s attention evoking the COUNTERFORCE vector while in the nudging the construction *to defend your right to offer it in the public square* refers to BLOCKAGE, defined as a force vector encountering a barrier and then taking any number of possible directions [9, p. 45].

To sum up, the “transforming the idea into effect” procedure aimed at uncovering the verbal effects produced by speeches employs three cognitive linguistic structures with contribute to the creation of impressions. The structures comprise morphosyntactic constructions, which being unities of form and meaning entrenched in human memory, evoke relations familiar to the addressee; the three-partite division of utterances into drawing, keeping and nudging

positions to render differences in the salience of verbal units; image schemas, representing varying aspects of body-environment interaction and differentiating the statuses of referents related to the source, vector, and target of different forces.

Results and Discussion. The principal ideas, implemented in J. D. Vance's speech, are outlined in the Introduction and developed in two main sections: cumulative, stockpiling negative facts about the European leaders, and accusing, bringing charges against them.

Introducing the main idea. The main idea offered at the beginning of the speech is that of *shared values* underlying the organization of the rest of the text (1):

(1) *And, you know, one of the things that I wanted to talk about today is, of course, our shared values<...>[17].*

In addition to dwelling on *shared values*, the Introduction addresses the Munich inhabitants (2) who suffered from a terrorist attack on the eve of the conference and in such a way lays the ground for positioning the vice president as the envoy of European population. The inhabitants are referred to via the zoom-in procedure:

(2) *I've been so impressed by the hospitality of the people <...>. And I've always loved the city of Munich, and I've always loved its people <...>. Our thoughts and prayers are with Munich and everybody affected by the evil <...>. We're thinking about you, we're praying for you, and we will certainly be rooting for you in the days and weeks to come [17].*

Appealing to the Munich inhabitants (2), the vice president fronts to the attraction positions of separate utterances the pronoun *I* repeated twice, the constructions *our thoughts and prayers* and *we're thinking*. The nudges of the utterances are filled in by several constructions with the noun *people*. First, the vice president zooms-in on the Munich inhabitants by the definite construction *the people*; second, he expresses his love for them by the possessive construction *its people*; third, the pronoun *everybody* zooms-in on the separate victims of the Munich tragedy. Finally, the pronoun *you* addresses the victims and their relatives directly.

The two main ideas of the Introduction to the speech, concerning shared values and people, receive further development in the main sections of the text.

Cumulative section of J. D. Vance's speech: Finding faults with European leaders. The beginning of the cumulative section rests on the antithesis between two types of threat the European Union faces – external and internal (3):

(3) (3a) *We gather at this conference, of course, to discuss security. And normally, we mean threats to our external security. <...>*

(3b) *But while the Trump administration is very concerned with European security <...> the threat that I worry the most about <...> it's not any other external actor. And what I worry about is the threat from within, the retreat of Europe from some of its most fundamental values – values shared with the United States of America.*

(3c) *Now, I was struck that a former European commissioner went on television recently and sounded delighted that the Romanian government had just annulled an entire election. <...>*

(3d) *<...> For years, we've been told that everything we fund and support is in the name of our shared democratic values [17].*

The units, fronted to the attraction positions of separate paragraphs in (3), zoom-in on the conference participants in the following order: all of them are united by the inclusive *we* (3a);

the American global actor is singled out by the construction *the Trump administration* (3b); its representative, J. D. Vance, is identified by the personal pronoun *I* (3c). All the distinguished actors, named in the attraction positions of those three paragraphs, are contrasted with a onetime European politician identified by the construction *a former European commissioner* in the keeping position of (3c). His status is lowered by the indefinite description, the adjective *former*, and by leaving out his name.

In accordance with the theme of the conference, the units in the keeping positions of the utterances in (3) refer to security from different perspectives: overall, by the noun *security* (3a), directional, by the construction *external security* (3a), and local, by the construction *European security* (3b). The *shared values* as the main idea of the speech are identified in the keeping positions of the utterances by the constructions *some fundamental values* (3b); *values shared with the United States* (3b), *our shared democratic values* (3d). The attributes characterize those values as *fundamental*, *shared*, and *democratic* with the following subsections dwelling on them in detail and picking faults with European leaders. Consequently, this section further splits into three subsections dealing with security, the main topic of the conference; shared values, indicated in the Introduction to the speech; democracy as one of those values.

Fault one of the European leaders: Mere talk about democratic values. The security subsection finds fault with the European leaders who, in the vice president’s view, fail to defend democracy which is expressed by a number of constructions:

(4) (4a) *Everything from our Ukraine policy to digital censorship is billed as a defense of democracy. <...> We ought to ask whether we’re holding ourselves to an appropriately high standard. <...> We must do more than talk about democratic values. We must live them.*

(4b) *Now, within living memory of many of you in this room, the Cold War positioned defenders of democracy against much more tyrannical forces on this continent. <...>*

(4c) *They lost because they neither valued nor respected all of the extraordinary blessings of liberty, the freedom to surprise, to make mistakes, to invent, to build [17].*

The attraction positions of the first two paragraphs in (4) are filled in by the constructions more or less neutral for the European ear: *from our Ukraine policy to digital censorship* (4a) and *the Cold War* (4b). The keeping positions have the constructions *a defence of democracy* (4a) and *defenders of democracy* (4b) which also sound quite neutral. However, the nudging parts of the utterances seem to be more intrusive for Europeans. The obligation modals in those positions refer to COMPULSION, which encodes an act of being moved by external forces [9, p. 47], raising J. D. Vance’s status: *we ought to ask; we must do more than talk; we must live them* (4a). The cited constructions position the speaker as the source of COMPULSION with the audience treated as the target which is hardly softened by the inclusive *we* meant to avoid the impression of ordering people about.

Fault two of the European leaders: Free speech in retreat. This subsection adds up new European faults in the realm of free speech emphasized by the construction *I look*, repeated five times in the attraction positions of separate utterances. The pronoun *I* refers to the speaker and the verb *look* underscores his personal experience to emphasize the evidentiality of the arguments:

(5) (5a) *And unfortunately, when I look at Europe today <...> it’s sometimes not so clear what happened to some of the Cold War’s winners.*

(5b) *I look to Brussels, where EU commissars warn citizens that they intend to shut down social media during times of civil unrest <...>.*

(5c) *Or to this very country, where police have carried out raids against citizens suspected of posting anti-feminist comments online <...>.*

(5d) *I look to Sweden, where, two weeks ago, the government convicted a Christian activist for participating in Quran burnings <...>.*

(5e) *And perhaps most concerningly, I look to our very dear friends, the United Kingdom <...>.*

(5f) *A little over two years ago, the British government charged Adam Smith-Connor, a 51-year-old physiotherapist and an army veteran, with the heinous crime of standing 50 meters from an abortion clinic <...> [17].*

Fault finding is mainly implemented in the nudging positions of (5) by the constructions with the verbs evoking BLOCKAGE to characterize the European authorities' actions: *to shut down social media* (5b); *raids against citizens* (5c); *convicted a Christian activist* (5d). The underlying BLOCKAGE schema represents the European leaders as its source with the targets covering the media, citizens and a Christian activist. Moreover, the vice president seems to indulge in misinformation through generalizations. He refers to all *EU commissars* (5b) instead of naming separate individuals and to the *German police* (5c) at large rather than naming particular units. He also accuses the Swedish and British governments of convicting (5d) and charging (5f) their citizens respectively while ignoring the European division of power into legislative, executive, and judicial.

How to do away with European faults: Vance's offer. The rather lengthy passage above (5) dealing with the European leaders' faults, which mainly consist in their lip service to democracy and blockage of freedom of speech, is followed by the suggestions of solving the problem which leaves an impression of being imposed on Europe (6):

(6) (6a) *So, I come here today not just with an observation but with an offer. And just as the Biden administration seemed desperate to silence people for speaking their minds <...>.*

(6b) *Now, again, we don't have to agree with everything or anything that people say, but <...> it is incumbent upon us to at least participate in dialogue with them [17].*

Strange to say, the vice president begins passage (6) putting the responsibility for all the freedom of speech faults on the Biden administration by the construction *to silence people* (6a) positioning the predecessors as the source of COMPULSION leveled against the population. Against this background, the speaker does not sound sincere: on the one hand, he views the people as the target of BLOCKAGE, using the negative construction *we don't have to agree* (6b), on the other hand, he turns to the open relations between the leadership and their subjects by the unit *participate in dialogue with them* (6b) evoking RESTRAINT REMOVAL, signalling an open way or path which makes possible the exertion of force [9, p. 46].

All in all, the cumulative section, collecting European leaders' faults, leaves a negative impression since it represents the audience as the target of the vice president's COMPULSION to change the state of things while the leaders are depicted as BLOCKAGE for the local population. This section lays the foundation for a more emotional accusing part.

Accusing section: Charging the European leadership. This section falls into two subsections focusing on the crisis of democracy and ignoring the local population.

Accusation one: Crisis of democracy of politicians’ own making. The effect, tended by the construction *crisis of democracy*, rests on the meaning of the noun *crisis* referring to multiple forces involved in an event [19, p. 65] with a result that there is no way out which evokes BLOCKAGE.

This subsection fronts the proper noun *Europe* and the pronoun *you* positioning the continent and its leaders as the targets of the crisis-BLOCKAGE of their own making:

(7) (7a) *Europe faces many challenges, but the crisis this continent faces right now, the crisis I believe we all face together, is one of our own making.*

(7b) *If you’re running in fear of your own voters, there is nothing America can do for you. <...>*

(7c) *You need democratic mandates to accomplish anything of value in the coming years. <...> But there is so much of value <...> that I think will come from being more responsive to the voices of your citizens.*

(7d) *If you’re going to enjoy competitive economies, if you’re going to enjoy affordable energy and secure supply chains, then you need mandates to govern <...>.*

(7e) *You cannot win a democratic mandate by censoring your opponents <...> [17].*

The first utterance (7a) is supposed to soften the vice president’s accusations against the European leaders by filling in the COUNTERFORCE slots evoked by the verb *face* by the units shifting crisis perception. While the first two uses of *face* (7a) position Europe as the target of COUNTERFORCE, its third occurrence (7a), associated with the inclusive pronoun *we*, shares the burden with the US: *the crisis I believe we all face together, is one of our own making* (7a).

The pronoun *you* in the attraction positions of the subsequent paragraphs (7b-e) addresses the European leaders accusing them of the dread of their population. All those charges are expressed by Subject-Predicate constructions opening separate paragraphs: *you need democratic mandates* (7c); *you need mandates to govern* (7d); *you cannot win a democratic mandate* (7e). In the cited constructions, the modal verbs *need* and *cannot* underscore the leaders’ disability while the complements in the nudging positions focus on the absence of the mandate to govern with the population assigned the roles of *voters* (7b), *citizens* (7c), *opponents* (7e). This contrast between the European leaders and their population underscored by the American vice president is sure to upset the media and politicians.

Accusation two: Ignoring European citizens. This subsection positions the vice president as the mouthpiece of the European population denoted by the construction *no voter on this continent* (8a), the pronoun *they* repeated four times to refer twice to all the Europeans (8a-b) and twice to Britons (8a) with all of them unified by the construction *the citizens of all nations* (8c):

(8) (8a) *No voter on this continent went to the ballot box to open the floodgates to millions of unvetted immigrants. But you know what they did vote for? In England, they voted for Brexit. <...> all over Europe, they’re voting for political leaders who promise to put an end to out-of-control migration. <...>*

(8b) *I just think that people care about their homes. They care about their dreams. They care about their safety and their capacity to provide for themselves and their children.*

(8c) *And they're smart. <...> the citizens of all of our nations don't generally think of themselves as educated animals or as interchangeable cogs of a global economy, and it's hardly surprising that they don't want to be shuffled about or relentlessly ignored by their leaders*[17].

In the keeping positions of separate utterances (8), the citizens of particular countries are characterized by *vote-*, *care-* and *think-*constructions. They tend to demonstrate that the vice president is more knowledgeable about the European citizens' aspirations than their leaders.

The *vote-*constructions bring forth the topic of Brexit by the question *But you know what they did vote for?* (8a) and by *they voted for Brexit* unit (8a) being further generalized by the mega-construction *they're voting for political leaders who promise to put an end to out-of-control migration* (8a). The *care-*constructions tend to open the European leaders' eyes to their citizens' aspirations, filling in the complement slots by the units *homes, dreams, safety, capacity to provide for themselves and their children* (8b). The *think-*constructions in the nudging positions of the utterances introduce negative units, evoking BLOCKAGE, to describe the Europeans' inner world: *don't generally think, don't want, ignored by their leaders* (8c).

As can be seen, the accusing section charges the European politicians with the negligence of their citizens. On the one hand, negative constructions demonstrate the local politicians their ignorance of the population's aspirations, on the other hand, the vice president's awareness of the Europeans' concerns poses him as the defender of the people, which is likely to trigger the dissatisfaction of the local politicians and media.

The way out of crisis: Doing the business of democracy. The conclusion of the speech capitalizes on the vice president's superior status created in the foregoing text which gives him grounds to continue lecturing the European politicians on what should be done to get out of crisis (9):

(9) *And it is the business of democracy to adjudicate these big questions at the ballot box* [17].

Linking democracy mainly to the question of election in the very first utterance of this section (9), J. D. Vance sees further developments in the bidirectional motion from the people to democracy and in the opposite direction accounted for in the zoom-out and zoom-in subsections respectively.

Zoom-out: From people to democracy. The zoom-out procedure of moving from *people* to *democracy* is rendered by *dismiss-* and *shut-*constructions which portray the rank and file Europeans as the target of BLOCKAGE (10) on the part of their leaders:

(10) *I believe that dismissing people, dismissing their concerns, or, worse yet, shutting down media, shutting down elections, or shutting people out of the political process protects nothing. In fact, it is the most surefire way to destroy democracy.*

And speaking up and expressing opinions isn't election interference <...> [17].

The utterances in (10) represent the European citizens as the target of the politicians' BLOCKAGE by constructions with the verbs *dismiss* (*dismissing people, dismissing their concerns*) and *shut* (*shutting down media, shutting down elections, or shutting people*). This state of things is equated with the demolition of democracy denoted by the mega-construction *it is the most surefire way to destroy democracy*. The second type of BLOCKAGE, expressed

by the negative construction *isn't election interference* in the last utterance of (10), is meant to underscore the vice president's position as the champion of freedom of speech.

Zoom-in: From democracy to people. The zoom-in subsection rests on fronting *democracy*-constructions to the attraction positions with the nudging filled in by the units naming the population from different perspectives (11):

(11) (11a) *And trust me, I say this with all humor, if American democracy can survive 10 years of Greta Thunberg's scolding, you guys can survive a few months of Elon Musk.*

(11b) *But what German democracy – what no democracy, American, German, or European – will survive is telling millions of voters that their thoughts and concerns <...> are invalid or unworthy of even being considered.*

(11c) *Democracy rests on the sacred principle that the voice of the people matters <...> [17].*

Passage (11) refers to democracy by the fronted constructions *American democracy* (11a), *German democracy* combined with the units *no democracy, American, German, or European* (11b), and followed by the unit *democracy* (11c) summarizing the ideas expressed in the previous utterances. The keeping position of the first utterance is filled in by the predicate *survive* repeated two times and combined with the units *10 years of Greta Thunberg's scolding* and *a few months of Elon Musk*.

Final lesson for the European leaders. The generalizing subsection of the conclusion, representing the vice president as a judge towering over Europe, is introduced by the rhyming constructions *the people have a voice* and *leaders have a choice* (12):

(12) (12a) *Europeans, the people have a voice. European leaders have a choice. <...>*

(12b) *You can embrace what your people tell you, even when it's surprising, even when you don't agree. <...>*

(12c) *To believe in democracy is to understand that each of our citizens has wisdom and has a voice. And if we refuse to listen to that voice, even our most successful fights will secure very little.*

(12d) *We shouldn't be afraid of our people, even when they express views that disagree with their leadership [17].*

The generalizing subsection (12) falls into two parts giving advice to the European politicians and dwelling on the challenges common for the leaders of both continents which is meant to soften the conclusion.

The part of this subsection addressing Europe rests on the contrast between the people and their leaders achieved by fronting the units *Europeans, the people have a voice* (12a) and *You can embrace what your people tell you* (12b). The part, dwelling on the common tasks of the leadership of all nations, generalizes on the essence of democracy by the statement *To believe in democracy is to understand that each of our citizens has wisdom and has a voice* (12c) and by the Subject – Predicate construction *We shouldn't be afraid of our people* (12d). In the last one, the predicate *shouldn't be afraid* poses the speaker as the source of RESTRAINT REMOVAL: it signals an open way or path making possible the exertion of force [9, p. 46], which is supposed to encourage the audience to join him.

The application of “transforming the idea into effect” procedure to the analysis of the verbal impressions produced by U.S. vice president's speech reveals a mismatch between his

main proposal of *shared values* and the impression it leaves on the European audience. This contradiction gives grounds to conclude that verbal effects mainly result not from what one says but from how one says it. Talking about the democratic value of free speech, the vice president positions the European leaders as the source of COMPULSION and BLOCKAGE for their citizens posing himself as a source of BLOCKAGE for the local politicians which is likely to trigger their negative impressions of the speech. This verbal effect is heightened by the 2024 democracy index considering the US as a flawed democracy with nine European countries regarded as full democracies [5].

Conclusions. The paper reveals that the mismatch between the vice president's intended idea of *shared values* and the negative impression his speech produces on Europe is brought about by the improper use of the units at three cognitive linguistic levels. They comprise morphosyntactic constructions, their differing degrees of textual salience and their image-schematic basis. It is found that with respect to verbal effects produced the speech falls into two main sections: cumulative, finding faults with European leaders, and accusing, charging them with the crisis of democracy. The cumulative section represents the European leadership as the target of the vice president's COMPULSION to change their policy. The European politicians' faults are emphasized in the attraction positions of separate utterances by the construction *I look*, repeated five times, and by the pronoun *you* accusing the European leaders of the dread of their people and positioning the vice president as their mouthpiece. The speaker seems inclined to misinformation putting the responsibility for the faults with democracy on the Biden administration, ignoring the division of powers in European democracies and reiterating the same facts several times. They include the terrorist attack in Germany on the eve of the conference and the cancellation of the elections in Romania. The accusing section portrays the European politicians as the source of crisis brought about by the multiple forces with a result that there is no way out which is expressed by the linguistic units referring to BLOCKAGE and COUNTERFORCE with the citizens positioned as their targets. The relations between the European leaders and the population are encoded by the *vote-*, *care-* and *think-*constructions characterizing the European citizens as well as *dismiss-* and *shut-*constructions denoting the politicians' activities. The conclusion of the speech capitalizes on the vice-president's superior status formed throughout the text representing him as a figure towering over European teaching the politicians how to do the business of democracy. The "transforming the idea into effect" procedure can be applied to the analysis of other speeches to predict how they might be received by the public.

REFERENCES

1. Дейкун О. Український переклад англійськомовних лексикалізованих конструкцій (на матеріалі заголовків BBC News та BBC News Україна). *Studia Philologica*, 2024. 22(1). Р. 30–45. Київ : Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка.
2. CBS: European leaders, media stunned by JD Vance's speech. *CBS*. 2025. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IMYiSuLd0zA>.
3. CBN: JD Vance Delivers Blunt Statements to World Leaders in Munich. *CBN*. 2025. URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j8D3e_nCNa4.

4. Gardner F. JD Vance’s blast at Europe ignores Ukraine and defence agenda. *BBC*. 2025. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c4g9nmeyzkjo>.
5. Democracy Index 2024. URL: <https://www.eiu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2024-confirmation/>.
6. Evans V., Green M. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
7. Goff B. Pistorius: Vance speech ‘not acceptable’. *Deutsche Welle*. 2025. URL: <https://www.dw.com/en/pistorius-vance-speech-not-acceptable/video-71616307>.
8. Hoffmann Th. *Construction Grammar*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2022.
9. Johnson M. *The Body in the Mind. The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination and Reasoning*. Chicago and London : The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
10. Johnson M. The philosophical significance of image schemas. In B. Hampe (Ed.), *From Perception to Meaning. Image schemas in cognitive linguistics* Berlin, New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 2005. P. 15–34.
11. LDCE (blast). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldceonline.com/dictionary/blast>.
12. LDCE (blistering attack/criticism). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldceonline.com/dictionary/blistering-attack-criticism-etc>.
13. LDCE (blunt). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldceonline.com/dictionary/blunt>.
14. LDCE (criticism). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldceonline.com/dictionary/criticism>.
15. LDCE (stun). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldceonline.com/dictionary/stun>.
16. LDCE (upset). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldceonline.com/dictionary/upset>.
17. Lu Ch. The Speech That Stunned Europe. Read U.S. Vice President J. D. Vance’s remarks at the Munich Security Conference. *Foreign Policy*. 2025. URL: https://foreignpolicy.com/2025/02/18/vance-speech-munich-full-text-read-transcript-europe/?utm_content=gifting&tpcc=gifting_article&gifting_article=dmFuY2Utc3BIZWN0LW11bmljaC1mdWxsLXRleHQtcml9cmFuc2NyaXB0LWV1cm9wZQ==&pid=PNIwBXzi9s1l1di.
18. Marquardt A., Edwards Ch., Contorno St., Michael W. Vance turns on European allies in blistering speech that downplayed threats from Russia and China. *CNN*. 2025. URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/02/14/europe/jd-vance-munich-speech-europe-voters-intl/index.html>.
19. Potapenko S. I., Shcherbak O. M. Conflict – Crisis hierarchy in English news discourse: Cognitive rhetorical perspective. *Research in Language*. 2020. 18 (1). P. 53–67.
20. Schmid H-J. Entrenchment, salience, and basic levels. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2007. P. 117–138.
21. Thaler R. ., Sunstein C. . *Nudge. The Final Addition*. Dublin Penguin Books, 2022.
22. Wintour P. JD Vance stuns Munich conference with blistering attack on Europe’s leaders. *The Guardian*. 2025. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/feb/14/jd-vance-stuns-munich-conference-with-blistering-attack-on-europes-leaders>.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Deikun O. Ukrainskyi pereklad anhliiskomovnykh leksykalizovanykh konstruktiv (na materiiali zaholovkiv BBC News ta BBC News Ukraina). *Studia Philologica*. 2024. 22(1). S. 30–45. Kyiv: Kyivskyi stolychnyi universytet imeni Borysa Hrinchenka.

2. CBS: European leaders, media stunned by JD Vance's speech. *CBS*. 2025. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IMYiSuLd0zA>.
3. CBN: JD Vance Delivers Blunt Statements to World Leaders in Munich. *CBN*. 2025. URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j8D3e_nCNa4.
4. Gardner F. JD Vance's blast at Europe ignores Ukraine and defence agenda. *BBC*. 2025. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c4g9nmezykjo>.
5. Democracy Index 2024. URL: <https://www.eiu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2024-confirmation/>.
6. Evans V., Green M. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
7. Goff B. Pistorius: Vance speech 'not acceptable'. *Deutsche Welle*. 2025. URL: <https://www.dw.com/en/pistorius-vance-speech-not-acceptable/video-71616307>.
8. Hoffmann Th. *Construction Grammar*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2022.
9. Johnson M. *The Body in the Mind. The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination and Reasoning*. Chicago and London : The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
10. Johnson M. The philosophical significance of image schemas. In B. Hampe (Ed.), *From Perception to Meaning. Image schemas in cognitive linguistics* Berlin, New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 2005. P. 15–34.
11. LDCE (blast). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/blast>.
12. LDCE (blistering attack/criticism). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/blistering-attack-criticism-etc>.
13. LDCE (blunt). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/blunt>.
14. LDCE (criticism). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/criticism>.
15. LDCE (stun). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/stun>.
16. LDCE (upset). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. URL: <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/upset>.
17. Lu Ch. The Speech That Stunned Europe. Read U.S. Vice President J. D. Vance's remarks at the Munich Security Conference. *Foreign Policy*. 2025. URL: https://foreignpolicy.com/2025/02/18/vance-speech-munich-full-text-read-transcript-europe/?utm_content=gifting&tpcc=gifting_article&gifting_article=dmFuY2Utc3BIZWN0LW11bmljaC1mdWxsLXRleHQtemVhZC10cmFuc2NyaXB0LWV1cm9wZQ==&pid=PNIwBXzi9s1lIdi.
18. Marquardt A., Edwards Ch., Contorno St., Michael W. Vance turns on European allies in blistering speech that downplayed threats from Russia and China. *CNN*. 2025. URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/02/14/europe/jd-vance-munich-speech-europe-voters-intl/index.html>.
19. Potapenko S. I., Shcherbak O. M. Conflict – Crisis hierarchy in English news discourse: Cognitive rhetorical perspective. *Research in Language*. 2020. 18 (1). P. 53–67.
20. Schmid H-J. Entrenchment, salience, and basic levels. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2007. P. 117–138.
21. Thaler R. ., Sunstein C. . *Nudge. The Final Addition*. Dublin Penguin Books, 2022.
22. Wintour P. JD Vance stuns Munich conference with blistering attack on Europe's leaders. *The Guardian*. 2025. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/feb/14/jd-vance-stuns-munich-conference-with-blistering-attack-on-europes-leaders>.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 14.07.2025

Прийнята до друку 27.07.2025

“ПРОМОВА, ЩО ПРИГОЛОМШИЛА ЄВРОПУ”: ВЕРБАЛЬНІ ЕФЕКТИ ВИСТУПУ ВІЦЕ-ПРЕЗИДЕНТА США ДЖЕЙ ДІ ВЕНСА В МЮНХЕНІ У 2025 РОЦІ

Сергій Потапенко

*Київський національний лінгвістичний університет,
бул. Велика Васильківська, 73, м. Київ, Україна, 03150
serhiy.potapenko@knl.u.edu.ua*

Василь Андрійко

*Київський національний економічний університет
імені Вадима Гетьмана,
Берестейський проспект, 54/1, м. Київ, Україна, 03057
andriyko_vasyl@kneu.edu.ua*

Мета статті – виявлення розбіжностей між негативними враженнями європейських ЗМІ про промову віце-президента США Джей Ді Венса на Мюнхенській безпековій конференції 2025 року й запропонованими ним ідеями спільних цінностей і голосу народу. Відповідно у статті задіяно процедуру “трансформації ідеї в ефект”, яка спирається на три різновиди лінгвокогнітивних структур, що послідовно впливають на творення вербальних вражень. Завдяки вкоріненості в свідомості мовців морфосинтаксичні конструкції як єдність форми й значення мають більший вплив на аудиторію, ніж окремі слова чи словосполучення, що обираються в момент комунікації. Різні ступені помітності конструкцій у висловленні зумовлені їхнім уживанням у трьох позиціях: привернення уваги, її утримання й спонукання, призначеного для управління поведінкою адресата. Образ-схеми кодують відносини між тілом людини й навколишнім середовищем, диференціюючи ефекти домінування й підпорядкованості референтів.

З’ясовано, що промова віце-президента США Джей Ді Венса створює негативні вербальні враження у двох – кумулятивній і звинувачувальній – секціях. Перша з них зосереджена на недоліках європейських лідерів, зображаючи віце-президента як джерело впливу на їхню політику, й наводить приклади їхніх дій, спрямованих на блокування свободи слова. Критика європейського керівництва наголошується у позиціях привернення уваги окремих висловлювань конструкцією *I look*, яка вказує на мовця п’ять разів, і займенником *you*, що позначає лідерів кілька разів поспіль, звинувачуючи їх в страху перед своїм населенням. Віце-президент постає як рупор народу, хоч не нехтує дезінформацією: покладає відповідальність за недоліки на попередню американську адміністрацію, у пошуках винних змішує функції різних гілок європейської влади й повторює одні й ті самі факти по кілька разів. Виявлено, що звинувачувальна секція промови зображає європейських політиків як джерело кризи демократії, що відображено використанням *vote-*, *care-* і *think*-конструкцій, які характеризують громадян, і *dismiss-* і *shut*-конструкцій, що зображають політиків. Крім вербальних засобів, причини неприйнятності європейцями позиції віце-президента пояснені в статті тим екстралінгвальним фактором, що в індексі свободи за 2024 рік 9 європейських держав зараховано до країн з повною демократією, а США – з неповною.

Ключові слова: вербальний ефект, процедура трансформації ідеї в ефект, морфосинтаксична конструкція, салієнтність, образ-схема, промова, віце-президент США Джей Ді Венс