

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Кафедра англійської філології, перекладу і філософії мови
імені професора О. М. Мороховського

Кваліфікаційна робота магістранта
Лінгвостилістичні характеристики інавгураційних промов
Барака Обама

Устименко Марини Геннадіївни
студентки групи МЛа 60-19
факультету германської філології
заочної форми навчання
Спеціальності 035 Філологія

Науковий керівник
кандидат філологічних наук
доцент Андрущенко І. О.

Допущена до захисту
«_____» _____ року
Завідувач кафедри
_____ проф. Маріна О. С.
(підпис) (ПІБ)
Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів: _____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ - 2020

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Professor O. M. Morokhovsky Department of English Philology, Translation, and
Philosophy of Language

Master's Thesis
Linguistic and stylistic properties of B. Obama`s inaugural speeches

Maryna Ustymenko
Group LLe 60-19
Department of Germanic Philology
Study by Correspondence
Speciality 035 Philology

Research Adviser
Assoc. Prof. **I. O. Andrushchenko**
PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv - 2020

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	4
INTRODUCTION.....	5
CHAPTER ONE. PUBLIC SPEECH AS OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC INVESTIGATIONS...	8
1.1 Genres of public speech and its units.....	8
1.2 Functions of political communication.....	11
1.3 Role of inaugural speeches in politics.....	14
1.4 Political semiotics and its meaning.....	16
1.5 The impact of the metaphor on the inaugural speech.....	19
1.6 Stylistic peculiarities of latest American Presidents' inaugural speeches.....	23
1.7 The power of nature in the Barack Obama`s inaugural speeches.....	36
1.8 Political metaphors in American presidential inaugural speeches	42
Conclusions to Chapter One.....	49
CHAPTER TWO. THE RESULTS OF THE STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF	
B. OBAMA`S INAUGURAL SPEECHES	50
2.1 Key values of the B. Obama`s inaugural speeches.....	50
2.2 Constitutive features of B. Obama`s inaugural speeches.....	59
2.3 The analyses of SD and EM in B. Obama`s inaugural speeches.....	62
2.4 Tactics used in metaphorical aspect of B. Obama`s inaugural speeches.....	64
Conclusions to Chapter Two	69
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	71
RESUMÉ.....	73
LIST OF REFERENCES	76
LIST OF ILUSTRATION MATERIAL.....	80

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SD - Stylistic Devices

EM - Expressive Means

INTRODUCTION

Modern linguistics is characterized by the focus on the study of the political discourse in general and the public speaking of some politicians in particular. Not surprisingly the political discourse of the 44th US President Barack H. Obama receives great attention. The enormous support of the American people, a unique position as the first African American president, pronounced rhetorical abilities, a well-prepared election campaign are the phenomena that should be taken into account while analyzing the stylistic specificities of the political speeches delivered by this leader. The purpose of this work is an attempt to identify the means of realizing the semantic potential in the speeches of the 44th President of the United States of America.

The topicality of this study is due to a certain significance for such a modern linguistic direction as political linguistics. Politicians use a variety of rhetorical tactics to win votes from the electorate. Political discourse, strategies and tactics of expressive influence are the material of the research of many linguists. In their political speeches, political leaders address both the citizens of their country and the world as a whole. Analysis of political speeches helps to determine intentions and effective ways of influencing the audience. In this regard, an attempt to identify the features of Barack Obama's speech behavior based on his speeches was made.

The object of the paper is Barack Obama`s inaugural speeches.

The subject-matter of the present study is the linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of Barack Obama`s inaugural speeches.

The theoretical value of the master`s paper denotes that the work contributes to the development of the problem of pragmatic features of political discourse. The obtained results contribute to the allocation of a set of linguistic tools for studying the influence of linguistic mechanisms of political discourse on society as a whole.

The practical value of the results gained in its materials used in university courses in Rhetoric, Stylistics, Lexicology, Linguistics, Communicative linguistics, Text linguistics, Linguocultural studies, Sociolinguistics, Discourse studies, Intercultural communication and professional studies.

The aim of this work is to single out linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of Barack Obama`s inaugural speeches.

The aim of this study is achieved with the following **tasks**:

- to figure out the linguistic personality of the president, taking into account the rhetorical orientation of his / her linguistic works;
- to analyze the American political discourse in terms of its stylistic features, taking into account the cultural - central dominance of linguistic research in the early XXI century;
- to specify a wide range of stylistic devices and expressive means used in presidential discourse;
- to identify the components of the inaugural speech and their impact on the consciousness of the addressee;
- to clarify the role of the presidential rhetoric in the development of the ideology of American political discourse.

Method of research used in the paper is semantico-stylistic defining the correlation between language means employed for the expressive conveyance of intellectual, emotional or aesthetic content of speech.

The novelty of the paper is represented in a comprehensive understanding of the president's linguistic personality taking into account the rhetorical orientation of his speech works. Additionally, American political discourse is analyzed in terms of its linguistic and pragmatic features, taking into account the culturally central dominant of linguistic research at the beginning of the 21st century. Moreover, there is a wide range of stylistic means used in the presidential discourse considered.

Compositionally, the paper consists of the introduction, two chapters, conclusions to each chapter and general conclusions to the whole paper, the list of references and the list of illustrative material.

In the **Introduction**, the paper presents the object and the subject of the investigation, underlines the topicality of the problem under study, mentions the novelty of the gained results, sets the main aim and the tasks by which it is achieved, considers the methods of research used in the paper, and discusses the content of each chapter separately.

Chapter One presents the theoretical aim of speech in politics and the usage of stylistic devices.

Chapter Two denotes the results of the stylistic analyses of B. Obama`s inaugural speeches mentioning the constitutive features and tactics of the inaugural speech.

CHAPTER ONE. THE THEORETICAL AIM OF SPEECH IN POLITICS

1.1 Genres of public speech and its units

Inaugural speech is a speech by the president-elect on the day of the inauguration. In his speech, the newly elected president will officially announce that he will assume responsibility as the country's top leader for the next four years. The inauguration marks the end of the election campaign and the beginning of a new administration. Although, the inaugural address is not required by the constitution, it is done every four years by all presidents before they take office. This has already become a tradition established by the first president of the USA, George Washington.

As a rule, the philosophy of the new administrator's policy and the basic principles of his policy will be voiced in his inaugural speech. The inauguration is held as a holiday, which is witnessed by many spectators. The inaugurations are important because they reveal basic political values, specific political principles and acceptance of the presidential personality. Their political significance thus becomes clear. In the inaugural speeches, an attempt is made to convince the populations of the country that the newly elected president is suitable for a political role and that he has the right to achieve his program goals. Thus, these addresses shed light on the legitimacy of political power and the worldview of presidents. Their political intent is to call for the support and loyalty of the political regime from both other owners of the political system and the public during their administration.

According to Campbell and Jamieson (2008), the inauguration is a "ritual of renewal in which the covenant between citizens and their leaders is renewed". This is a series of symbolic actions performed in ancient times by almost all cultures in moments of change of leadership. The inauguration closely connects the present and even the future with the past, which is believed to be the source of the orientation of the individuals and culture. This cultural transition is usually

celebrated with ceremonial members of society. The inauguration expresses hope for future prosperity, which is based on the qualities of the incumbent leader and the restoration of traditional values. Thus, the inauguration ceremony is defined as a ritual by which the institutional role is called and embodied by the person performing it. At this ceremony, the leader receives and expresses authority (Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2012).

Some formal definitions of public speaking may be as follows: public speaking is a procedure or performance of acting a person-centred presentation that speaks directly to the audience in a controlled, cautious manner to update, influence, or entertain them. It is usually understood as official personal communication of one being with a group of listeners. It is closely related to "presenting", though the latter is more often linked with commercial activities. In most cases, public speaking is to persuade the audience. It is clear indeed, public speaking includes speaking to assembly, speaking at a convention, giving a lecture to the full amphitheatre of the aptitude.

A century ago, John Dolman (1922) in his book "Handbook of Public Speeches" renowned that public performances are very diverse from theatrical presentations - that "this is not a regular imitation of life, but life, the natural function of life, a real person in real communication with neighbors, and better all when it is the most truthful.

There are dissimilar types of speech because we will not express the same way when we hold a political rally, or if we speak with the board of executives of the company if we speak with our wives or communicate with groups. Consequently, we do not want to accomplish the same effect. From time to time, we want to move people in some direction, now and then we just want to inform, diffuse certain information in a certain way, depending on what effect we want to achieve. In other words, depending on who our onlookers are and what goal we want to attain with our language, we will choose the type of speech, and in so doing we will as well change our language and adapt to surroundings.

Depending on what we desire to achieve with this talking, we may also extricate various types of it, what the situation is in which the speech takes place, and, of course, who our addressees are. Four types of speech are mainly used in business and personal lifecycle.

Call to action speech - the features of this type of speech are that customarily, it is a much more peppy speech, followed by larger signals, an increased tone, often a faster or more flexible rate of the articulation of words and the like, with which we unswervingly encourage our listeners to then do or make a choice instantly.

Informative speech - has a dissimilar look than the previous single, followed by a lenient, slightly slower tempo that keeps at because then we talk comparable TV announcers reading the broadcast, the tone of speech is not too loud, loud or loud. This type of language is not reflected by too dynamic representation, because it carries only some information.

Speech for persuading - this type of speaking is accompanied by greater caring with the audience, mostly superior physical affection, a soother tone of voice, appeal to the inner heart of the listener and his sentiments. When we want to convince someone of somewhat, we must be close to that auditor or group of listeners. We then speak in such a way that this trust looks, so to speak, half-meditative, so that the tone of the speech is practically reminiscent of hypnosis, a hypnotic voice, in addition to that it places the listener in an assured gender hypnotic trance, soft otherwise shallow hypnotic trance. The language that convinces listeners of something should relax the same audience, for the reason that only when they are relaxed are they humble to receive our suggestions, which, of course, they will not do if they are worried.

Commemorative and apt speech - it is used at distribution to the speaker, delivery and response of prizes, collectables, praise, inauguration, compliments, performance at the opening of the object, expositions. This type of speech, however, is completely poles apart from the previous three types of speech for the reason that of the specific rule. It should be noted here that rhetoric or public

speaking itself has certain rules; of course, the same rules are applied to almost every type of speech and for any situation, except for this fourth type of speech. This language looks a little not the same than the previous three types of language, and is no unlike in terms of energy, tempo, tone, etc., because there we can choose almost anything we want, but diverge only in one technical detail, besides it is a way of concocting this language (Novaković, Teodosijević, 2017).

1.2 Functions of political communication

The main function of political communication seems to be an **incentive** function, which consists in influencing the addressee to conquer and retain power. (АКИНИНА, 2018). Sheigal (2000) even introduces this feature into her definition of political discourse: it is "communication, the main intention of which is to struggle for power". Indeed, political discourse is based on the desire have power, that is a reason why it is often used as a way to manipulate people. Struggling for power implies the need to induce the audience to take action (for example, before the elections), to convince them of the purity of intentions, the correctness of the speaker's judgments, etc. That is why the political language is rich in various stylistic means with the help of which the speaker makes his speech more convincing and impressive. The incentive function can be expressed in different ways in discourse: explicitly, that is, in the form of slogans, direct appeals to the people, etc., and implicitly, when the author conveys through his discourse a certain emotion, it can be fear, anger or feeling unity, thereby nudging the audience to take action.

Despite the dominance of the incentive function, other functions of the language also play an important role in political discourse. The **communicative** function is responsible for the transfer of information: political discourse often contains information about important political events, political trends and everything that may be important for a given communicative situation.

The **emotive** function is responsible for expressing the feelings and emotions of the speaker, as well as for awakening the same emotions in the addressee. Thanks to the persuasiveness of speech and the success of the choice of stylistic means, the speaker is able to evoke a whole spectrum of various emotions in the listener. In political discourse, it is very important that the addressee share the sender's feelings: only then, they can jointly strive to achieve common goals.

The **phatic** function is associated with the establishment and maintenance of communicative contact. It is closely intertwined with the previous one because only in the case of interest and commonality of tasks and views, contact between the parties will be established and communication will be successful.

The **metalanguage** function helps to correctly convey the meaning of a word or phrase. Thus, politicians often resort to explaining certain terms, concepts and ideas of the world of politics, since their meaning may not be completely clear to the audience.

The last function in this series is **aesthetic**. It is aimed at creating expressiveness of speech. As in a literary text, it plays an important role in political speech, since the use of stylistic means makes speech vivid and memorable.

The functional features of political discourse leave an imprint on its content and formal components. One of the features of political discourse is that it combines standardization and expression. The first component is necessary for the discourse to be accessible to a wide range of addressees. It consists of observing certain sequences of construction and reproduction of discourse, as well as the rules for choosing vocabulary. Expressiveness, on the other hand, allows you to convey in discourse the emotional state of the author and his attitude to the topic.

Expressed with the help of stylistic figures of speech, expressiveness also makes the text interesting for perception, which is extremely important for the world of politics, since the more thoughtful, the discourse is, the more impact it can have on the audience.

The character of the audience also leaves an imprint on political discourse, which is characterized by the predominance of the mass addressee. This feature

lies in the fact that when creating and reproducing any sample of discourse, the author expects that it will be heard immediately by a significant number of people. Therefore, for example, debates in parliament take place in the presence of its members, and the inaugural speech of the new president is broadcast on television and radio not only in the respective country but abroad.

Political language is also an integral part of political discourse. It is characterized by ambiguity, often expressed through words with abstract meanings and polysemy. It reveals itself due to the fact that politicians often have to talk covertly about unpleasant things that cast a shadow on them. This also includes the anonymity of some statements to hide the actor responsible for a particular decision. In addition, this can include the use of uncertainty by the speakers, so as not to show their ignorance in any matters. In addition, uncertainty helps to avoid possible conflicts, because if the speaker does not specify his message, but speaks vaguely, then he will not have to answer for what he said or it will be much easier to reflect the attacks of opponents and ill-wishers. Consequently, political discourse adapts to external conditions.

Lasswell classifies the types of political discourse "according to the degree of transparency of the language, depending on the tension of the situation in the country or the world" (Lasswell, 2007). So, if political decisions play a key role in deciding the fate of a country or a specific person, as, for example, in the case of the promulgation of laws or the passing of a sentence in court, the discourse will be built according to developed standards and be transparent and concise.

Other situations, such as calls to take one side or the other in elections or a referendum, when the people must choose the path of future development for themselves, are still largely tense, since the audience faces a choice, and, therefore, is responsible for him. Nevertheless, the authors of discourse have much more freedom to express their emotions about what is happening, to use stylistic means of expression, etc.

The last situations on this scale are least connected with the tension of their participants. These include celebrating the victory of one of the presidential

candidates in an election or the inauguration ceremony for a new president. The corresponding discourse is the most colorful, abundant in stylistic means, highlighting the values of society and the idea of the unity of the nation.

At the present stage of development of political discourse, many researchers are studying the linguistic features of political discourse, called "political language", which means a special style, manner of communication with the addressee.

Political language is in a bilateral relationship with extralinguistic reality. On the one hand, it is significantly influenced by the political situation in the world arena, because it reflects the life of the country with its values, traditions and priorities. For example, political reality often forces speakers to distinguish between people in their discourse on "us" and "foes", and it is often necessary to accurately draw this line so as not to cause new conflicts.

1.3 Role of inaugural speeches in politics

Political activity plays a special role in society. It is believed that the place of a country in the international arena depends on a certain political position or situation, along with its relations with other states, as well as its role in the activities of the world community. However, an important role in determining the country's image is played by the way it is presented by the country's political leaders. With the help of speeches, politicians have the opportunity to appeal to both the international community and the citizens of their country. The word "politics" comes from the Greek word "politiko", which meant state or public affairs, a field of activity related to relations between classes, nations and others. Political speech is a prepared sharp speech with positive or negative assessments, justification, specific facts, with outlined plans, the prospect of political change (Мацько, 1999).

A political speech can be a parliamentary speech as a public attempt to convince the audience of the feasibility of a particular idea or action. For this

purpose original offers, arguments, unexpected thoughts, emotional statements, a fast reaction, the "frame" of a language etiquette are used. Political speeches are always sharply journalistic because they contain an assertion of some idea, view, direction, ideological position, and this inevitably means the removal of other views, even if they are not named (Філологічні науки, 2016).

The expression of an ideological position, especially for a large audience, always requires pathos, which can be expressed in different ways: successful, "shock" paraphrases, comparisons, epithets and metaphors, moral and ethical antitheses, affirmative objections; repetition of certain ideologues; a hyperbole, an accentuation of individual words and expressions, accurate in any situation, an occasional neoplasm, an arrhythmic syntax, an expressive toning. After all, a pre-prepared and written political speech should always be designed for live speech (Мацько, 1999).

Political speech is the most prototypical genre of political discourse; it is a public speech with the effective means of gaining recognition and demonstration of leadership.

The inauguration of the president as a ritual act has the following features:

1. The formalization of symbolic actions is due to the fixed time and space in which the inauguration takes place and the legislative certainty of political symbols.
2. Increased ceremonialism is due to the solemnity of the ritual action and the use of symbolic objects of a sacred nature.
3. The plot integrity of the inauguration is represented by a fixed sequence of ritual actions: the announcement of the winner of the election, the swearing-in, the receipt of symbols of power, the inaugural speech. Each inauguration takes place according to a unique scenario, subject to the general scheme of alternating actions, which cannot be violated.
4. The phasic nature of communication is traditionally contrasted with its informativeness. The fatality of the political ritual is manifested in the

actualization of the event aspect: the ritual is self-sufficient; the fact of its conduct determines the communicative load in the political discourse.

5. The social importance of the inauguration is due to the general features of the ritual as an event that is momentous for society or a particular social group of people. Besides, the inauguration ceremony marks the beginning of a new stage in the country's history, associated with the activities of the newly elected president.

6. The regularity or frequency of the inauguration is due to its cyclical nature (Karasik, 2004).

Inaugural speech as a genre of political communication is performative naturally, as it is based on the speech act "oath". The inaugural speech is also an act of the president and therefore characterized by performativity. Sheigal (2004) singles out such functions of the inaugural speech as integrative, inspiring, declarative and performative (Sheigal, 2004). The content of the inaugural speech is subordinated to these functions.

1.4 Political semiotics and its meaning

The political speech of an individual politician is a unique set of verbal and nonverbal means of transmitting information, strategies, tactics, an exceptional structure of political speech, which is inherent in an individual figure, the leader of the state. All these elements form an individuality, an "eloquent porter" and make it possible to distinguish the communicator from others. Today, stylistic media plays a very important role in creating the image of a politician in the media, and have a great influence on the process of forming public opinions. It is worth noting that nowadays many politicians resort to various stylistic devices to express and enhance what is said in their speeches.

Semiotics as science was introduced in the early twentieth century. Despite its formal institutionalization, its status as a single science remains controversial. The interests of semiotics extend to human communication (in particular, through natural

language), animal communication, information and social processes, the functioning and development of culture, all kinds of art (including fiction), metabolism and more.

The Swiss linguist F. de Saussure (1857-1913) formulated the foundations of semiology or the science of signs.

It is well known that mass politics is an integral part of politics communications. Politics is more than other social activities; it requires special means of information exchange, establishment and maintenance of constant connections between its subjects. This is due to the very nature of politics as a collective, organized purposeful activity. It becomes a specialised form of human communication for the realisation of group goals and interests concerning the whole society. Therefore, there is a need to analyse the relationship of communication processes in some aspects of political semiotics (Акайомова, 2010).

For adequate interpretation of political texts, much of which, in particular, through television, reaches the modern “consumer” within a broad extralinguistic context, which necessitates the need to take into account all the variety of signs as components of the specifics of political language. "The language of politics is not just about words. What politicians consider significant or insignificant is somehow reflected in the nation's lifestyle. Politics - clothing, food, housing, entertainment, literature, cinema and leisure - to the same extent as languages and articles.

Signs of different nature such as verbal, nonverbal and mixed, form the semiotic space of political discourse. Verbal signs include words, statements, and precedent texts. Non-verbal signs are flags, emblems, portraits, sculptures, buildings, symbolic actions and, finally, symbolic persons - politicians themselves. Mixed signs include the anthem (a combination of poetic text and music), creolised texts that combine visual and verbal elements (poster, caricature).

The symbolic essence of politics is manifested in two main aspects:

1. The politician as a representative of the group, as a metonymic sign that replaces group. This feature is associated with the personalisation of

political parties and movements - they are easily identified by the names of their leaders. As a representative of a political group, a politician also acts as a symbol of certain political views, concepts, trends;

2. The politician as an actor, as a performer of the role, he creates his image or plays on the image that was developed for him by political technologists. The role can be understood in two ways: on the one hand, as an image, the embodiment of certain features of appearance and behaviour (king, courtier, stuntman, prodigy, capriciousness, taiga emperor, speechless deputy), and on the other hand, as a political agent (Акайомова, 2010).

The ritual and non-ritual actions stand out among the behavioural signs of political discourse.

Ritual political events are ceremonial actions (inauguration, parade and other patriotic ceremonies). Ritualism does not imply an element of novelty; it is predictable, programmed. Phatic signs in political communication are used to demonstrate unity and patriotism. They should evoke a sense of joy at such unity. For the same reason, the so-called "communication of the leader with the people", for example, visits to enterprises or shops should be referred to purely phatic communication.

Symbolic actions of a non-ritual nature include political actions, which are a theatrical metaphor. Examples of such symbolic actions may be burning off a stuffed animal or a staged funeral of a politician (Акайомова, 2010).

Traditional artefacts, which act as symbols of supreme power, include the sceptre, the state, the sword, clothing (mantle), hats (crown, tiara, crown, and tiara). The symbolic value of hats is that they visually increase the height of those who wear them and thus act as a symbol of rising power. In most modern communities, these symbols have become exclusively the property of history (Бидерман, 1996).

In political semiotics, there are communicative events and correlations with these genres that have a clear "attachment" to certain socio-cultural loci. First, these are the most genres of institutional communication. Socio-political

institutions have at their disposal certain material resources, which include the physical space of certain buildings and premises. Their image is fixed in the mind as a sign of a certain event. Political loci with a stable genre connection include, firstly, the buildings of the parliament, the government, and presidential structures (Щукин, 1997).

At every temporal moment, any society has its models of communication, recognising some of more central, others referring to the periphery. This is similar to the problem of acknowledging what is true and what is a lie (Акаймова, 2010). Society is struggling to recognise certain texts as more correct and necessary. Some of them are beginning to displace others, doing so through criticism. Therefore, it is compulsory that the problem of semiotics as a communication model began to worry not only scientists but also marketers and individuals who write texts and develop emblems and logos of parties and party blocs.

1.5 The impact of the metaphor on the inaugural speech

The study of metaphor in political discourse is currently one of the most dynamically developing areas of modern linguistics. It is not surprising that in recent years various aspects of the functioning of political communication have appealed such close devotion of researchers, not only linguists but also political scientists, sociologists, psychologists. After all, it is a language that plays a key role in public speeches of political leaders, parliamentary debates, and diplomatic negotiations.

Modern technologies of speech influence make it possible to have a real impact on the consciousness and behavior of people, to influence the results of elections, to create a certain image of one or another politician or parties. The ultimate goal of any speaker, his communicative intention is to convince the audience that he is right, to induce it to what actions. The achievement of this goal is feasible largely due to the use of emotionally rich speech, which, of course, has the greatest impact on the addressee. That is why politicians so widely use in their

speech a variety of rhetorical techniques, a special place among which is a metaphor.

In the works of domestic and foreign linguists, it has been repeatedly noted that at the present stage metaphor has ceased to be just an adornment of speech and is used as an effective means of argumentation and emotional impact which, in turn, is the main goal of political communication.

According to Baranova and Karaulov (1991), a political metaphor is a speech impact to form in the recipient (most often in society) either a positive or negative opinion about a particular political unit (politics, a party, a program, an event). It should be noted that the number of scientific works devoted to the functioning of metaphor in political discourse has significantly increased in recent years. Both foreign and Russian researchers have made a significant contribution to the study of political metaphor: J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, M. Osborne, K. de Landtsheer, R.D. Anderson, A. Mussolf, H. Kelly Holmes and V.O. Regan, A. Chenki, I.R. Gozzi, T. van Dijk, E. McCormack P. Chilton, A. Goatley, A.N. Baranov, Yu.N. Karaulov, E.S. Kubryakova, A.P. Chudinov, I.M. Kobozeva, E.V. Budaev and others.

At the same time, modern linguists are interested in such issues as the mechanisms of metaphorization, the classification of the main types and models of metaphor, the allocation of metaphor functions characteristic of political communication, the regularities of the deployment of metaphorical images in political texts, the predominance of certain metaphorical models in specific historical periods. As already noted above, the role of metaphor in political discourse is not limited to giving speech expressiveness and imagery.

In addition to artistic, or aesthetic, the main functions of metaphor in political communication are communicative, cognitive and pragmatic. In addition to the fact that the metaphor makes speech more figurative and expressive (aesthetic function), it allows you to convey information in the most accessible form for the addressee, to explain complex political phenomena by means of simple and more familiar reality to the addressee (communicative function).

Quite often, there is also a euphemistic use of metaphors, when the author, for one reason or another, does not consider it possible to designate information directly. However, in the texts of political discourse, the interaction of two other functions of metaphor - cognitive and pragmatic - plays a key role. The uniqueness of the metaphor lies mainly in the fact that it gives a real opportunity to transform the picture of the world existing in the mind of the addressee. In addition, the metaphor is the most effective tool for manipulating public consciousness and forming a certain emotional state in the addressee.

It should be noted that the described functions of political metaphor are only relatively autonomous - in specific texts, they are, as a rule, closely intertwined. A number of scholars have made interesting observations regarding the relationship between the change in the political situation and the number of metaphors, as well as the relationship between the frequency of metaphors and socio-political changes (Anderson, 2004).

Studies have shown that during periods of social and political and economic transformations, during the pre-election period, and during any other significant events in the life of the public, the language used in the texts of political discourse becomes, on the whole, more vivid and expressive. At the same time, the number of metaphors also noticeably increases, in particular, individually the author's ones, since they have the highest pragmatic potential. This indicates that the metaphor is reaching a qualitatively new level - it is directly involved in solving problematic situations and has an impact on the decision-making process. Besides, in a particular historical period, various conceptual metaphors are activated, dominant metaphorical models that are characteristic of each historical era.

According to A.P. Chudinov (2001), the study of the system of conceptual metaphors in different historical periods allows one to draw conclusions about the development of national political consciousness and the specifics of a particular stage in the development of political communication.

As already noted, the metaphor is actively used in the speech of the political leaders as a means of influencing the political views of the most different layers of

society. Those politicians are most interested in manipulating the public conscience, in shaping the audience's favorable attitude to this or that phenomenon or event, as well as in the corresponding emotional background. The ability to use a metaphor effectively in public speeches usually aimed at a mass audience testifies to the high oratory skill of a politician, which, in turn, has a direct impact on his popularity rating (Чудинов, 2008).

Political discourse is based on unvarying and specific communication skills. Appealing to a metaphor seems to be one of the most operative processes for spreading a political message. There is a creative metaphor; in the same way, political speeches indicate change through their exertion. A metaphor allows you to recycle linguistics, whilst political speeches tend to recycle and recover old ideas and concepts. To be recognized as prized and appropriate, the metaphor must be striking, as a respectable political speech commitment express catchy ideas in order to make an encouraging impression on the audience. This appeal applies mutually to the metaphor of the Aristotelian tradition and to political actions.

On the contrary, a lie is rooted in a metaphor as a trick that binges through political speech. In short, the metaphor appears as a vital course for the conformation of political speech, which takes its substantial aspects. The metaphor is the foundation of political discourse for the reason that the evident similarities flanked by the metaphorical process and the political process, the metaphor is the cornerstone of political discourse.

In political speech, the capability to explain is often united with the ability to persuade. Besides the explanation, the metaphor is advantageous for persuasion. As an element of orotundity, from the point of view of Aristotle, the metaphor is aimed at influence. In this sense, it looks like a process of action, since it hypothetically affects publics.

The metaphor as an art of persuasion is based on remembrance and processing being evident in political speeches as the newfangled president seeks to invite citizens to share their views on America. On the other hand, the ability to

persuade can slip into the confinement of the mind of the listeners, and the metaphor may fail when it becomes a trap of the critical mind.

The pleasure of creating or listening to moral metaphors is often linked with the aesthetics of speech and, in particular, with the practice of metaphors. It is assumed that the beauty of speech is decorative, and the metaphor is one of the best decorations to hide the scarcity of speech.

The charming function of metaphor is primarily reserved for legendary metaphors, creative metaphors, and original metaphors. For classical rhetoric, poetry, as well as political discourse, are ideal loci for metaphors, where the goal is to seduce and attract the audience using neatly invented metaphors.

If attractiveness and charm fit in a metaphor, deception and lies are also part of the seduction borne by metaphors. The influence of seduction also means the power of deception: internal deception through ontological fights in a metaphor, external deception with contextual battles, exophoric or endophoric, in the middle of metaphorical expression and context. Political discourse is an upright illustration of both aspects of the concept of seduction through a metaphor, both nice-looking and unreliable (Bourse, 2018).

1.6 Stylistic peculiarities of latest American Presidents' inaugural speeches

Donald Trump's talking has unexpected dissimilar personal characteristics. Investigating Trump's speech can not only recognize his attractiveness but also comprehend his administrative inkling. In this tongue, Trump time after time strained the idea of "*America First*" (Trump, 2017). It is no doubt that his inaugural address has a special political significance. The analysis of Trump's inaugural address can not only encompass the research of public speech, furthermore but also make available some reference for the changes in the American programme. Further down there will be discoursed phonetic, vocabulary, rhetorical and syntax features.

Donald Trump occasionally precise his idea with elisions or swallowing echoes; he succeeds himself to express himself clearly in order to let addressees obtain his every word. He also infrequently customs abbreviation.

For example, he would use “*have not*” rather than “*haven't*”. When on earth, he says the word “*Make America ... Again*” (Trump, 2017), he will gap a little silence even though and the listeners will praise and applause. As here, we can determine the significance of pause.

Donald Trump is in decent use of the rhythm. He put stress syllables at a fitting position and type the speech jingles like a piece of poems. All the words are so striking that one can under no circumstances forget.

For example, “*The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed across the entire world*”, in this verdict, he put stress on “*wealth*”, “*middle class*”, “*ripped*”, “*homes*”, “*redistributed*”, “*world*” while the “*of*”, “*has*”, “*from*”, “*across*” (Trump, 2017) are laid-back word.

That procedure deeply exposes the deteriorated situation that the middle class of American is suffering. He hopes to inspire citizens to contrary to the unfair status quo and rebuild a new-fangled and affluent nation. In this sentence “*We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs*”, these words “*borders*”, “*ravages*”, “*countries*”, “*products*” (Trump, 2017) are all stressed words and also rhyming with each other word. That decree demonstrates his willpower and courage to tackling difficulties and gaining citizens’ backing.

In Donald Trump’s language, alliteration is likely used as a way to implement the power of language charisma, such as in “*It is time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget: that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots, we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms, and we all salute the same great American Flag*” (Trump, 2017).

That paragraph joints excellent tense with feeling. In addition, Donald Trump points out the freedom that everyone is countersigning. We can find as well this essence in The Declaration of Independence, which says, “*We hold these*

truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” (Trump, 2017).

Seeing the varied enlightening background of his addressees, Donald Trump used the most mutual words that inhabitants used every day in its place of abstract terminology or difficult rulings. The distinct sorts of speech determining that listeners cannot appraise it just like analyzing books at that state. Whatever the speaker needed to do is to speak at a proper anxious person and use the intense then again not difficult words to direct his ideas and feelings. If the speaker needs to show off his superior level of language by expending hard words, he may lose more than gain, and listeners would most likely become unfocused and tired. However, Donald Trump had unequivocally circumvented these quandaries and whatever he used is some daily-life arguments, which hold the frankest partisanship.

For example, *“But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation; an education system, flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of knowledge; and the crime and gangs and drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential”* (Trump, 2017).

Words like *“trapped”, “tombstones”, “cash”, “crime” “gangs and drugs”, “stolen” and “robbed”* (Trump, 2017) are some modest but lively terminologies. By using these arguments, Donald Trump needs to accentuate the severe economic location and the perilous social atmosphere that citizens are facing. His purpose is to motivate loyalty, no doubt that this speech has efficaciously struck an approachable chord in the hearts of his listeners. Over and done with the skillful language usage, the audience was overwhelmed by his glamour.

In Donald Trump’s speech, there is no lack of the first person and the second person.

For instance, *“Today’s ceremony, however, has very special meaning. Because today we are not merely transferring power from one Administration to another, or from one party to another - but we are transferring power from Washington, D.C. and giving it back to you, the American People.”* (Trump, 2017). In this sample, by means of the fluent use of the first person and the second person, Donald Trump establishes his determination of fair power transition that is for the decent of citizens.

And another example is *“Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams, will define our American destiny. And your courage and goodness and love will forever guide us along the way”* (Trump, 2017). In this sentence, Donald Trump discovered his consideration of people’s dominant role and hope to inspire citizens’ desire to hasten American revitalization.

In order to define one’s idea obviously and exactly, a presenter had better not use that extravagant language. Instead of using abstract and universal words, the choice of definite language using may engross listeners the most. The language of speech is dissimilar to other oral countenance, and a speaker needs to consider the expression more serious. The rigorous usage of words is beneficial to impressing listeners and help the public to accept the idea, which the speaker is working on distribution.

In Donald Trump’s inaugural address, he uses precise words to present his ideas such as regarding thoughtful condition, which American publics are facing, and his compassion to common people. Donald Trump uses some visual and tangible arguments such as *“people have borne the cost”, “the jobs left, and the factories closed”, “the factories shuttered and left our shores”, “The wealth of our middle class has been ripped”, “protect our borders from the ravages of other countries”, “build new roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways”* (Trump, 2017). These words show people’s life disorder and the road of the invention to the forthcoming.

Donald Trump’s inaugural address arranges his treatise construction and length at a suitable level, and he uses parallelism, couplets and repetition properly

to evade dullness and states his thoughts and ideas clearly. These parallel sentences in Donald Trump's speech are at a high rate.

For example, *"Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while they celebrated in our nation's Capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land"* (Trump, 2017).

In that speech, Donald Trump mocked those politicians who have stolen the wealth of all country and he demonstrates his anger to those unfilled talkers who are relentlessly complaining but never doing anything to advantage people. He furthermore points out that he will do entirety to change the partial power arrangement. Understandably, it has bound the tone and set the temperament by the using of the parallel sentence.

Another example of the parallel sentence is that *"We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams"* (Trump, 2017). He has made his honest capacities to his cherished and respectable citizens. Whatever he wants is to let all and sundry who is living in America distinguishes his strong willpower. Not like his precursor, Donald Trump have faith in himself as a campaigner who will innovate the old and unbending America and rebuild a new prosperous and unprejudiced country. The key point of this parallel sentence is to highlight the concept of *"American dream"* which has been producing by years, but it has been demonstrated as an immortal but daily-new matter.

For instance, in Donald Trump's inaugural address we have the following metaphors:

1. *Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come. - Together, we will determine the future and what to do for American and the world* (Trump, 2017).

2. *One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions upon millions of American workers left behind. - One by one, the factories bankrupted and left our shores, with not even a*

thought about the millions upon millions of American workers left behind (Trump, 2017).

3. I will fight for you with every breath in my body - and I will never, ever let you down. - I will protect your rights with all I can do- and I will never, ever let you down (Trump, 2017).

4. When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice. - When you totally accept and obey patriotism, there is no room for prejudice. As you can see, the second sentence of each pair is the explanation of the first original sentence (Trump, 2017).

The metaphor has an important role in enhancing the understandability of a speech. In these sentences, Donald Trump is demanding to convey his principles and feelings to his beloved nationals. It is known to us all that a huge number of people perceives him as a destroyer, but what he desires to do is to transform that unreasonable image that has been produced for years. By means of metaphor, Donald Trump openly has a private altercation of opinions with American people.

In the inaugural speeches, uniting the comprehension of the past and the future of the nation in contradiction of the background of the present, the concepts act as a structure of consciousness, which fix the appreciative of a person of political representativeness and signify a set of philosophies that have arisen at different times and different epochs that have carried the past through the previous years and the centuries. The action of the main concepts of the inauguration speeches of the American presidents is traced and the speech is echoed in the compositional structure of the inaugural address. During the search of the inaugural speeches of the American presidents, the succeeding theoretically organized physical components of the inaugural speech were revealed:

1. The president's oath.

The President's oath of loyalty to the morals of the state is a praise to the ritual that was recognized by the first President of the United States, George Washington, at the inauguration ritual on April 30, 1789, and conventionally stands for 35 words:

For example, *“I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully the President will execute of the United States of the Office of the Office of protect and defend the Constitution of the United States”* (Washington, 1789).

In the abstract plan, the presidential oath replicates the endurance and conservation of traditions - the concept of the “past” is actualized as a foundation of permanent morals and the continuity of compeers.

The concept of “Constitution” is also objectified as a field construction of the inclinations allocated in it by semantic lexical and paradigms, in place of the segments of the content of the concept and the path of the further semantic distribution - the Constitution-document, the Constitution-right and the Constitution-protects. The concept of "president" is thus represented as a “keeper”, guarantor, protector of the US Constitution, the preamble of which contains an extremely important provision that the people of the US in the name of its benefits accept the Constitution and prosperity - obliquely presented is the concept of “end-to-end”.

After taking the presidential oath, the newly elected president publicly takes the full obligation of the head of state and at this point leads the United States, gaining full state power - the actualization of the notion of "power".

2. The assurance and promise of the president to make every effort to satisfactorily fulfil their farm duties and to lead the kingdom, led by a bright future, ensuring the richness and well-being of the reception.

For example, *“Having determined not to become a candidate for reelection, I shall have no motive to influence my conduct in administering the Government except the desire ably and faithfully to serve my country and to live in grateful memory of my country-men”* (Buchanan, 1857).

For example, *Your suffrages having elected me to the office of President of the United States, I have, in conformity to the Constitution of our country, taken the oath of office prescribed therein. I have taken this oath without mental reservation and with the determination to do to the best of my ability all that is required of me. The responsibilities of the position I feel, but accept them without*

fear. The office has come to me unsought; I commence its duties un-trammeled. I bring to it a conscious desire and determination to fill it to the best of my ability to the satisfaction of the people (Ulysses, 1869).

For example, *I should be untrue to myself, to my promises, and to the declarations of the party platform upon which I was elected to office, if I did not make the maintenance and enforcement of those reforms a most important feature of my administration* (Howard Taft, 1909).

As a rule, the gaining of the president worthy of fulfilling his duties is uttered much more muscularly by the individual-personal of the speaker, displayed in the frequent use of proposals by the subject "I" - the concept of "president" is explicated as a person who is not accountable to the general public. In the process of communication, the personality of the opening is a very vital element, on which the demonstrative attunement of the participants in communication, in the inaugural speeches, the advance of the personal leader of the president-president, has a direct impact on the creation of optimistic emotional mood of the state of the individuals of America.

For example, *I shall look with confidence to the enlightened patriot-ism of that body to adopt such measures of conciliation as may harmonize conflicting interests and tend to perpetuate that Union which should be the paramount object of our hopes and affections. In any action calculated to promote an object so near the heart of everyone who truly loves his country, I will zealously unite with the coordinate branches of the Government* (Taylor, 1849).

For example, *On all leading questions agitating the public mind I will always express my views to Congress and urge them according to my judgment, and when I think it advisable will exercise the constitutional privilege of interposing a veto to defeat measures which I oppose; but all laws will be faithfully executed, whether they meet my approval or not. I shall on all subjects have a policy to recommend, but none to enforce against the will of the people... I know no method to secure the repeal of bad or obnoxious laws so effective as their stringent execution* (Ulysses, 1869).

3. Excursion into the historical past in the context of the situation

Times gone by tour shows that the US Presidential Institute is emerging with the community. Its purpose is to imitate the continuity of the ideals of the American state - an explication of the concept of "past" is drew, and the axiological ideals of the American nation are abstractly presented. An excursion into the history of the ancient in the inaugural rehearsals realizes the concept of the "past", which points toward a mention of the wisdom of the founding fathers, the first president of the United States, a confident assessment of the former president's actions. History is viewed as a valuable resource for solving the problems facing the country, assuming a link to the existing historical experience:

For example, *We have assembled to repeat the public ceremonial, begun by Washington, observed by all my predecessors, and now a time-honored custom, which marks the commencement of a new term of the Presidential office* (Rutherford, 1877).

For example, *I've just repeated word for word the oath taken by George Washington 200 years ago, and the Bible on which I placed my hand is the Bible on which he placed his. It is right that the memory of Washington be with us today not only because this is our bicentennial inauguration but because Washington remains the Father of our Country* (George Bush, 1989).

The excursions in the earlier times also serve as an argumentative equivalence allowing you to hope for an efficacious overcoming of problems:

For example, *Yet our distress comes from no failure of substance. We are stricken by no plague of locusts. Compared with the perils which our forefathers conquered because they believed and were not afraid, we have still much to be thankful for* (Roosevelt, 1933).

The inaugural discourse is indissolubly linked with the world-vision urgencies and the value dominants of the culture, which form its conceptual basis. At the speech level, the value alignments of the recipients of the inauguration speeches of the American presidents are signified by the following basic concepts:

freedom, equality, work, faith, discipline, comfort, security, safety, prosperity, etc., which are national values that need to be stored and passed on.

For example, *“When our Founders boldly declared America's independence to the world and our purposes to the Almighty, they knew that America, to endure, would have to change; not change for change's sake but change to preserve America's ideals: life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness. Though we marched to the music of our time, our mission is timeless. Each generation of Americans must define what it means to be an American”* (Clinton, 1993).

However, one support is not sufficient. Emphasizes the implication of the moment in the situation, says the need for reforms, renewal, the president and the president to progress the political state in the country - the concepts of "present" and "future" are presented, which have a constructive impact on the awareness of the addressee. Even though the feminine, festive nature of the ceremony, the President considers it compulsory to show the people his understanding and concern for the difficulties that worry the entire community, demonstrating, thus, the unity of the societies.

For example, *“As times change, so Government must change. We need a new Government for a new century, humble enough not to try to solve all our problems for us but strong enough to give us the tools to solve our problems for ourselves, a government that is smaller, lives within its means, and does more with less. Yet where it can stand up for our values and interests around the world, and where it can give Americans the power to make a real difference in their everyday lives, Government should do more, not less. The preeminent mission of our new Government is to give all Americans an opportunity, not a guarantee but a real opportunity, to build better lives”* (Clinton, 1997).

The inaugural speech is considered as a high degree of emotional overload. The fund of stylistic means, enhancing soulfulness and increasing the emotional potential of the inaugural speech, has a bulky arsenal of methods designed to evoke spirits of national pride, heroism, courage, and explicating such concepts as “patriotism”, “national unity”. For example, the guilt of the speaking speeches of

the American presidents has detected extensive use of parallel structures and the impressive structure. Let us bond the recipient and the addressee, causing a sense of national unity and nationalism:

For example, *“Great is the stake placed in our hands; great is the responsibility, which must rest upon the people of the United States. Let us realize the importance of the attitude in which we stand before the world. Let us exercise forbearance and firmness. Let us extricate our country from the dangers, which surround it and learn wisdom from the lessons they inculcate”* (Jackson, 1833).

For example, *“With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan - to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations”* (Lincoln, 1865).

4. A declaration of the principles that the president will be guiding in internal and external strategy:

For example, *“We face at this moment a most important question that of the future relations of the United States and Cuba. With our near neighbors we must remain close friends. The declaration of the purposes of this Government in the resolution of April 20, 1898, must be made good. Ever since the evacuation of the island by the army of Spain, the Executive, with all practicable speed, has been assisting its people in the successive steps necessary to the establishment of a free and independent government prepared to assume and perform the obligations of international law which now rest upon the United States under the treaty of Paris”* (McKinley, 1901).

For example, *“Together, we will reclaim America's schools, before ignorance and apathy claim more young lives; we will reform Social Security and Medicare, sparing our children from struggles we have the power to prevent; we will reduce taxes, to recover the momentum of our economy and reward the effort and enterprise of working Americans; we will build our defenses beyond*

challenge, lest weakness invite challenge; and we will confront weapons of mass destruction, so that a new century is spared new horrors” (Bush, 2001).

The data declaration of principles is not of controlling nature, is not a direct call to action, but is only accessible for reflection, is realized through the concepts of "duty" and "work". The concept of "debt" is understood through the subsequent indicators: commitment, a sacred obligation, hallowed duty, responsibility:

For example, *“It has been our uniform practice to retire, not increase our outstanding obligations, and this policy must again be resumed and vigorously enforced”* (McKinley, 1897).

The concept of "work" is comprehended through the task, effort, service, work, challenge.

For example, *“Anxiety for the redemption of the pledges which my party has made and solicitude for the complete justification of the trust the people have reposed in us constrain me to remind those with whom I am to cooperate that we can succeed in doing the work which has been especially set before us only by the most sincere, harmonious, and disinterested effort”* (Cleveland, 1893).

5. A conviction of the countless destiny of America:

For example, *“Realizing that we can not live unto ourselves alone, we have contributed of our resources and our counsel to the relief of the suffering and the settlement of the disputes among the European nations. Because of what America is and what America has done, a firmer courage, a higher hope, inspires the heart of all humanity”* (Coolidge, 1925).

The concept of "grandeur" is the obligatory component of the inaugural speech. This concept is implemented by means of the succeeding indicators: great affective, use of superlatives:

For example, *I see a great nation, upon a great continent, blessed with a great wealth of natural resources* (Roosevelt, 1937).

For example, *“Great nations like great men must keep their word. When America says something, America means it, whether a treaty or an agreement or a vow made on marble steps”* (Bush, 1989).

For example, *“Then, in turmoil and triumph, that promise exploded onto the world stage to make this the American century. And what a century it has been. America became the world's mightiest industrial power, saved the world from tyranny in two World Wars and a long cold war, and time and again reached out across the globe to millions who, like us, longed for the blessings of liberty”* (Clinton, 1997).

6. Persuasion by appeal to God:

The appeals to the God of Guinness of the presidential speeches of the US presidents testify to the steadfast foundations of state power in the US, its divine nature: the president exercises state power for the good of his people, but he is known by the supreme power - God as the defender of the nation. Religious impressions of the inauguration speeches of American presidents are measured in an effort to know the phenomena of religious spirit and are presented by the following etymological causes: God, Providence, Religion, Scripture, Salvation, Spirituality, etc.

For example, *“The Almighty God has blessed our land in many ways. He has given our people stout hearts and strong arms with which to strike mighty blows for freedom and truth. He has given to our country a faith, which has become the hope of all peoples in an anguished world.*

So we pray to Him now for the vision to see our way clearly to see the way that leads to a better life for ourselves and for all our fellow men-and to the achievement of His will to peace on earth” (Roosevelt, 1945).

7. An optimistic final of the speech:

The presidents struggle to thoroughly complete their speech, optimistic about the future - the concepts of “future” and “prosperity” are denoted, which make a positive emotional attitude on the part of the onlookers, in the meantime the guilt of the presidential speeches of the American presidents, the future of the agents as general well-being and wealth.

For example, *“America. In the face of our common dangers, in this winter of our hardship, let us remember these timeless words. With hope and virtue, let us*

brave once more the icy currents and endure what storms may come. Let it be said by our children's children that when we were tested we refused to let this journey end, that we did not turn back nor did we falter; and with eyes fixed on the horizon and God's grace upon us, we carried forth that great gift of freedom and delivered it safely to future generations” (Obama, 2009).

So, notions as syncretic and dynamic units of awareness, generating knowledge about the world of authenticity and swaying it, not only join decoding of the semantic system of the manuscript, being content-thematic dominants, at the same time simple-or-explicit presenting information, activating connotative-associative effect but converts into momentous rudiments in the design and compositional association of the text, closing of the communicative-thematic blocks in the outreach messages of American presidents.

1.7 The power of nature in the Barack Obama`s inaugural speeches

Learning from Ancient Greeks, President habits didactic poetry: persuading, undoubted and easy-to-be-remembered rhythmic panache when speaking to a wide audience of the Americans. Didactic poetry rests upon parallelism and repetition parallelism, which are the basic utensils for forming an effortlessly memorized dispatch. Parallelism is, in turn, a part of a linguistic field of semantics. Concentrating on parallelism laboring in the speech, I have found that personal pronouns play a noteworthy role in making a foregrounding effect, which is a feature of pragmatics. Wholly these devices positively associate through a rhetorical style, which the orator selects for the speech.

If we agree to move to the examination of the countenance of the executive influence epitomized in a series of presidential addresses, we might bargain some thought-provoking facts. These facts will make us more and more familiar with the

antiquity of all inaugural speeches and we will find out that the metaphor plays a noteworthy part.

Amongst the four basics that make up nature, the air is the most vital area for articulating political change. Political fluctuations can be elusive (“*breeze, clouds*”) or else violent (“*hurricane, storm*”), reach its zenith with the help of a storm. The metaphorical process of assimilation is suitable here concerning the political atmosphere and the meteorological atmosphere. The weather forecast, remarkably predicted by the wind, echoes a change in the general political trend for the better (“*new wind, rising fog*”), but often for the worse (“*fog, hurricane of disasters, raging storms*”), culminating in a mournful seasonal description with “*winter*” difficulties of B. Obama (Obama, 2009).

Water is additional repetitive means of telling about political life in a metaphorical sense. It is well known that numerous states of water define the mind or external objects of a person, such as politics. As a consequence, the positive abstract concepts (“*freedom, faith, justice, democracy, peace, prosperity*”) that have its place in the political sphere are thrown into the waters (“*currents, tide, river, ocean, sea, water*”), over and over again for the worse side, using the exception of approximate reduction (“*ebbing tide, an ebb and flow*”). Diplomatically, water is considered threatening (“*raging sea, icy currents*”) or beneficial for “*rising tides*” or “*still waters*” (Obama, 2009).

Earth is less referred to as a political transfer. The privative prefix un- (‘uncrossed, unclimbed’) highlights the difficulty to reach a new-fangled political step in America’s ground.

Fire, as the most recent of the four elements, carries various types of metaphors in political speech. From spark to a flame, the entire variety of fire gives rise to numerous interpretations, in cooperation with a positive and negative attitude. The smaller the fire (“*spark, candle*”), the better. On the other hand, the expression “*fire*”, used in a figurative sense, can be confusing, since G.V. In his inaugural speech in 2005, Bush turned to the same metaphor to arouse the events of September 11 (“*Day of Fire*”) and the consequences (“*this unbridled fire of*

freedom”). This example is a respectable design of the semi-mapping of a metaphor, what time different semantic features are used in altered situations to rapidly show diverse meanings.

The use of the vegetal to signify economics in politics is extensive in political speeches. Most metaphors have become dead or lexified through language. From birth to death, from “*roots*” to “*leaves*” and “*fruits*,” the lexicalization gradient is visible in political speech. From “*seeds*” (“*seeds in the wind*”) to “*fruits*” (“*fruits of the earth*”), from living metaphors to traditional metaphors, the plant metaphor accentuates lexicalization, where the initial conflict is no longer professed. The verb “grow” is an upright illustration of the wonder of lexicalization, since the true plant import has undergone semantic bleaching. “*Flourish*” and “*root*” in the method of verbs look like semi-lexized metaphors due to the broader use of these terms when referring to the economy. Reach out to the plant community to define the political challenges associated with America’s metaphorical landscaping (“*uprooting*”) with the president as a gardener.

From plant to animal, the metaphorical sphere of power turn out to be even more understandable. A zoomorphic metaphor (Tournier, 2004) completely reveals the power at stake. The choice of an animal to designate a metaphor is not innocent, and even more so when it comes to politics. The reference to “*ostriches*” or “*dogs*” in contrast with Roosevelt demonstrates the power of hierarchization since the dog is well-known to be mediocre to humans, for the reason that the ostrich is well-known to be afraid of reality. Conversely, the use of the “*tiger*” as a metaphor for Russia, invented by Kennedy, demonstrates the potential danger of the tiger, which is perceptibly tamed but is waiting to jump and consume its former master (“ended up inside”).

Johnson’s metaphor of “*assimilating men into ants*” paints an unlike the type of power, which seems to be the influence of organization and collaboration. Such an example is a good illustration of the integrative view of metaphor. The democratic process of an integrated metaphor turns out to be clear from reading: a conflicting analogy focuses on the ability to organize rather than give up. These

three illustrations have shown the helpfulness of zoomorphic metaphors in launching power, irrespective of whether it refers to dominance, hierarchy, or organization.

The authenticity of war, as well as the archetype of war, is every so often present in the inaugural speeches of American presidents. It is not amazing that World War II and the Cold War troupe a shadow over our outfits. It is also not startling if we take into account the prominence of the military industry for the American budget, and this war is every so often a selective advantage for the American election. Military metaphors reproduce the ability of people to contest for their country in contrast to an "enemy." Without a doubt, attack metaphors (*"lines of attack, energetic actions, the struggle for complete victory, brutal attacks, will be defeated, wage our wars, marshal, weapons"*) are copious in comparison with defense metaphors.

The power to build is as frequent as the control to battle in American presidents' speeches. The architectural metaphor presents a numerous range of sub-categories: types of construction (*'temple, fortress, shelter, cathedral, bastion'*), rudiments of the house (*'doorstep, stone, threshold, front porch, marble steps, pillars'*), construction procedure (*'building, construct, rebuild'*), demolition progression (*'bring down the walls, torn down the barriers'*), passage route (*'bridge, door'*).

The collective powers of America can also be found in fellow citizen or friends relationships. Opposing to military powers, those metaphors are likely to express solidarity and a determination to peace. Entertainingly enough, from Roosevelt's first address in 1933 to B. Obama's first speech in 2009, the vocabulary has evolved on or after *'neighbor'* to *'friend'*.

Despite the recurrent usage of the pronoun *'we'* used by all American presidents to direct America's powers as a collective power, the metaphors we have deliberated so far are often tainted by bits of personal authority. The executive power, over and done with the president's single voice, time and again implicitly spectacles through the text.

If, as requested by J.F Kennedy, America “*intends to remain the master of its own house*”, most American presidents acknowledge that this wish dismisses being fulfilled without the will of God. Subsequently the collective powers of men, after the individual powers of a single man, derive the powers of the divine. From community to independence, from individuality to uniqueness, metaphors of power fluctuate.

The powers deliberated to God by most American presidents repeatedly come at the end of their inaugural addresses.

As if, without God’s blessing, the power conversed on the president and people would be abolished. In that sense, the command of God comes as the paramount power over man. This regular coda in inaugural addresses is the locus for various metaphors of divine power.

The general lexical analysis of pronouns recycled in inaugural addresses goes in contrast to the hypothesis that the same speeches would be a mirror for the gradual omnipresence of the American leader. The analysis of the corpus as a whole has to be sure revealed a great proportion of pronouns keen on the collectivity compared to those assigned to the individual, i.e., the President. The number of occurrences of the pronoun ‘*we*’ (1001) is greater than the number of the personal pronoun ‘*I*’ (202). In the recent years, G.W. Bush’s speeches epitomised the extensive executive powers with two linguistic ruptures in terms of pronouns: he is the only president with a score of more than ten “*I*” amongst the last six presidents (Clinton to Obama) and the only president since Johnson (1965) to use fewer than forty occurrences of “*we*”. Even if the evolution of quantification of pronouns in inaugural speeches remains uneven throughout the years and despite two contradictory immoderations (Roosevelt and Obama), a slight tendency of the extension of the presidential powers over and done with addresses being noticeable.

As the examination shows, the metaphor look as if simply as a linguistic category and a category of thinking, on the other hand, as a strategic category that agrees us to nipulate the consciousness of a common American. The groundwork

of the value system of the addressees is a security of the maximum full disclosure of the rich potential of metaphor. Meta-fora here is not a simple gestalt, an abridged image, a compound device that belongs to the state of affairs in the modern world, which brands it likely to change certain characteristics of it, which is especially vital when it comes to big politics. The metaphor is understood as an appearance of the analogue abilities of human thinking - this is an arrangement in accordance with which an individual only thinks, but performs.

Metaphoricity is intrinsic not only to language but to philosophy, that is, metaphoricity has two basic forms of existence: tangible (metaphorical language) and intangible (metaphorical thought). The specificity of the so-called metaphor in thought depends on the level of knowledge. At the level of empirical knowledge, a metaphor is a generalized image that has a gestalt configuration, that is, an image-schema in the usual linguistic terminology. The images-schemes are epistemological universes, apotomous free from the influence of culture, i.e. are devoid of cultural markings.

At the level of conceptual knowledge (conceptual comprehension), the formation of the main types of cognitive metaphors (ontological metaphors, structural metaphors, orientational metaphors) occurs. This level of cognition is not without the freedom to influence culture, because it is here that the value component begins to take shape. At the level of representational-evaluative thinking, the value component is fixed in full, since the conceptual metaphor receives more specific content. The substantial diversity of the modern metaphor appears in the functions that it implements. So, the metaphor of the traditional performs the following functions (Самигуллина, 2011).

1. nominative / identifying / indicative, since the metaphor is necessary, first of all, to fix the knowledge;
2. communicative - information transfer function;
3. pragmatic - the function of forming the recipient of a special emotional state or attitude towards the world;
4. pictorial, with the help of which communication acquires image;

5. euphemistic, that is, a function that softens the effects of the recipient;
6. a popularizing function of an easy-to-understand explanation of complex information;
7. instrumental / heuristic, which contributes to the formation of the recipient's own presentation of the world;
8. hypothetical - a function that contributes to the creation of the so-called "possible world";
9. modeling, which allows the attachment of all possible implementations of the analogue capabilities of a person into the system.

In consequence, modern metaphor notifies, influences, clarifies, systematizes, produces new images and “possible worlds”. The best outcome from the control of the metaphor of origin is when there is a support for the system of principles of this or that of the linguistic-cultural community, and therefore the main force of the metaphor is based on the level of interpretive-evaluative thinking (Самигуллина, 2011).

1.8 Political metaphors in American presidential inaugural speeches

The American presidential inaugural address is an imperative political discourse. In the speech, the new president will revenue benefit of this chance to make his important political values and policies community. It kinds the public be clear about the political assessments and stands in domestic and international affairs of the new administration. As a powerful weapon for politicians, it plays an important role in political life. In the addresses, the politicians should make their speeches more convincing frequently using the metaphor.

Political metaphors ought to have such functions as filtering, persuasion, motivation, simplification and bridge. Different metaphors highpoint diverse aspects and in consequence have altered purposes. Metaphors are intensely entrenched in people’s experience and the American philosophy. The

understanding and clarification of metaphors are sensibly related to the social, historical and cultural knowledge of America, which is at ease with to the American people. For that reason, it is not tough to appeal to the emotions of the Americans to have improved thoughtful understanding of the policies of the officials.

Metaphor study is an upright way of skimpy the fundamental ideologies, arrogances and principles and thus turns out to be a vigorous means of understanding more about the complex relations between thought, culture and language.

This part will classify, tag, examine and clarify the political metaphors in the American presidential inaugural addresses. According to conceptual metaphor theory obtained by George Lakoff, over a thorough examination of the metaphors recognized by the five-step procedure in the addresses, the findings turn out to be very fruitful. The author has classified the major and most frequent metaphors.

A. Journey Metaphors

Lakoff (1993) defined “journey” metaphor as PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITY IS TRAVELLING ALONG A PATH TOWARD A DESTINATION.

Being objective like a traveler. In a journey, any activities of any politicians are goal-oriented and their goals can be abstracted as the terminuses of a traveler. In American data, there are also a lot of metaphors that include “*speed*”, “*path*”, “*steps*”, “*advancing*”, and “*goals*”, etc. President Bush wants to engage metaphor as a tool to assist him in gaining the support from his people about his domestic and foreign policy

For example:

1. *We seek the end of tyranny in our world.* (Bush, 2006)
2. *Far from being a hopeless dream, the advance of freedom is the great story of our time.* (Bush, 2006)
3. *The only way to protect our people, the only way to secure the peace, the only way to control our destiny is by our leadership - so the united states of America will continue to lead.* (Bush, 2006)

4. *Every step toward freedom in the world makes our country safer - so we will act boldly in freedom's cause.* (Bush, 2006)

5. *We will choose to act confidently in pursuing the enemies of freedom or retreat from our duties in the hope of an easier life.* (Bush, 2006)

Americans have a sturdy view of democracy, rights and freedom. They highpoint the “*natural rights*”, and they think everybody is shaped with equal and human privileges are superior to the whole thing. For that reason, “*democratic progress*” is a publically valued activity, and we should not give up or “*retreat*” when opposed with problems. The great supremacy of this metaphor makes Americans accept as true that what Bush`s government does is to attain equality in the world. Hence, all the actions Bush`s government takes can be vindicated and Americans are made to support Bush`s foreign policy.

For example:

6. *Tonight I will set out a better path: an agenda for a nation that competes with confidence* (Bush, 2006)

7. *So tonight, I ask you to join me in creating a commission to examine the full impact of baby boom retirements on social security, Medicare, and Medicaid.* (Bush, 2006)

8. *To meet this goal, we must have stronger immigration enforcement and border protection.* (Bush, 2006)

As we can see from the overhead examples, Bush`s domestic policy is abstracted in terms of a journey. This metaphor procedures a path that calls American people to contribute to the journey.

9. *The only way to protect our people, the only way to secure the peace, the only way to control our destiny is by our leadership.* (Bush, 2006)

10. *Together, let us protect our country, support the men and women who defend us, and lead this world toward freedom.* (Bush, 2006)

11. *We will build the prosperity of our country by strengthening our economic leadership in the world.* (Bush, 2006)

In the journey, if there are no drawings, the traveling worker may get lost; consequently, he needs a guide who distinguishes the way for journey's end. In the American data, Bush indicates the word “*leadership*” numerous times, endeavoring to say his citizen that America is the finest and strongest nation in the world. Within this metaphor, Americans will have a sense of dominance and partake in his journey, serving him finish his so-called great cause.

B. War Metaphor

POLITICS IS WAR, this metaphor is deeply entrenched in people’s thoughts and spoken in everyday language. In fact, the election campaign is associated with war. The applicants try all resources to fight for the presidential place. This can be seen undoubtedly in the news report about the presidential election.

In a war, there are enemies and for the American people, enemies are social drawbacks, any forces that hinder the progress of America and those countries that are against America.

For example:

12. *We have beaten back despair and defeatism. We have saved a number of countries from losing their liberty.* (Harry Truman, 1949)

13. *Standing in this same place a third of a century ago, Franklin Delano Roosevelt addressed a Nation ravaged by depression and gripped in fear.* (Richard Nixon, 1969)

14. *These United States are confronted with an economic affliction of great proportions.* (Ronald Reagan, 1981)

15. *We suffer from the longest and one of the worst sustained inflations in our national history. It distorts our economic decisions, penalizes thrift, and crushes the struggling young and the fixed-income elderly alike. It threatens to shatter the lives of millions of our people.* (Ronald Reagan, 1981)

16. *There is crime to be conquered, the rough crime of the streets.* (George H. Bush, 1989)

17. *We will stand mighty for peace and freedom, and maintain a strong defense against terror and destruction.* (Bill Clinton, 1997)

In the above cases, the enemies are crime, inflation terror, destruction, depression, defeatism and despair. These enemies are authoritative and will not depart themselves. To seepage or surrender is without a doubt not allowed. The enemies are prevailing but not dreadful. Just as Franklin Roosevelt supposed in his first inaugural address in 1933 when challenged with the Great Depression, “*the only thing we have to fear is fear itself*”. It is the task of the people to master the enemies. Submission or emission is not allowed.

C. Building Metaphor

Building which is common in people’s life is a mutual source area. A building requires a stanchion, structure, base and bricks. From the data two theoretical metaphors can be preoccupied, namely, SOCIETY IS A BUILDING and WORTHWHILE ACTIVITY IS BUILDING.

SOCIETY IS A BUILDING A society shares many resemblances with an edifice. A society, which is composed of people, also has fundamentals and buildings. In political speeches, the society, nation, and its systems are usually the target spheres. In building metaphor, the American individuals are the producers and the societal system is the building. In order to build and protect a network, efforts are desirable from everyone. The political system is improper of the edifice, which cannot be stunned. If not, the whole construction will ruin. That is the most precarious object for a country. The following are some examples:

18. *Our whole system of self-government will crumble either if officials elect what laws they will enforce or citizens elect what laws they will support.* (Herbert Hoover, 1929)

19. *Thrones have toppled and their vast empires have disappeared.* (Dwight D.Eisenhower, 1953)

20. *Let us remember that America was built not by government, but by people - not by welfare, but by work - not by shirking responsibility, but by seeking responsibility.* (Richard Nixon, 1969)

21. *Let us resolve that we the people will build an American opportunity society...* (Ronald Reagan, 1985)

22. *Communism's collapse has called forth old animosities and new dangers.* (George W. Bush, 2001)

In examples 18, 19 and 22 the social system-capitalism, thrones, and collectivism are preoccupied as constructions. Once they flop, the whole country will vanish. Examples 20 and 21 highlights that the building desires one and all to make effort to add a brick. Building metaphor is a characteristical example of reification.

D. Family Metaphor

Family metaphor is used far and wide in political speeches which can bond the people to a great extent. In this metaphor, the government is the strict father and citizens are children.

23. *To renew America, we must be bold. We must do what no generation has had to do before. We must invest more in our own people, in their jobs, in their future, and at the same time cut our massive debt. And we must do so in a world in which we must compete for every opportunity.* (Bill Clinton, 1993)

24. *Each and every one of us, in our own way, must assume personal responsibility - not only for ourselves and our families, but for our neighbors and our nation. Our greatest responsibility is to embrace a new spirit of community for a new century. For any one of us to succeed, we must succeed as one America.* (Bill Clinton, 1997)

Example 23 is a warning of the dangers of the outside world. In 24 example the father is educating his children what is wrong and should not be done.

The strict father delivers nurturance and expresses his devotion to his family by backing and protecting them, and also by setting and enforcing strict moral bounds and by inculcating self-discipline and self-reliance through hard work. For the strict father, strictness is a form of nurturance and tough love. The strict father is restrained in showing affection and emotion overtly and prefers the appearance

of strength and calm. He regards charity as an expression of compassion for those less fortunate and as an expression of gratitude for his own good fortune.

E. Natural Environment Metaphor

For the expediency of analysis, natural setting is divided into two subcategories - weather conditions and geographical features. These two source domains are less common than others are; conversely, they are still key.

Weather condition is a conventional source domain for conveying abstract concepts of changes. This metaphor is related to a conceptual metaphor CIRCUMSTANCES ARE WEATHER (Grady, 1997).

The facts that wind carries about a change in the weather delivers a valuable metaphorical picture of the cause of the change of social circumstances.

Commonly metaphors related by means of changing conditions are more collective than those associated with stable ones are. So here, the conceptual metaphor SOCIAL CONDITION IS WEATHER is proposed.

While sunshine and breeze designate a promising social condition, storm and tempest imply a disagreeable condition. The more intense the weather condition is, the more intense the change is implied. Such uses are based on source knowledge of the destructive potential of the weather that is so mutual in our life. Weather metaphors induce either a positive or a negative assessment.

Generally, this metaphor syndicates with the journey metaphor as the weather condition habitually touches the portable of a person. And yet good weather is favorite, bad weather cannot be evaded. What people should believe is that after the tempest the beautiful rainbow will be seen. People will delight in happiness after undergoing hardships.

25. *For a new breeze is blowing, and a world refreshed by freedom seems reborn.* (George W.Bush, 2001)

26. *There are times when the future seems thick as a fog; you sit and wait, hoping the mists will lift and reveal the right path.* (George H.Bush, 1989)

27. *...we rode through the storm with heart and hand.* (Ronald Reagan, 1985)

28. *Since this century's beginning, a time of tempest has seemed to come upon the continents of the earth.* (Dwight Eisenhower, 1953)

Social conditions are closely connected to the geographical features as well - SOCIAL CONDITIONS ARE GEOGRAPHICAL FEATURES. This metaphor highpoints a particular facet of a physical geographical feature, which is either horizontal or vertical. Once the vertical feature is involved it is related to the conceptual metaphor UP IS GOOD.

This honor now signals America - the chance to aid principal the world at last out of the valley of turmoil, and onto that high ground of peace, that man has imagined of since the beginning of civilization (Richard Nixon 1969).

Conclusions to Chapter One

On what mainly a day of celebration is, numerous new presidents make sure not to gloss over the enormous encounters the country is always facing. Being president is not cool - even for the period of the country's best, greatest wealthy days, there are trials. Meanwhile the inaugural address stances in for that year's State of the Union address, it is vital for the president to express sympathy of the issues and to suggest some kind of resolution for them.

Fundamentals of public speaking are mainly big efforts in which we tense the importance of grasping the approaches of oratory skills and public speaking, in order for those facts to attend each distinct as the main tool for the calmer triumph of all arguments of a corporate and individual statement. We elucidate and summarize the definite idea of public speaking and its components and bound a reaction to the central query of who in fact needs those oratory skills. In addition, we turn to the basic separations and types of speech, their main features and differences, as well as a very important segment of oratory that is improvised, or impulsive speech.

Genre analysis not only leaks the accessible form-function linking of a text or discourse but also contributes pointedly to language learners' accepting. Presidential speech can be regarded as a genre over and done with examining the communicative purposes, rhetoric situations, functions and generic traditions of the inaugural address. Since in the least genre will have its particular cognitive construction to shadow, the schematic structure of the presidential speech is examined.

To sum it up, we may conclude that the public speaking is each feature of the distinct creating a speech to the group or individual listener, either animate or via electronic means of communication, which aims to achieve a specific goal or to give a certain image of themselves through countless techniques of impact, evidence and performing.

CHAPTER TWO. THE RESULTS OF THE STYLISTIC ANALYSES OF B. OBAMA`S INAUGURAL SPEECHES

2.1 Key values of the B. Obama`s inaugural speeches

When President Barack Obama presented his first and second inaugural addresses, he was speaking to more than just the record-setting 1.8 million people in 2009 and 1 million people in 2013 that packed the National Mall. Based on his speeches it is clear that he was speaking to a much larger audience that encompasses over 300 million people, American citizens. The first step in addressing this audience is to make them feel united and show them that they share the commonality of being American citizens (Campbell and Jamieson, 2008). President B. Obama does use religious rhetoric when he tries to accomplish this sense of unity in his 2009 inaugural address; however, he uses this religious rhetoric while also relying heavily on the shared American ideals set forth by the Founding Fathers. B. Obama (2009) does so by affirming that Americans must carry on the idea of the *“God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness.”*

In order to inspire unity B. Obama seems to have chosen to emphasize specific ideals in this phrase that are well associated with American nationality. The ideals of equality, freedom, and the pursuit of happiness are derived directly from the Declaration of Independence: the text that gave Americans’ their own national identity and thus united us as a distinct nation. B. Obama (2009) also refers to the common civil religion shared by Americans when he states that these ideals comprise a promise that is *“God-given”*.

According to Beasley (2004), appeals to civil religion and overarching American ideals in order to unite the American people are constants in presidents’ inaugural addresses throughout history. This is because presidents in the past have defined American national identity based on the premise that Americans are

“*God’s chosen people*” and have certain shared beliefs that unite them as Americans (Beasley, 2004).

President B. Obama uses the long-standing rhetorical tradition of portraying Americans as God has chosen people and reiterating their divine destiny to call the American people to action. In doing so B. Obama has utilized and perpetuated a tradition in presidential rhetoric that has been consistent since the first inaugural address given by George Washington. B. Obama’s (2009) appeal to this time tested ritual in presidential rhetoric is illustrated as he lays out “*the price and promise of citizenship*”, and states that the confidence to enact this promise comes from “*the knowledge that God calls on us to shape an uncertain destiny.*”

According to B. Obama (2009) “*the price and promise of citizenship*” comprises a new era of responsibility - a recognition, on the part of every American, that we have duties to ourselves, our nation and the world, duties that we do not grudgingly accept but rather seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character than giving our all to a difficult task.

The price and promise of citizenship is basically a new label on old ideals. As stated before, this characterization of Americans is not new. B. Obama’s statement is actually very similar to a passage in Benjamin Harrison’s 1889 inaugural address when he stated that God placed “*diadem*” upon our heads and gave us wealth and power beyond “*definition or calculation.*” Both B. Obama’s and Harrison’s statements seem to call Americans to act because God has gifted them with great power and responsibility.

Cherry (1971) asserts that America’s call to a “*special destiny by God*” is deeply rooted in American history. In this view, England, Egypt and America is the new promised land. Like Moses in Israel, B. Obama is now speaking to the people that he is responsible for leading. Rather than begging or demanding the American people to live up to their responsibilities as Americans, President B. Obama portrayed these desired actions as a promise that we have made to God to fulfill our destiny. President B. Obama makes many references to God and a shared

civil religion in his inaugural addresses but contradicts Beasley's (2004) assertions that national identity is based on civil religion. He transcends this notion by including those who do not follow this common civil religion by stating, "*We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus, and nonbelievers.*" (Obama, 2009).

Including religious non-believers violates the notion that we are all one nation under God and the claim that our national identity rests upon this. This suggests that B. Obama's definition of American national identity is more inclusive than previous presidents as he encompasses those who are outside of the common American civil religion. President B. Obama does not entirely conform to Beasley's (2004) definition of American national identity in his inaugural addresses. Beasley (2004) asserts that presidents have defined.

American national identity in terms of a common civil religion in their inaugural address and state of the union addresses. President B. Obama does appeal to a shared religion in his speeches, but it seems clear that this does not comprise the entirety of American national identity in his view. His inaugural addresses suggest that he defines American national identity through the shared American ideals set by the founding fathers. In his first inaugural address, he states that faithfulness to America's founding ideals and principles has allowed America to carry on through good times and bad (Obama, 2009). His increased reliance on shared ideals rather than a shared faith is also made appearances at the start of his second inaugural address. He states, "*that what binds this nation together is not the colors of our skin or the tenets of our faith or the origins of our names.*" (Obama, 2013). Instead, we are bound "*our allegiance to an idea, articulated in a declaration made more than two centuries ago*" (Obama, 2013). It seems that President B. Obama's rhetorical style has always relied more on shared ideologies more than shared religion. This can be seen as a continuation of his campaign rhetoric in 2008 as his rhetoric was not overly sacred nor anti-sacred according to Marietta (2012).

B. Obama's preference for shared ideals over religion can also be explained by the fact that his two books and his speeches provide proof of his extensive knowledge of American history and ideals according to Kloppenburg (2011). Through his inaugural addresses, B. Obama may be redefining the prevalent view of American national identity by putting emphasis on shared ideals rather than shared religion.

In terms of calling the American people to act, B. Obama appeals to both shared religious beliefs and the American ideals of the founding fathers in his 2013 inaugural address. B. Obama (2013) references the recently prevalent issue of climate change and states that America must lead the transition on the path towards sustainable energy. By leading this transition B. Obama (2013) claims that America will be preserving the planet that has been "*commanded to our care by God*". This is very similar to his mention of America's destiny and responsibility in his first inaugural address and adheres to the assertions made by Cherry (1971) about America's God-given destiny. In the next sentence, he puts emphasis on shared ideals rather than shared religion. He claims that America's actions related to climate change will "*lend meaning to the creed our fathers once declared.*" (Obama, 2013). This use of sacred and non-sacred rhetoric seems to characterize B. Obama's rhetoric and distinguishes him from other presidents.

This also suggests that President B. Obama's definition of American national identity is more focused on shared American beliefs rather than shared religion. This broadens the scope of American national identity to include those who do not fit under the umbrella of the commonly held American civil religion.

By becoming President of the United States of America B. Obama has also become in large part Americans' voice in the global community, and in this is particularly illustrated in his first inaugural address when he speaks to general and specific factions of a global audience. This is illustrated when B. Obama first addresses "*all other peoples and governments who are watching today, from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born*" (Obama, 2009).

This shows that he is cognizant of this larger audience for this address and seems to attempt to portray himself as similar to them by referencing his father's origin. It is well known that B. Obama's father is not a natural-born American citizen. This may have influenced B. Obama's rhetoric on immigration and towards immigrants as he is the son of an immigrant himself.

Past presidential rhetoric as characterized by Beasley (2004), shows that presidents have been much more exclusive in their rhetoric, President Obama was much more inclusive than past presidents in his rhetoric on this matter. This is exemplified in B. Obama's 2009 inaugural address as he places immigrants and slaves in context with those who fought in historic battles.

Specifically, those who *"packed up their worldly possessions and traveled across oceans in search of a new life"* are mentioned (Obama, 2009). He states that in American history these people are the ones who carried this generation on the *"path towards prosperity and freedom"* (Obama, 2009). This is very different from how immigrants were portrayed at the time that they were traveling across those oceans to immigrate to America. Beasley (2004) characterizes past presidential rhetoric as very exclusive; especially during the 1880s to the 1920s immigrants were portrayed as ignorant, vicious, and dangerous. Beasley (2004) exemplifies this characterization through Benjamin Harrison's 1889 inaugural address which criticizes the naturalization laws at the time and portrays American citizenship as being very exclusive. Harrison (1889) stated that the naturalization process should examine the character of immigrants closely and that Americans should be hospitable to immigrants, but not careless when examining their character. According to Harrison (1889), American citizenship should be highly revered due to the many privileges and serious responsibilities associated with it. With so much at stake Harrison (1889) stated that Americans *"may well insist upon a good knowledge of every person applying for citizenship and a good knowledge by him of our institutions."* Harrison (1889) continues to say that immigration of some people can be *"a burden upon our public revenues or a threat to social order."*

The differences in Harrison's speech and B. Obama's are pronounced on this issue. Harrison portrays immigrants as nuisances while B. Obama portrays them as brave individuals who helped to build success for the current generation of Americans. This shows a great change in past presidential rhetoric on immigration as B. Obama includes those who have historically been excluded, and portrays them as a positive piece of our shared history as Americans. President B. Obama violates many of the exclusive rhetorical traditions of past presidents as he portrays immigrants as beneficial aspects of the nation. B. Obama (2009) states that as Americans we "*know that our patchwork heritage is a strength, not a weakness.*" However, B. Obama is not the first president to violate the typical inclusive rhetoric. Beasley (2004) states that John F. Kennedy had made a similar argument characterizing immigrants as a source of strength in his book *A Nation of Immigrants*.

B. Obama's also uniquely portrays immigration in a positive light as he states, "*we are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth.*" (Obama, 2009) According to Beasley (2004), past presidential rhetoric has portrayed America as the pinnacle of excellence and has viewed American culture and ideals as the most important aspect of being an American citizen. Several presidents have stated that this nation and its culture is "*ours*" and is uniquely American. B. Obama's statement seems to violate this logic as he states that we are "*shaped*" by languages and cultures from all over the world.

This statement breaks down the logic of American exceptionalism present in past examples of presidential rhetoric and indicates that our culture is influenced by immigrants and is not purely American. This logic also invalidates the premise that past presidential rhetoric had used to exclude immigrants who were that immigrants could not adapt to our uniquely American culture. B. Obama's (2009) quote suggests that there is no need to make this distinction because America is a "*patchwork*" nation that includes people of many different cultures. This also suggests that President B. Obama's definition of American identity includes more than one type of American, and views this variety as a strength.

In his first inaugural address, B. Obama does not only speak to American citizens and those who inhabit this nation. He also directs his speech to more specific audiences outside of America's borders. He adapts his message to more specific audiences in the global community when he specifically addresses the Muslim world and claims that America wants a new relationship with them in the future that is grounded in "*mutual interest and mutual respect.*" (Obama, 2009). This audience is a small part of the global community but has become very influential in the past decade and that seems to be illustrated herein that the president feels that he needs to speak directly to this group. This theme of speaking to certain factions of the global community directly continues in his next phrase in which he chastises "*those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent*" (Obama, 2009).

After narrowing in on certain factions, B. Obama returns to addressing the larger global audience by promising America's help to "*the people of poor nations*", and calling upon "*nations like ours that enjoy relative plenty*" to do more for the global community (Obama, 2009). It seems that B. Obama views the global audience as very significant and that he attempts to tailor his messages to them. Many people around the world watched B. Obama's 2009 inauguration as the transition of power in the world's most influential country took place, and his speech seemed to speak to all of them.

While President B. Obama may be much more inclusive of immigrants than past presidents he still has his pitfalls. This is seen in his second inaugural address President B. Obama as seems very welcoming to immigrants, but he seems to be emulating an example of presidential rhetoric that Beasley (2004) referred to as exclusive. Beasley (2004) asserts that Lyndon B. Johnson's rhetoric on immigration focused on what an immigrant could do for America rather than their origin or their faith in American ideals. B. Obama's (2013) rhetoric is very similar as he states that we need to welcome "*striving*" and "*hopeful*" immigrants. He states that our journey is not complete until "*bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country*" (Obama,

2013). B. Obama's statement seems to be loaded with ideas from the past about immigration, and portrays them as doers for America rather than included as American citizens.

According to Beasley (2004), this shows that there are still preferences and calls for judgments to be made about which immigrants should be allowed to stay in America. This seems very different from B. Obama's first inaugural address where he contradicted many of the exclusive rhetorical traditions of past presidents. Here it seems that he has conformed and began to follow the crowd in his rhetoric on immigration.

Later in his 2013 speech, B. Obama strays away from this exclusive rhetoric of past presidents and returns to the inclusive rhetoric that was present in his 2009 inaugural address. B. Obama (2013) refers to the oath that he has taken as president and compares it to the oath that is taken "*each time a soldier signs up for duty, or an immigrant realizes her dream.*" Like in his 2009 address, he references immigrants along with American citizens who have fought in a war or joined the armed services. This suggests that they are the same and both of them have become American citizens by adopting the ideals present in their respective oaths. This seems to be more characteristic of B. Obama's rhetoric as he frequently places immigrants at the same level of prestige as those who have fought for America.

Previous presidential rhetoric as characterized by Beasley (2004) has presented racial discrimination as an issue for the law or the government to deal with. President B. Obama violates Beasley's (2004) characterizations by putting the responsibility of eradicating racism on the American people. This is exemplified when he says that Americans have come out of a bleak past of segregation and civil war more united, but hopes that "*old hatreds shall someday pass*" (Obama, 2009). According to Beasley (2004), recent presidential rhetoric on race has focused on the government's role in the inclusion of minorities and ending racism. Before that, it was the law's problem rather than the people or the governments. Now B. Obama (2009) seems to be saying that the American people need to be responsible for eradicating racism by letting "*old hatreds*" go. This

message acknowledges that even in 2009 we still have not become a racially blind society and still have lingering feelings of discontent for people of different ethnicities and races. What makes this more significant is that it is being spoken by a man that can relate the issue of racial discrimination in a way that no other president has been able to before.

President B. Obama has a drastically different perspective on racism in America compared to past presidents, which seems to greatly distinguish his rhetoric on this issue. This is particularly exemplified in a moving statement that he makes later in his first inaugural address. He refers to “*the price and promise of citizenship*” and the American ideals that embody it as the reason why Americans of every race and faith can come together to celebrate at this joyous occasion (Obama, 2009). He also states that “*the price and promise of citizenship*” is the reason why “*a man whose father less than 60 years ago might not have been served at a local restaurant*” can now stand before America and take the oath of office as President of the United States of America (Obama, 2009). Past presidential rhetoric analyzed by Beasley (2004) looked at the race issue from an outsider’s perspective and in comparison, they barely scratched the surface.

January 21, 2013 set up an interesting context for President B. Obama to be inaugurated for his second term as president. The first black man to hold the highest office in America was re-inaugurated on Martin Luther King Jr. Day. From where B. Obama stood to give his second inaugural address he was able to look out and see the monument erected in King’s honour staring back at him. Nearly forty years before this day, thousands of people gathered in the same mall to hear Martin Luther King Jr. give his “*I Have a Dream Speech*”. This significant moment was not lost on President B. Obama as he addresses equality in America. B. Obama (2013) states that self-evident truth that we are all created equal guides us today as it guided “*our forebears through Seneca Falls, and Selma, and Stonewall; just as it guided all those men and women, sung and unsung, who left footprints along this great Mall, to hear a preacher says that we cannot walk alone*” (Obama, 2013).

The founders of America asserted that all men are created equal. This truth is self-evident but has not always been executed. B. Obama embodies this here by bringing in the example of King's speech.

2.2 Constitutive features of Barack Obama`s inaugural speeches

In his inaugural address, the President calls for the unity of the nation, appeals to traditional values, appeals to the patriotic feelings of citizens, and proclaims the principles of his government. By delivering the inaugural speech, the president formally takes office (Акинина, 2018). The oath is the structural core of speech.

The material studied by us allows us to conclude that the genre “inaugural address” has the following constitutive features:

1. The participants are the president and the general audience.

By delivering the inaugural address, the president formally takes office. He speaks to his people, demonstrating respect for the law and for the people who elected him to this office. As you can see from the following example, B. Obama expresses respect towards the people using the address “*compatriots*”.

“My fellow citizens: I stand here today humbled by the task before us, grateful for the trust you have bestowed, mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors” (Obama, 2013).

2. Text - the inaugural address itself, existing in writing and pronounced by the president.
3. Purpose - the declaration of the principles of the new administration and the unity of the nation through faith in their leader and their country

In delivering the address, the President calls for the unity of the nation. B. Obama's inaugural address emphasizes that citizens should not only realize that

they are part of this country, but also feel it. In his speech, we meet the pronoun we, the verb unite, which are proof of the idea of unity.

“On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord. On this day, we come to proclaim an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations and worn-out dogmas that for far too long have strangled our politics” (Obama, 2013).

“We recall that what binds this nation together is not the colors of our skin or the tenets of our faith or the origins of our names” (Obama, 2013). As Parshina notes, in delivering a speech, the president also in a somewhat exaggerated way emphasizes the dignity of the nation, appeals to traditional values, appeals to the patriotic feelings of citizens and proclaims the principles of his government (Parshina, 2004). Therefore, B. Obama emphasizes that his people have always been able to turn turning points into the pillars of history, remained faithful to the traditions of their ancestors, and did not look for easy ways to solve problems.

“The words have been spoken during rising tides of prosperity and the still waters of peace. Yet, every so often the oath is taken amidst gathering clouds and raging storms. At these moments, America has carried on not simply because of the skill or vision of those in high office, but because we the People have remained faithful to the ideals of our forebears, and true to our founding documents” (Obama, 2013).

“It has not been the path for the faint-hearted, for those who prefer leisure over work, or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame. Rather, it has been the riskakers, the doers, the makers of things - some celebrated, but more often men and women obscure in their labor - who have carried us up the long, rugged path towards prosperity and freedom” (Obama, 2013).

Proclaiming the principles of his government, the American president claims that his goal will be to preserve peace and friendship.

“With old friends and former foes, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat” (Obama, 2013).

“And because we have tasted the bitter swill of civil war and segregation and emerged from that dark chapter stronger and more united, we cannot help but believe that the old hatreds shall someday pass; that the lines of tribe shall soon dissolve; that as the world grows smaller, our common humanity shall reveal itself; and that America must play its role in ushering in a new era of peace” (Obama, 2013).

“To the Muslim world, we seek a new way forward, based on mutual interest and mutual respect” (Obama, 2013).

4. Time constraints and local factors.

This feature is reflected in the fact that the inaugural address is pronounced only during the presidential inauguration ceremony, at a certain time, in a certain state and in a certain territory. For example, US presidents deliver their inaugural address in Washington, DC, at the Capitol on January 20th the following year after the election.

5. Semantic integrity and clear structure.

Another characteristic feature of this genre is its clear structure, which, together with a single goal, determines the semantic integrity of the inaugural address.

An integral part of the inauguration ceremony is the oath that precedes the president's address. The inaugural address is structurally subdivided into introduction, main part and conclusion. In his introduction, the President expresses gratitude to all those present for the responsibility entrusted to him, and also thanks his predecessor.

“I thank President Bush for his service to our nation... as well as the generosity and cooperation he has shown throughout this transition” (Obama, 2013).

The main part provides a summary of the main policy course. From the point of view of Parshina in this genre uses the temporal factor: “consistent appeal to the past, present and future” (Паршина, 2004).

In the final part of his speech, the President turns to the future, expressing confidence in the change in the situation in the country for the better. In B. Obama's speech, there is a firm belief that the nation will cope with the problems that threaten it with the help of God and the hard work of the citizens themselves to restore peace through peaceful negotiations, not armed conflicts. B. Obama hopes that the citizens of the United States will undoubtedly continue on the path of democracy in the name of their freedom and in the name of the freedom of their descendants so that they can be proud of them

“Let it be said by our children s children that when we were tested we refused to let this journey end, that we did not turn back nor did we falter; and with eyes fixed on the horizon and God s grace upon us, we carried forth that great gift of freedom and delivered it safely to future generations” (Obama, 2013).

2.3 The analyses of SD and EM in B. Obama`s inaugural speeches

B. Obama's speech undoubtedly won the hearts of the public. The stylistic devices used in this speech are quite simple. To begin with, it is worth noting that stylistic techniques were used in the speech at the grammatical level of the text:

1. Parallelism;

For example, *“Homes have been lost; jobs shed; businesses shuttered our health care is too costly; our schools fail too many”* (Obama, 2009). In this example, we can observe syntactic parallelism which simplifies speech, giving it rhythm, gradation and asyndeton. These stylistic techniques are used to enhance the impact on the audience to more clearly convey ideas to the audience.

2. Polysindeon;

For example, *“And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age”* (Obama, 2009). Despite the dividing effect, polysindeton has an intensifying and excretory function, emphasizing various semantic, emotional meanings and components of the utterance.

3. Metaphor;

For example, *“Starting today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin again the work of remaking America.”* (Obama, 2009) The emphasis is on the fact that America wants to build a strong country with common forces.

For example, *“It has never been the path of the faint-hearted...but more often men and women obscure in their labor, who have carried us up the long rugged path towards prosperity and freedom”; :This is the journey we continue today...”; “As we consider the road that unfolds before us...”* (Obama, 2009). Striving for the future takes place as a journey along the road filled with obstacles and difficulties. However, hope and faith should be maintained for the best.

For example, *“to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day... “; “...we have tasted the bitter swill of civil war and segregation, and emerged from that dark chapter... “; “...see a friend lose their job, which sees us through our darkest hours”* (Obama, 2009). Like black and white stripes of life, Americans daily face difficulties, but, being united, they cope with everything successfully.

For example, *“On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord...”* (Obama, 2009). America confronts world conflicts, thereby becoming an omnipotent power.

4. Personification;

For example, *“At those moments, America has carried on...”* (Obama, 2009). In political discourse wears aesthetic character. By personifying America, B. Obama heightens the patriotic emotion of the audience.

5. Metonymy;

For example, *“At those moments, America has carried on. ...to nourish the starved bodies and feed hungry minds”* (Obama, 2009). In B. Obama's speech, the use of metonyms "place for residents" and "body parts" can be seen within a political context, metonymy gives the text imagery and expressiveness.

6. Comparison;

For example, “*And to those nations like ours that enjoy relative plenty*” (Obama, 2009). There is a comparison of two phenomena. B. Obama uses this stylistic device once, likening America with similar the worldview of the country. Thus, uniting not only people inside the country but also abroad.

Many sentences in B. Obama's inaugural speech are characterized by the use of the auxiliary verb will with the personal pronoun “we”: “*We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our commerce and bind us together. We will restore science to its rightful place and wield technology's wonders to raise health care's quality... and lower its costs. We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age*” (Obama, 2009).

The combination of the personal pronoun we and the verb will is not accidental: this combination has a fairly effective effect on the audience since it gives an opportunity to see a positive future, the confidence that all problems will be solved. Moreover, the people will not be building a happy future alone, but together with their president, thus creating the effect of unity between the head of state and the nation, in other words, the president says: “*I am yours.*” From the very beginning of his speech, a politician must establish contact with the audience, win the support of the population. This task cannot always be realized with the help of rational belief, that is, it can be based on logical evidence. The internal impulses of the speaker and his psychological impact on the public are of great importance.

2.4 Tactics used in metaphorical aspect of Barack Obama`s inaugural speeches

All speaking of B. Obama is metaphorical and extremely emotional. This circumstance allows the policy to manipulate the consciousness of the recipients in order to convince the latter of the correctness of their views. Metaphoricity, the

strong expressiveness of the political speeches of American leaders is also explained by the same political notions of their politics (which is also indirectly referred to in the words of B. Obama), as politics is a fight / was, politics is an all-absorb consumed us for so long no longer apply, politics is journey, etc.

Summing up the above, we note that the function of metaphor in the inaugural speech broadens significantly as B. Obama makes good use of all the possibilities of temporal metaphor, which are maximally revealed at the level of interpretive-evaluative thinking. Tactics based on the value system of the recipients, vivid and understandable for each image, as well as emotionality, allow B. Obama to implement his communicative message by successfully applying his strategy of manipulation.

Therefore, B. Obama in his first inaugural speech uses the following tactics.

The **tactics of identification**: *“We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age. All this we can do. All this we will do”* (Obama, 2009);

The **praise tactics**: *“We remain the most prosperous, powerful nation on Earth. Our workers are no less productive than when this crisis began. Our minds are no less inventive, our goods and services no less needed than they were last week or last month or last year. Our capacity remains undiminished”* (Obama, 2009);

The unity tactics: *“On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord”* (Obama, 2009);

The **positive positioning tactics** based on previous positive experience: *“Their memories are short, for they have forgotten what this country has already done, what free men and women can achieve when imagination is joined to common purpose and necessity to courage”* (Obama, 2009);

The **super-target design tactics**: *“We will harness the sun and the winds...”* (Obama, 2009).

Consequently, political communication requires a profound contextual adjustment and a thoughtful choice of linguistic items to influence listeners' perceptions and their subsequent actions; President B. Obama demonstrates his understanding of these concepts in the speech analysed. Several carefully made choices take place in B. Obama's speech. Captivating metaphors are found by converting abstract notions into concrete ones related to the human body and natural phenomena (hand, fist, winter, current, storm, tide).

Personifications are also captivating for the affectionate tone they convey ("*...America is a friend and a young nation...*").

Cultural meaning related to human experience is behind evaluative metaphors, either positively or negatively, ("*...intend to move forward not turn back...*").

Similarly, B. Obama's Inaugural Address evidences evaluative metaphors which conceptualize political life as a journey (*charter, path, short-cut*), a construction (*build, remake, levee*) and a conflict (*defeat, foe, slaughter*). However, the war metaphor denotes a more novel way to construct political discourse when compared with the oratory of his predecessor, President Bush; particularly as it relates to the post 9/11 world. Positively associated metaphors seem to be much more beneficial in political speech than those conveying negative associations.

Opposing the metaphors of "*segregation and hate*", B. Obama prefers the positive metaphor of "*unity and hope*". The Inaugural Address calls out for values and ideals such as loyalty to America's Founding Fathers, "*...faithful to the ideals of our forbearers...*"; renewal of democracy, "*...the work of remaking America...*"; inclusiveness regarding race, "*...every race and every faith can join in celebration...*"; and praise to diversity, "*...our patchwork heritage is a strength...*". In the end, a good combination of touching values is what makes this Inaugural Address highly empathic.

B. Obama's Inaugural Address is a good example of how persuasive political communication involves linguistic strategies mostly related to cultural beliefs. B. Obama is persuasive because of his highly captivating metaphors,

which directly engage the emotions of his audience. They are captivating for their cognitive, pragmatic and linguistic qualities.

Most of them take into account the deepest social and ideological American values and depict positive associations. Overcoming past events, and embracing opportunities for reconstruction and hope embodied in a personal as well as a societal victory, they are metaphors, which celebrate the election of the first Afro-American president of the United States.

Let's consider some of the features of metaphORIZATION in B. Obama's inaugural speech. Here are some of the brightest examples.

There is an example of the basic cognitive metaphor such as "*development of the country is a journey; development of the country is a battle*". It means you should have an accessible character to develop the country; it is not possible without difficulties and the support of the tradition and achievement of the past.

For example, "*Our journey has never been one of short-cuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the faint-hearted, for those that prefer leisure over work, or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame. Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things - some celebrated, but more often men and women obscure in their labor - who have carried us up the long rugged path towards prosperity and freedom. For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and traveled across oceans in search of a new life. For us, they toiled in sweatshops, and settled the West, endured the lash of the whip, and plowed the hard earth. For us, they fought and died in places like Concord and Gettysburg, Normandy and Khe Sahn. This is the journey we continue today. Time and again these men and women struggled and sacrificed and worked till their hands were raw so that we might live a better life. They saw America as bigger than the sum of our individual ambitions, greater than all the differences of birth or wealth or faction.*" (Obama, 2009).

The sense of the metaphor is to express the value of striving to achieve more in all spheres of life, the priority of diligence and conscientiousness provided in the

basic cognitive metaphor is *“prosperity is tidy; achieving a purpose is agriculture.”*

For example, *“Forty-four Americans have now taken the presidential oath. The words have been spoken during rising tides of prosperity and the still waters of peace. Yet, every so often, the oath is take amidst gathering clouds and raging storms. To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict, or blame their society’s ills on the West - know that your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy.”* (Obama, 2009).

Meaning an aspiration for the future, readiness for change, hope and virtue are expressed in the basic cognitive metaphor is *“hope is a living being”*.

For example, *“Let it be told to the future world...that in the depth of winter, when nothing but hope and virtue could survive... that the city and the country, alarmed at one common danger, came forth to meet [it].With hope and virtue, let us brave once more the icy currents, and endure what storms may come.”* (Obama, 2009).

An example of the basic cognitive metaphor is *“greatness is money; America is a melting spot”* expresses the desire of America to remain an almighty power, consisting of people of different nationalities. The American dream.

“In reaffirming the greatness of our nation we understand that greatness is never a given. It must be earned. For we know that our patchwork heritage is a strength, not a weakness. We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus, and non-believers. We are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth; and because we have tasted the bitter swill of civil war and segregation, and emerged from that dark chapter stronger and more united, we cannot help but believe that the old hatreds shall someday pass; that the lines of tribe shall soon dissolve; that as the world grows smaller, our common humanity shall reveal itself; and that America must play its role in ushering in a new era of peace (Obama, 2009).

“Political activity is a journey” is another productive metaphor in political speech (M. P. Guitart, 2005). The main idea conveyed in this metaphor is that political activity is conceived as a journey.

Accordingly, B. Obama’s Address regards life in politics as a journey full of ways, routes, and paths, *“...it is the surest route to our common good.”* He also refers to *“...the road that unfolds before us...”* as an equivalent of *“a double opportunity.”* On other occasions, he depicts life as a progression, *“...this is the journey we continue today.”* Likewise, his references apply to the long distances walked together after having overcome difficulties, *“...how far we have traveled.”* An evident persuasive effect lies behind the unity that B. Obama creates with his audience. This captivating strategy of closeness is also evidenced in the next metaphor,

“Our journey has never been one of short-cuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the faint-hearted (...) Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things - some celebrated but more often men and women obscure in their labor, who have carried us up the long, rugged path towards prosperity and freedom.” (Obama, 2009)

Conclusions to Chapter Two

This analysis has shown that President B. Obama has a rhetorical style that is quite different from his predecessors. In terms of the tradition of uniting the nation under a shared civil religion, B. Obama divides his rhetoric. He does still use sacred rhetoric. He does this usually through the rhetorical tradition of referring to America as God’s chosen people and emphasizing America’s divine destiny and the responsibilities associated with this.

He emphasizes America’s shared ideals more than their shared religion. He seems to believe that the principles laid out by America’s founding fathers are more binding. By focusing more on shared ideals rather than a shared religion he becomes more inclusive by including that outside of the American civil religion. This exemplifies a broader definition of American national identity.

As a result of the analysis of linguistic units used in the first and second inaugural addresses of B. Obama, we came to the following conclusions:

1. Lexical units characteristic of the first inaugural speech of the American president: nation, spirit, remaking, greatness, great, prosperous, prosperity, powerful, freedom, risk, struggle, sacrifice, God;

2. When arguing his political and ideological views, B. Obama focuses, on the one hand, on simple human relations (for example, the relationship between mother and son), and on the other hand, on the relationship between a person and the state;

3. As the central functions in the speeches of the American president, one can single out the orienting, manipulating and solidarization function;

4. The following tactics are used in the speeches of the head of the United States: the tactics of identification; praise tactics; unity tactics; positive positioning tactics, based on previous positive experience; super-target design tactics.

The values and ideals of a nation flow through B. Obama's Inaugural Address, very often through captivating metaphors. As with any discursive genre, political rhetoric is embedded in the culture and society in which it is produced. Additionally, it implies a set of techniques which involves the manipulation of language for persuasive reasons.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the features of the genre of the victory speech and its functional differences from the genre of the inaugural speech carried out in the article makes it possible to speak about the separate nature of the first, despite the similarity of both genres. Victory speeches have a special purpose - to show the regularity of the current situation, inscribing it into the historical context and designating the achievements of the last time; summarize the election campaign, summarizing its postulates; to express gratitude to everyone who supported the presidential candidate; prove that people have made the right choice, as it will allow them to move closer to achieving a perfect society. In addition, they are distinguished by a greater degree of expressiveness, since they represent an immediate reaction of an eligible participant to the post of president of the country. Thus, it is legitimate to speak of the genre of the victory speech as an independent genre of political discourse.

The analysis of B. Obama's inaugural addresses suggests that a skillful orator who employed various linguistic and rhetoric devices for the efficiency of the address delivered the speeches. They are tightly linked together and, at times, it is hard to separate one from another, as they are often multifunctional. It could be suggested that the high level of education of the speaker was helpful when setting various tools in collaboration so that the use of them produced the effect of a desirable message, the one that the audience accepted as if it had come from itself.

In an attempt to cover the most important values of the American people, B. Obama appeals to those, which rest upon family and religion. He cites the Bible but quite carefully and, having pointed out the diversity of religions represented in the country, applies his words to universal, 'transcendental truth'. He also creates an emotional atmosphere of a nation as a family, which suggests unity and support, the desire for a better future and a readiness for working hard on it for the next generation's sake. The lexical register along with the foregrounding help to fulfil the task in a favorable view.

The newly elected president needs his people's support for the forthcoming reforms, which he has planned to carry out. The unity of the Americans, in order to receive their advanced approval, seems to be the aim of the President's address to the nation. His speech is persuasive but hardly aggressive. By using linguistic techniques, which have been employed by a number of the nation's "Fathers" and which have proved to be successful and appreciated both by the audience present and forthcoming generations, B. Obama announces his address to his people in a favorable way. That is to say, the extensive use of pronouns 'we' and 'our' in combinations with the lexical chain discussed above, affects the speech in such a way that the audience, to some extent, might almost be considered to be participants in it and the President performs as a representative of the people. The various linguistic and rhetorical devices suggest that the orator articulates the ideas of the audience and that as a president; he represents the interests of his people.

RESUMÉ

до магістерської наукової роботи «Лінгвостилістичні характеристики інавгураційних промов Барака Обама»

Магістрант: Устименко Марина Геннадіївна

Керівник: кандидат філологічних наук, доцент Андрущенко Ірина Олександрівна.

У цьому дослідженні розглядається політичний дискурс 44-го президента США Барака Х. Обама. Величезна підтримка американського народу, унікальна позиція першого афроамериканського президента, яскраво виражені риторичні здібності, добре підготовлена передвиборча кампанія - явища, які аналізуються в цьому дисертаційному дослідженні.

Об'єкт дослідження - інавгураційні промови Барака Обама.

Предметом цього дослідження є мовні та стилістичні особливості вступних виступів Барака Обама.

Мета роботи - представити роль інавгураційних промов Барака Обама як першого афроамериканського президента США.

Практична цінність це аналіз результатів, отриманих у його матеріалах, що використовуються в університетських курсах з риторики, стилістики, лексикології, лінгвістики, комунікативної лінгвістики, лінгвістики тексту, лінгвокультурології, соціолінгвістики, дискурсознавства, міжкультурної комунікації та професійних студій.

Проведений у статті аналіз особливостей жанру інавгураційної промови та його функціональних відмінностей від жанру вступної промови дає змогу говорити про окремий характер першого, незважаючи на схожість обох жанрів. Виступи інавгураційної промови мають особливу мету, а саме: показати регулярність поточної ситуації, вписавши її в історичний контекст і позначивши досягнення останнього часу; підвести підсумки виборчої кампанії, узагальнивши її постулати; висловити подяку всім, хто підтримав кандидата в президенти; довести, що люди зробили правильний вибір,

оскільки це дозволить їм наблизитися до досягнення ідеального суспільства. Крім того, вони відрізняються більшим ступенем виразності, оскільки являють собою негайну реакцію учасника виборів на пост президента країни. Отже, правомірно говорити про жанр промови перемоги як про самостійний жанр політичного дискурсу.

Аналіз інавгураційного звернення Барака Обама свідчить про те, що промову виголосив вмілий оратор, який використовував різні лінгвістичні та риторичні засоби для ефективності звернення. Вони тісно пов'язані між собою, і часом важко відокремити одне від одного, оскільки вони часто є багатофункціональними. Разом з тим, високий рівень освіти доповідача був корисним при встановленні різних інструментів у співпраці, так що їх використання дало ефект бажаного повідомлення, того, яке аудиторія прийняла так, ніби воно прийшло від нього самого .

Висвітлюючи найважливіші цінності американського народу, Б. Обама звертається до тих, хто спирається на сім'ю та релігію. Він цитує Біблію, але досить обережно і, вказавши на різноманітність релігій, представлених у країні, застосовує свої слова до загальної, «трансцендентної істини». Він також створює емоційну атмосферу нації як сім'ї, яка передбачає єдність та підтримку, прагнення до кращого майбутнього та готовність до напруженої роботи над нею заради наступного покоління. Лексичний реєстр разом із попереднім плануванням допомагають виконати завдання в сприятливому вигляді.

Новообраний президент потребує підтримки свого народу щодо майбутніх реформ, які він планував здійснити. Єдність американців, щоб отримати їх попереднє схвалення, здається, є метою звернення Президента до нації. Його промова переконлива, але навряд чи агресивна. Використовуючи лінгвістичні прийоми, які застосовуються низкою “батьків” нації і які виявилися успішними та оціненими як присутніми, так і майбутніми поколіннями, Б. Обама сприятливо оголошує своє звернення до свого народу. Тобто, широке використання займенників “ми” та “наш” у поєднанні з

розглянутим вище лексичним ланцюгом впливає на мову таким чином, що аудиторія, певною мірою, майже може вважатися її учасницею і президент виступає як представник народу. Різні лінгвістичні та риторичні прийоми дозволяють припустити, що оратор формулює ідеї аудиторії та як президент; він представляє інтереси свого народу.

Магістерської роботи складається зі вступу, двох розділів, висновків та списку ілюстрованого матеріалу.

У вступі визначається актуальність теми та проводиться короткий огляд поставленої задачі.

У першому розділі розглядається роль інавгураційної промови в політиці.

У другому розділі проводиться аналіз лінгвостилістичних засобів в інавгураційних промовах Барака Обами.

У висновках проводиться аналіз проведеної роботи та отриманих результатів.

Магістерська наукова робота містить 81 сторінку.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Bailey, M. (2009). *Civil religion*. In *Encyclopedia of the American presidency* (Vol. 1, p. 89). New York, NY: Infobase Publishing.
2. Beasley, V. B. (2004). *You, the People: American national identity in presidential rhetoric*. Texas A&M University Press.
3. Bhatia, V. K. (1991). *A Genre-Based Approach to ESP Material Development*. *World Englishes* 10 (2): 1-14.
4. Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analyzing genre: language use in professional settings*. New York: Longman Publishing.
5. Bimes, T. (2009). *Understanding the rhetorical presidency*. *The Oxford handbook of the American presidency*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Bourse, S. (2018). *Conjuring up terror and tears: the evocative and persuasive power of loaded words in the political discourse on drug reform*. Lexis.
7. Campbell K.K., Jamieson K.H. *Inaugurating the Presidency*. (1986). *Form, Genre and the Study of Political Discourse*. Columbia.
8. Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (2008). *Presidents creating the presidency: Deeds done in words*. Chicago, IL:University of Chicago Press.
9. Cassirer E. (1979). *Symbol, myth and culture*. New Haven; London.
10. Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. Palgrave-MacMillan.
11. Cherry, C. (1971). *God's new Israel; religious interpretations of American destiny*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
12. Coolidge, C. (1925). *1925 Inaugural address*. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C.
13. Digital IIP. *Инаугурация президента США: особая традиция*.
14. Fabb, N. (1999). *Verse constituency and the locality of alliteration*. *Lingua*, 108(4).

15. Flowerdew, L. (2000). *Using a genre-based framework to teach organizational structure in academic writing*. *ELT Journal*, 47 (4): 369-378.
16. Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2018). *An introduction to language*. Cengage Learning.
17. Harrison, B. (1889). 1889 *Inaugural address*. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.inaugural.senate.gov/swearing-in/address/address-bybenjamin-harrison-1889>
18. *Inaugural Addresses of the presidents of the United States*. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.bartleby.com/124/index.html>
19. Jones, C. O. (2010). "*The inaugural address: Ceremony of transitions*." *The president's words: speeches and speechwriting in the modern White House*. Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas.
20. Joslyn R. (1986) *Form, Genre and the Study of Political Discourse*. Columbia.
21. *Journal of Economics, Management and Informatics* (2017). Volume 8, Number 2.
22. Karasik V. I. (2004). *Linguistic Circle: personality, concepts, discourse*.
23. Kloppenberg, J. T. (2011). *Reading Obama: dreams, hope, and the American political tradition*.
24. Koller, V., & Semino, E. (2009). *Metaphor, politics and gender: a case study from Germany*. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*, 9-35. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
25. Laswell H.D., Leites N. (1949). *Language of politics: Studies in quantitative semantics*. N.Y.: Sewart.
26. Liu, F. (2012). *Genre Analysis of American Presidential Inaugural Speech*. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 2.
27. Marietta, M. (2012). *The politics of sacred rhetoric: Absolutist appeals and political persuasion*.
28. Mirador, J. F. (2000). *A move analysis of written feedback in higher education*. *RELC Journal*, 31 (1): 45-60.

29. Obama, B. H. (2009). 2009 *Inaugural address*. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.enebooks.com/data/JK82mxJBHsrAsdHqQvsK/2009-07>
30. Obama, B. H. (2013). *Transcript of Obama's speech on Boston marathon bombings*.
31. Obama, B., H. (2013). 2013 *Inaugural address*. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C.
32. Qian, Y. (2006). *Stylistics: A coursebook for Chinese EFL students*. Foreign language teaching and research. Press.
33. Reagan, R. (1981). 1981 *Inaugural address*. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C.
34. Semino, E., & Short, M. (2004). *Corpus stylistics: Speech, writing and thought presentation in a corpus of English writing*. Routledge.
35. Sheigal E. I. (2004). *Semiotics political discourse*.
36. Shu-hong, G. U. A. N. (2005). *Analysis on a Speech from Functional Stylistics Perspective*. Journal of East China Jiaotong University, 3.
37. Sinclair, J. & R. M. Coulthard. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
38. Stuckey, M. (2010). *Inaugural addresses*. In *Encyclopedia of the American presidency*. New York, NY: Infobase Publishing.
39. Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
40. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. (2012).
41. Trimble, L. (1985). *English for science and technology: a discourse approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
42. Trump, D. J. (2017). *The inaugural address*. The White House, 1, 20-37.
43. Tulis, J. K. (1988). *The rhetorical presidency*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
44. United States, & Jefferson, T. (1970). *The declaration of independence*. Achille J. St. Onge.

45. Verdonk, P. (2002). *Stylistics*. Oxford University Press.
46. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
47. Wang Junling. (2010). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama's Speeches*, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1 (3): 254-261.
48. Widdowson, H. G (1973). *Principle & practice in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
49. Yajun, C. H. E. N. (2011). *Stylistic analysis of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg address*. Foreign Language Learning Theory and Practice.
50. Алтунян А.Т. (2010). *Анализ политических текстов*.
51. Арапов М. В. (1997). *А уяснится предмет - без труда и слова подберутся*.
52. Баранов А. Н. (2001). *Введение в прикладную лингвистику*
53. Бидерман Г. (1996). *Энциклопедия символов*
54. Богданов В. В. (1997). *Текст и текстовое общение*.
55. Воробьева О. (2000). *Политическая лексика. Ее функции в современной устной и письменной речи*.
56. Мацько Л. І. (1996). *Лінгвістична риторика. Наука і сучасність*: Зб. наук.
57. *Філологічні науки*. (2016). Відновлено з file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/Nzfn_2016_1_47.pdf
58. Цицерон, М. (1972). *Трактаты об ораторском искусстве*. Відновлено з <http://ancientrome.ru/antlitr/>
59. Чудинов А. (2006). *Политическая лингвистика*. Учеб. Пособие. Москва: «Флинта», «Наука».
60. Шейгал Е. (2002). *Инаугурационное обращение как жанр политического дискурса* (с.220). *Жанры речи*. М.: Саратов
61. Щукин В. (1997). *Социокультурное пространство и проблема жанра*. Вопросы философии.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

1. Trump, D. J. (2017). *The inaugural address*. The White House, 1.
2. Obama, B. H. (2009, January 20). *2009 Inaugural address*. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.enebooks.com/data/JK82mxJBHsrAsdHqQvsK/2009-07>
3. *Inaugural Addresses of the presidents of the United States*. Retrieved from <http://www.bartleby.com/124/index.html>
4. Obama, B. H. (2013). *2013 Inaugural address*. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C.