

UDC 81-11'4:811.111/161.2

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32589/2311-0821.1.2020.207235>

COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES AS A TWO-FACETED PHENOMENON: A CROSS-LINGUISTIC STUDY OF INAUGURAL ADDRESSES

Serhiy Potapenko

Kyiv National Linguistic University, Ukraine

e-mail: potapenkoknlu@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8623-3240>

The recommended citation for this publication is: Potapenko, S. (2020). Communicative strategies as a two-faceted phenomenon: A cross-linguistic study of inaugural addresses. *Herald of Kyiv National Linguistic University. Series in Philology*, 23(1), 71-83. ISSN 2415-7333 (online), ISSN 2311-0821 (print)

Abstract

The paper combines extralinguistic and linguistic facets of communicative strategies suggesting four synthesized levels of their application: a complete text of a particular genre subordinated to an overall strategy of achieving the author's goal; strategic sections carrying maximal textual meanings; tactical moves rendering enhanced meaning formed according to discourse patterns; turns guiding the choice of linguistic units with minimal meaning. This approach is applied to a cross-linguistic study of Presidents Trump (2017) and Zelenskyi's (2019) inaugural addresses.

Key words: inaugural address, communicative strategy, tactical move, cross-linguistic study, President Trump, President Zelenskyi, two-faceted method.

1. Introduction

In contemporary linguistics the wide-spread method of modeling discourse and text is represented by communicative strategies. It's an umbrella term also covering their discursive and rhetorical types, though the scope of their application is far from being settled: the definitions can be divided into expanded, broad and narrow. The expanded interpretation of strategies concerns three basic approaches in the humanities: narodnichestvo / peopleism, modernism and postmodernism (Monakhova, 2016, p. 4). The broad definitions regarding the strategy as a plan of achieving an addressor's goal (Issers, 2012, p. 54; Wodak, 2011, p. 40) reveal its similarity to the genre, a goal-oriented temporarily stable, though flexible phenomenon (Gruber, 2013, p. 31), imposing constraints on the use of lexico-grammatical and discursal resources (Bhatia, 2014, p. 241). These features of the genre arise from imperatives posed by constantly evolving socio-cultural situations (Cap and Okulska, 2013, p. 3). However, some scholars doubt the pervasiveness of genre features pointing to their possible occurrence only one time in a complete text, often at its beginning or ending (Bieber, 2014, p. 193). The initial goals imposed by genres turn out to be external while the objectives governing the choice of communicative strategies appear to be internal and more flexible since they are set by the addressor in response to the situational and generic requirements. Therefore, the proper study of communicative strategies as a goal-oriented phenomenon is only possible with respect to a particular genre with its more or less fixed goal and stringent requirements to the text structure. It determines this paper's focus on the inaugural addresses which have fixed generic features determining the overall strategy of text construction.

The narrow definitions of strategies form two groups embedded into the top-down and bottom-up directions of discourse processing (Brown and Yule, 1983, p. 234). In accordance with this, political

discourse employs two main strategies: cooperative and confrontational (Slavova, 2015, p. 24; Pjetsukh, 2018). However, this approach faces several challenges which prompts to search for other directions of research. First, cooperation and confrontation are categorized in different terms: as superstrategies (Slavova, 2015, p. 24) or as interactions (Pjetsukh, 2018 p. 8). Second, the phenomena regarded as strategies by one researcher are viewed as tactics by the other which, for example, concerns the compliment (Slavova, 2015, p. 26; Pjetsukh, 2018, p. 18) with some scholars treating it as a speech act (Lorenzo-Dus, 2001, p. 108). Third, it is far from being proven that strategies are applicable to the interpretation of traditional phenomena of irony and argumentation (Pjetsukh, 2018, p. 20-21). The former, for instance, is defined more widely as a deeply seated capacity in people, penetrating beyond a mere communication technique (Colston and Athanasiadou, 2020). Finally, the top-down approach stops short of explaining the use of particular linguistic units focusing instead on the conditions for applying strategies and tactics.

Within the bottom-up discourse processing, strategies are defined either as means of signal distribution (Langacker, 2004, p. 45) or techniques of combining meanings in ways that will effectively promote communication (Davis, 2004, p. 156), though a further development of this approach seems to be precluded by the fuzziness of the notion of meaning.

The outlined problems with the definition and application of communicative strategies prompt an objective of this research aimed at interpreting strategies as a means of interactive processing taking place at several discourse levels simultaneously. It presupposes projecting the addressor's goal as an extralinguistic entity on the selection and distribution of meaning in a separate text or conversation. Thus, this paper's tasks are to develop a method of applying a hierarchy of communicative strategies congruent with interactive discourse processing to text analysis; to apply this method to the analysis of the inaugural addresses by American President Trump (2017) and Ukrainian President Zelenskyi (2019); to undertake a cross-linguistic comparison of the strategic organization of the addresses under study.

2. Material and methods

The **material** under study includes the inaugural addresses delivered by American President Donald Trump (2017) and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyi (2019) as speeches of this kind constitute a distinct category or genre (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985, p. 394). As noted above the proper study of communicative strategies as goal-oriented phenomena can only be carried out within the confines of a particular genre. American presidents' inaugural addresses are divided into a number of elements irrespective of the overall goal of the text. Some scholars distinguish relatively stable characteristics of inaugural speeches that make the addressee (and the analyst) approach the entire current manifestation of the genre in the way most congruent with the recollection of the earlier manifestations: tone-setting introduction, the act of thanking the predecessor, the act of invoking continuity of beliefs and ideals, etc (Cap and Okulska, 2013, p. 4). Others single out obligatory elements supposed to be part of any inaugural address: to unify the audience by reconstituting its members as "the people" who can witness and ratify this ceremony; to rehearse common values drawn from the past; to set forth the political principles that will govern the new administration; to demonstrate that the President appreciates the requirements and limitations of his executive functions; to urge contemplation not action, focusing on the present while incorporating past and future, and praising the institution of the Presidency and the values and form of the government of which it is a part (Campbell and Jamieson, 1986, p. 396). The organization of Austrian chancellors' inaugural addresses was studied with the application of minimal or enhanced topical moves (Gruber, 2013, p. 54): it is found that a minimal move comprises only the announcement of a policy or a policy change and may be very short constituting the largest part of the "main body" of a speech while an enhanced move elaborates this minimal structure by inserting two positions before the announcement of a policy or policy change (ibid).

Ukrainian presidents have followed the model set by American inaugural addresses since the institution together with its procedures was borrowed from the US after this country obtained independence in 1991. However, Ukrainian presidents' inaugural addresses seem to have acquired some specific features requiring investigation.

The **method** applied to the study of the inaugural addresses is that of a two-faceted strategic analysis, which combines two hierarchies: extralinguistic with the author's goal guiding the application of strategies, tactics and steps (Slavova, 2015, p. 24), and linguistic, subordinating genres, sections, moves and linguistic steps. Following the genre theory this paper treats the move in a somewhat narrow sense as a particular rhetorical or linguistic pattern, stage, or structure conventionally found in a text or in its segment unlike rhetoric where this general term means any strategy employed by a rhetor (Nordquist, 2019).

The combination of extralinguistic and linguistic facets results into distinguishing four dual levels of strategic analysis within corresponding linguistic constituents: 1) the genre belongingness and the organization of a text as a whole are governed by an overall strategy, or super-strategy; 2) the general meaning of strategic sections is subordinated to the author's personal strategy guided by his / her objectives; 3) a tactical move is a "functional, not a formal, unit", expressed by a clause, a sentence cluster, or a paragraph (Swales, 2004, p. 228-229); 4) a step fills in the discourse patterns associated with moves by particular linguistic units.

In their turn, steps are distinguished according to five functional criteria: 1) referential, representing social actors; 2) predicational, characterizing them; 3) argumentational, justifying positive or negative attributions; 4) perspectival, representing the speaker's point of view of the social actors; 5) intensifying / mitigating, qualifying or modifying the epistemic status of the proposition (Wodak, 2011, p. 41-42). Accordingly, the referential steps provide for units naming social actors ranging from individuals to groups, entities etc. The perspectival steps determine the choice of the units representing social actors from zooming-in or zooming-out standpoint as well as by foregrounding or backgrounding them. The predicational steps characterize social actors by predicative groups. The intensifying / mitigating steps govern the use of units amplifying or diminishing social actors' status. Argumentation splits between the move incorporating the premise and the steps representing arguments. The linguistic steps merge forming mixed types within sentences and paragraphs, e.g. referential perspectival, predicational perspectival, etc.

The application of the two-faceted method of strategic analysis begins with defining the overall strategy drawing on the specifics of a genre since it influences the interpretation of the lower levels. Second, the functional criteria discussed above serve as the basis for singling out minimal meanings at the level of linguistic steps. Third, the build up of the linguistic steps on the supersentential level results into moves rendering an enhanced meaning. Fourth, related – similar or contrastive – moves form sections with maximal meanings congruent with the author's personal strategy typically outlined at the outset of an inaugural address (Potapenko, 2016).

3. Results

The application of the two-faceted strategic procedure to the analysis of the inaugural addresses delivered by American President Donald Trump (2017) and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyi (2019) has yielded the following results.

3.1. Rallying the nation for confrontation and promissory strategies in President Trump's inaugural address

President Trump's address (2017) falls into two strategic sections structured by semantically similar tactical moves: rallying the nation for confrontation, uniting the masses against the establishment; and promissory, foretelling America's great future under the new leader's guidance with a culmination move opening it.

The strategic section rallying the nation for confrontation consists of two pairs of integrity and confrontation moves with that of power transfer sandwiched between them.

The first integrity move rallying the nation around the head of state is implemented by two steps: unanimity per se and unanimity for the sake of progress.

The unanimity referential and predicational steps trigger the use of three units in this passage: "*We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and to restore its promise for all of our people*" (Trump, 2017, para. 2). One can note the inclusive *we*, the apposition *the citizens of America*, and the predicate *are joined*. The noun *promise* at the end of the cited utterance anticipates the second – promissory – strategic section of the address. Therefore, the utterance above can be treated as the one formulating the essence of the author's personal strategy congruent with his objective within the inaugural genre.

The unanimity for the sake of progress is expressed by the utterance "*Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come*" (ibid). This step combines the noun together with the inclusive *we* serving as a springboard for the predicational progress step referring to the expected gains in the country and throughout the world in a new era ushered in by the president.

The first confrontation move, indicated by the conjunctions *while* and *but*, has an argumentational structure supported by the referential and predicational steps opposing the country's elite and the rank and file constituting the president's electorate: "*For too long, a small group in our nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the cost. Washington flourished – but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered – but the jobs left, and the factories closed*" (Trump, 2017, para. 6). In this extract, the steps carrying arguments are expressed by the units *a small group in our nation's Capital*, *Washington*, *politicians* and *establishment*, on the one hand, and by the units *people*, *jobs*, *factories*, *citizens of our country*, on the other. The predicational steps are implemented by predicative groups characterizing the elite and the general population.

The second argumentational move rests on the opposition between two perspectival steps, i.e. *their*-referential and *your*-predicational: "*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, para. 7).

The power transfer move is carried out by the steps naming the stages of power transmission from the elite to the grass roots. It opens with a performative act rendered by the utterance "*That all changes – starting right here, and right now*" (Trump, 2017, para. 7) which is easily transformed into the performative utterance *I hereby change all this*. This act serves as a premise for the arguments introduced by *your*- and *you*-perspectival steps in the utterance "*This moment is your moment: it belongs to you*" (Trump, 2017, para. 7). The next step shifts the power focus from the elite to the masses: "*What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people. January 20th 2017 will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again*" (Trump, 2017, para. 8). This shift is achieved by combining the verb *control* and the predicate *became rulers* with the units naming the party and government, on the one hand, and the general population, on the other.

The second integrity move rests on two referential perspectival steps. The initial pair explicates the views of the masses by the units *everyone*, *you*, *tens of millions*, *nation*, *citizens*, *Americans*, *public*: "*Everyone is listening to you now. You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before. At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves. These are the just and reasonable demands of a righteous public*" (Trump, 2017, para. 9).

The second pair of unanimity steps combines inclusive *we* with a three-time occurrence of the pronoun *our* (*our pain*, *our dreams*, *our success*): "*We are one nation – and their pain is our*

pain. Their dreams are our dreams; and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny" (Trump, 2017, para. 11). Throughout the cited extract the unity idea is intensified by the numeral *one* (*one nation; one heart, one home, one destiny*).

The second confrontation move concerns all other countries though in the inaugural addresses of President Trump's predecessors this move criticizes only the states considered America's adversaries. Its argumentational structure hinges on the meaning of the conjunction while contrasting other countries' prosperity with the plight of ordinary Americans: *"We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has disappeared over the horizon"* (Trump, 2017, para. 12).

The second strategic – promissory – section opens up with a culmination move outlining the essence of the president's policy. This extended premise consists of three steps: predicational *America First*-step (*"From this moment on, it's going to be America First"*); referential zooming-in every-step (*"Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families"*); and predicational *protect*-step: *"We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs"* (Trump, 2017, para. 14). The last one transforms into a referential *protection*-step: *"Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength. I will fight for you with every breath in my body – and I will never, ever let you down"* (Trump, 2017, para. 14). The *protection*-step followed by two other steps: that of address expressed by the pronoun *you* and that of zooming-in rendered by the quantifier *every* focusing on individual elements of a set (Radden and Dirven, 2007, p. 121) as a result of motion from the mass to a cluster (Johnson, 1987, p. 26).

The following tactical moves of the promissory strategic section – futurity intervened with obligation and crowned up with existentiality – are meant to prove the correctness of the president's policy.

The beginning of the futurity move continues the culmination part combining two steps: inclusive referential, expressed by the pronoun *we*, and predicational, highlighting the expected fruits of the president's new policy (*"We will build"*), his criteria for success (*"We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and Hire American"*), and attitude to alliances: *"We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones"* (Trump, 2017, para. 16-18).

The intervening obligation move draws on the predicational steps referring to unity (*The Bible tells us, how good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in unity*); comfort (*"There should be no fear"*); imagination: *"We must think big and dream even bigger"* (Trump, 2017, para. 20-22).

The futurity move continues drawing on the steps of two types: referential inclusive, expressed by the pronouns *we* and *our*, and predicational of prosperity (*"We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again"*). Against this backdrop the referential *pride*-step introduces predicational steps enumerating preconditions for the promised prosperity: *"A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights, and heal our divisions"* (Trump, 2017, para. 23-24).

The existential move underscores the nation's unity drawing on referential and predicational steps. The referential *we*-inclusion together with the predicational step characterizes the nation's racial diversity (*whether we are black or brown or white*). Meanwhile the referential intensifying step, expressed by *we all* in the following three utterances, is supported by the predicational intensifying step, expressed by a three-time combination of the attribute *same* with the sentential objects denoting blood (*we all bleed the same red blood of patriots*), liberty (*we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms*), and glory: *we all salute the same great American Flag* (Trump, 2017, para. 24).

The conclusion comprises pre-closing and closing moves. The former combines two referential perspectival steps: *"So to all Americans, in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, and from ocean to ocean, hear these words"* (Trump, 2017, para. 25). In the cited utterance the *all*- and *every*-steps shift the perspectives from zooming-out to zooming-in to refer to the citizens scattered all over the vast territory of the country. The referential steps expressed by *you* and *your*

join the predicational units referring to the Americans' most valuable features: *"You will never be ignored again. 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, para. 25).

The closing move rests on the merger of we-step intensified by *together* with the predicational units characterizing the nation as *strong* (*Together, We Will Make America Strong Again*), *wealthy* (*We Will Make America Wealthy Again*), *proud* (*We Will Make America Proud Again*), *safe* (*We Will Make America Safe Again*), and *great* (*We Will Make America Great Again*) (Trump, 2017, para. 26).

To sum up, the communicative strategies divide President Trump's inaugural speech (2017) into two sections rallying the nation for confrontation and making the pledges. The boundaries of the sections are set by the homogeneity of the meanings building up the moves: in rallying the nation for confrontation section they alternate ending up with domination while the promissory section is structured by the futurity move intervened with obligation and wrapped up with existentiality. The conclusion splits into pre-closing and closing moves shifting nation representation from zooming-out to zooming-in offering an inclusive view.

3.2. Unification, policy outline and confrontational strategies in President Zelenskyi's inaugural address

The text of President Zelenskyi's inaugural speech (2019) falls into three strategic sections: unification, consolidating the country; policy outline with the moves spelling out the president's actions on the challenging issues; confrontational, concerning the leader's opposition to the sitting authorities.

The strategic unification section consists of the move concerning unity for responsibility followed by moves referring to the path to Europe; the Donbas issue; the Ukrainian migrant workers. The unity for responsibility move is implemented by two perspectival steps representing the nation from the inclusive and zooming-in standpoints. The inclusive step is expressed by the deictic units *"ми"* [we], *"наш"* [our] and intensified by the adjective *"спільний"* [common] repeated three times in the following extract: *"Це не моя, це наша спільна перемога. І це наш спільний шанс. За який ми несемо нашу спільну відповідальність"* [It is not mine, it is our common victory. And it is our common chance. And we bear our common responsibility for it] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 2). The zooming-in step is rendered by the construction *"кожен з нас"* [each of us] foregrounded in three utterances with the distributive quantifier *"кожен"* [every] implanting responsibility in the mind of every listener: *"Кожен з нас поклав руку на Конституцію і кожен з нас присягнув на вірність Україні. Від сьогодні кожен з нас несе відповідальність за країну, яку ми залишимо дітям. Кожен з нас на своєму місці може зробити все для розквіту України"* [Each of us has put his hand on the Constitution and each of us has given an oath to the country. Since today each of us bears a responsibility for the country we will leave to our children. Each of us in his / her place can do his / her best for the prosperity of the country] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 2).

The way to Europe move draws on referential and perspectival steps. It begins with a zooming-in expressed by the distributive quantifier *"кожен"* [each] in the utterance *Європейська країна починається з кожного* [A European country begins from everybody] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 4). The inclusive locational step structures the following utterance: *"Ми обрали шлях до Європи, але Європа не десь там. Європа ось тут (у голові). І коли вона буде ось тут і тоді вона з'явиться ось тут – в усій Україні"* [We have chosen a way to Europe, but Europe is not somewhere there. Europe is here (in the head). And when it is here, then it will emerge here – all over Ukraine] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 4).

In the statement above the inclusive locational step combines the personal deictic *"ми"* [we] with a zooming-in perspective brought about by the opposition between *"там"* [there] and *"тут (у голові)"* [here (in the head)]. Finally, the construction *"тут – в усій Україні"* [here – all over Ukraine] performs a zooming-out to the national level.

The Donbas and Ukrainian migrant workers moves rest on similar oppositions between zooming-in and zooming-out perspectives. In the Donbas move the zooming-in step is intensified by a three-time repetition of the quantifier "кожен" [every]: "Кожен з нас загинув на Донбасі. Кожного дня ми втрачаємо кожного з нас. І кожен з нас переселенець" [Each of us has fallen in Donbas. Every day we lose each of us. Each of us is a migrant] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 5). The zooming-out step generalizes reference to social actors by the repetition of the distal demonstrative pronoun "ті" [those] in combination with the predicational steps denoting individuals' losses and gains: "Ті, хто втратив власний дім... І ті, хто відчинив двері власного дому" [Those who have lost their homes... And those who have opened the door of their own houses...] (Zelenskyi 2019, para. 5).

In the Ukrainian migrant workers move the zooming-in step is also expressed by the distributive quantifier "кожен" [every] ("І кожен з нас заробітчанин" [And each of us is a migrant worker]). Meanwhile the zooming-out step underscores the number of Ukrainians toiling in foreign lands by the repetition of the demonstrative pronoun "ті" [those]: "Ті, хто не знайшов себе вдома, а знайшов заробіток на чужині... Ті, хто в боротьбі із бідністю змушений втратити власну гідність" [Those who have not found their place at home, but found their payment in foreign lands... Those who in struggle with poverty have to lose their honor] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 5).

In the policy outline section, the moves develop the ideas ushered at the beginning of the speech transforming unification move into that of rallying the nation and the Donbas issue into that of war termination.

The rallying move consists of five steps underscoring the nation's unity from the zooming-out perspective by the following means:

- the combination of the inclusive "ми" [we], the quantifier "всі" [all] and the predicative "українці" [Ukrainians] in the utterance "Ми всі українці [...]" [We are all Ukrainians];
- the predicate in the utterance "І ми маємо бути єдині" [And we must be united];
- the collective quantifier "всі" [all] in the statement "І сьогодні я звертаюсь до всіх українців у світі" [I am addressing all the Ukrainians in the world];
- the numeral "65 мільйонів" [65 million] referring to a seemingly exaggerated number of Ukrainians in the statement "Нас 65 мільйонів" [We are 65 million]. The rallying move is further continued by the predicational steps addressing Ukrainians throughout the world with the words of necessity ("Ви нам дуже потрібні" [We greatly need you]) and compulsion: "Ви повинні їхати в Україну" [You must come to Ukraine] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 7-9).

The culmination steps wrapping up the rallying move refer to a new epoch and underscore the expected triumph of the national idea: "Все це допоможе нам почати нову епоху. [...] А може, це і є наша національна ідея? Об'єднавшись – зробити неможливе. Всупереч усьому" [All this will help us begin a new epoch. Can it be our national idea? To unite and do the impossible. Against the odds] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 10).

The premise expressed by the utterances above is supported by a number of arguments citing the experience of other countries: "І це наш шлях. Ми повинні стати ісландцями у футболі" [...] [This is our way. We must become Islanders in football] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 12).

The war termination move is implemented by five steps outlining the president's plan on the ceasefire in the country's east: attention grabbing; personal argumentative; war end; return of the lost territories and of the people; army support. The attention grabbing step prioritizes the Donbas issue by the combination of the deictic "наше" [our] with the ordinal numeral "найперше" [first and foremost]: "І наше найперше завдання – припинення вогню на Донбасі" [And our first and foremost task is to achieve a ceasefire in the Donbas] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 13). The personal argumentative step expounds the leader's readiness to resolve the Donbas issue at the expense of his popularity: the premise "я готовий на все" [I am ready for everything] is supported by the arguments: "я готовий втратити свою популярність / втратити свою посаду / не втрачаючи наших територій"

[I am ready to lose my popularity / to lose my position / without losing our territories] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 13). The predicational war end step offers an inclusive perspective on the conflict solution by an opposition between the verbs "починати" [begin] and "закінчувати" [end] with the noun "діалог" [dialogue] paving a possible way between the two reference points: "Не ми почали цю війну. Але нам цю війну закінчувати. І ми готові до діалогу" [We didn't start this war. But it is up to us to end it. And we are ready for the dialogue] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 14). The return of lost territories steps are implemented by the interaction of the pronoun "наш" [our] with the lexical unit "втрачений" [lost]: "Наш наступний виклик – це повернення втрачених територій. [...] Неможливо втратити те, що і так наше. І Крим, і Донбас – це наша українська земля. Де ми втратили найголовніше. Це люди" [Our next challenge is the return of the lost territories. It is impossible to lose what is ours. Both Crimea and Donbas are our Ukrainian land. But our bigger losses are different. That is the people] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 15).

The consciousness return steps is delivered in Russian to draw the attention of the target audience "И сегодня мы должны возвращать их сознание" [And today we must return their consciousness] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 16). It combines the inclusive "мы" [we] with the compulsion verb "должны" [must].

The argumentative step of army support consists of the premise "я зроблю все, щоб ви відчували повагу" [I will do everything for you to feel respect] with the arguments referring to the servicemen's remuneration, living conditions, leaves, and NATO standards in the armed forces (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 18).

The confrontational strategic section begins with a move referring to the country's troubles followed by the moves criticizing the competence of the sitting authorities which echoes the Ukrainian migrant workers move from the first section. The troubles move consists of the premise naming the challenges facing the nation supported by three arguments referring to wages, medicine and roads: "Безумовно, окрім війни, є багато бід, які роблять українців нещасливими" [No doubt, besides the war, there are many other troubles which make Ukrainians unhappy] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 19).

The argumentational move confronting the sitting government draws on the premise citing Ronald Reagan's famous statement that "government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem" (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 20) hinting at the similarity between the former American actor turned president and the new Ukrainian leader. This premise is supported by two arguments: the first one criticizes the Ukrainian government by the negative form of the verb "можемо" [can] ("ми нічого не можемо зробити" [we cannot do anything]); the second one underscores its abilities by the verb "можете" [you can]: "Можете. Ви можете взяти аркуш, взяти ручку [...]" [You can take a paper, take a pen] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 22). Conversely, in the next utterance the noun "можливості" [opportunities] opposes the government's disability to a country of the future built under the president's leadership: "Ми збудуємо країну інших можливостей [...]" [We will build a country of new opportunities] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 23). However, the translation of President Reagan's statement into Ukrainian as "Уряд не вирішує наших проблем. Уряд є нашою проблемою" [The government is not the solution to our problems; the government is the problem] does not seem quite accurate. The absence of the article with the noun "government" in the English original signals that President Reagan meant a broader idea of a system of controlling a country rather than a group of people in charge of it. The more general interpretation of the noun *government* in the English original is supported by the following statements lamenting the system of managing the US: "From time to time we've been tempted to believe that society has become too complex to be managed by self-rule, that government by an elite group is superior to government for, by, and of the people" (Reagan, 1981, para. 10). Besides further on the noun referring to the group of people controlling the country is capitalized which is not the case with the excerpt discussed above, e.g. "Our Government has no power except that granted it by the people" (Reagan, 1981, para. 13).

Besides the government, the new Ukrainian leader demotes the devout attitude to the presidential status: "*Президент – не ікона, не ідол, Президент – це не портрет*" [President is not an icon, President is not an idol. President is not a portrait] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 23). The cited utterance demonstrates that this predicational step is implemented by combining negation with the nouns denoting icons, idols, portraits.

The move confronting the President with the MPs is expressed by the imperative sentences "*прошу вас ухвалити*" [I beg you to decide]; "*прошу звільнити з посад*" [I beg you to fire]; "*ухваліть*" [adopt] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 26-28). The culmination of this move is encoded by the performative utterance "*Я розпускаю Верховну Раду України 8-го скликання*" [I dissolve the Supreme Rada of the eighth convocation] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 29).

The conclusion has an argumentative structure comprising two steps: the premise refers to the president's earlier activity depicted by the predicate "*усміхалися*" [smile]: "*Протягом свого життя я намагався робити все, щоб українці усміхалися*" [All my life I have been doing everything so that the Ukrainians can smile] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 31). The consequence brings in a semantically related idea of doing his best to prevent Ukrainians from crying: "*Тепер я робитиму все, щоб українці принаймні більше не плакали*" [Now I will do everything so that the Ukrainians shouldn't cry] (Zelenskyi, 2019, para. 31).

To sum up, President Zelenskyi's inaugural address (2019) consists of three strategic sections which subordinate the selection of moves and steps: unification, policy outline, and confrontation. In the unification section moves are structured by unifying and prespectivational steps portraying the nation from different standpoints. In the policy outline section the moves rally the nation and set out the president's political agenda concerning the end of the war in the east with two culmination steps calling for unification and drawing attention to the Donbas issue. In the confrontational section the move of trouble is followed by argumentation criticizing the government being followed by the compulsion step nudging the cabinet and the Parliament to quit with the final performative act of Parliament dissolution.

4. Discussion

The overall structure of the inaugural addresses by President Trump (2017) and President Zelenskyi (2019) reveals that the contents of sections subordinated to the authors' personal strategies and moves are mainly influenced by the sociolinguistic factors differing in scope: the political systems of the two countries and the state of affairs on inauguration day.

The choice of the communicative strategies impacting the contents of the corresponding sections is brought about by the difference between the presidential system in the US where the head of state has all the executive power and the semi-presidential republic in Ukraine with an executive presidency and a head of government accountable to the parliament. It means that the American president has more power than his Ukrainian counterpart and, as a result, strategically the two inaugurals evolve in different directions of ascertaining real and rhetorical powers. Unifying the nation for confrontation with a promise of a great future structures the address of President Trump who has a full executive power while the Ukrainian president's speech consists of the strategic sections of unification meant to rally the country, policy outline concerning the issues worrying all the citizens and only then confrontation.

Due to the distinct systems of government the direction of confrontation in both speeches is also different: President Trump scuffles with the previous administration while President Zelenskyi opposes the sitting government and parliament which results in the choice of referential steps. These very reasons result in the different positions of the performative utterances in the two inaugural addresses: at the beginning of President Trump's speech and at the end of President Zelenskyi's speech. However, both inaugural addresses disrupt the genre dropping the act of thanking the predecessors for their service to the country (Cap and Okulska, 2013, p. 4).

The enhanced meanings of the tactical moves are conditioned in both texts by the state of things in the two countries at the inauguration time. Though the moves of rallying the nation for confrontation with the elite and unification seem to be coded similarly in the two speeches, there are some differences. President Trump's address focuses on the transfer of power from the establishment to the people as a prerequisite for his vision of a great future. The Ukrainian president concentrates on less lofty targets urgent for his country: to end the war in the east and to employ the Ukrainian migrant workers.

The steps differentiate the two inaugurals with respect to the choice and distribution of linguistic units. The first distinction concerns the selection of languages: President Trump's inaugural address is delivered solely in English while in President Zelenskyi's speech the step of consciousness return addresses the population in the east in Russian to strengthen the appeal. The second set of differences concerns the steps implementing the unification moves. Though both presidents resort to the zooming-in and zooming-out perspectives, they are more numerous in the Ukrainian leader's speech with a difference in the function of the words with similar meaning. The quantifier "every" in the American president's address refers to entities other than people due to the existence of the pronoun everybody in English while the quantifier "кожен" [every] in the speech by the Ukrainian leader names the citizens. Besides President Zelenskyi employs the demonstrative pronoun "ти" [those] to establish a zooming-out perspective while his American counterpart avoids similar constructions.

The steps of intensifying unification differ in both speeches in the choice of linguistic units. The Ukrainian president employs the adjective "спільний" [common] while the related semantics is missing from President Trump's speech: instead he prefers the numeral "one" which is not the case with the Ukrainian leader's speech.

The ordinal numerals "first" and "перший" [first] occur in both speeches but in somewhat different functions. In President Trump's address it prioritizes *America First* slogan while in the Ukrainian president's inaugural it draws attention to the Donbas issue being used in the construction "наше найперше завдання" [our first and foremost task]. The use of this numeral for culmination identification and attention grabbing is not surprising since it denotes entities placed in the most notable – initial – position of any sequence, i.e. in the position of a figure. For the American president it is the global status of his country while for the Ukrainian leader it is the solution of the Donbas conflict.

It is evident that the advantage of the two-faceted approach to strategies from cross-linguistic perspective consists in differentiating sociolinguistic, rhetorical and linguistic levels of inaugural addresses which paves the way for the analysis of texts of other genres.

5. Conclusions

The treatment of communicative strategies as a two-faceted phenomenon combining extralinguistic and linguistic features at particular levels of meaning construction turns out to be useful for several reasons. The affinity between strategies and genres as goal-oriented entities prompts singling out an overall communicative strategy which organizes a separate text meeting the demands of a genre. The synthesis of the extra- and intralinguistic aspects of strategies results into three textual layers of their implementation. Strategic sections divide a text into parts rendering maximal meanings subordinated to the addressor's communicative strategies and objectives. Tactical moves comprise enhanced meaning embodied in discourse patterns and constructions; linguistic steps encode minimal meanings of the referential, predicational, perspectival, intensificational or argumentational type. The cross-linguistic application of this approach to the analysis of two inaugurals reveals the influence of sociolinguistic factors on the organization of strategic sections and of tactical moves with the latter impacting the arrangement of linguistic units selected at the level of steps. The perspectives of further study consist in revealing the cognitive aspect of the two-faceted view of strategies as well as in investigating the texts of other genres.

References

- Bhatia, V. (2014). Professional written genres. In J. P. Gee and M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 239-251). London and New York: Routledge.
- Bieber, D. (2014). Register and discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 191-208). London and New York: Routledge.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, K. K. & Jamieson, K. H. (1986). Inaugurating the presidency. In H. W. Simons & A. A. Aghazarian (Eds.), *Form, genre, and the study of political discourse* (pp. 203-225). Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Cap, P. & Okulska, U. (2013). Analyzing genres in political communication : An introduction. In P. Cap, O. Okulska (Eds.), *Analyzing genres in political communication* (pp. 1-28). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Colston, H. L. & Athanasiadou, A. (2020). Preface. In Angeliki Athanasiadou & Herbert Colston (eds.) *Diversity of irony* (p. V). Berlin: Gruyter.
- Davis, J. (2004). Revisiting the gap between meaning and message. In E. Contini-Morava (ed.), *Cognitive and communicative approaches to linguistic analysis* (pp. 155-176). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Issers, O. S. (2012). *Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian speech*. Moscow: Editorial URSS. / Issers, O. S. *Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.
- Gruber, H. (2013). Genres in political discourse: The case of the 'inaugural speech' of Austrian chancellors. In P. Cap, O. Okulska (Eds.), *Analyzing genres in political communication* (pp. 29-72). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: the bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (2004). Form, meaning, and behavior. In E. Contini-Morava, R. S. Krisner, & B. Rodríguez-Bachiller (Eds.), *Cognitive and communicative approaches to linguistic analysis* (pp. 21-60). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2001). Compliment responses among British and Spanish university students: A contrastive study. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33, 107-127.
- Monakhova, T. V. (2016). *Modern text-building strategies in the Ukrainian language* (Synopsis of the dissertation for the Doctoral Degree). I. I. Mechnykov Odesa National University, Odesa, Ukraine. / Монахова Т. В. *Сучасні стратегії текстотворення в українській мові* (Автореферат докторської дисертації). Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова, Одеса, Україна.
- Nordquist, R. (2019). *Rhetorical move*. Available at <https://www.thoughtco.com/rhetorical-move-1691917>.
- Pietsukh, O. I. (2018). *UK parliamentary debates from the perspective of cognitive discourse paradigm* (Synopsis of the dissertation for the Doctoral Degree). I. I. Mechnykov Odesa National University, Odesa, Ukraine. / Pietsukh, O. I. *Парламентські дебати Сполученого Королівства Великої Британії та Північної Ірландії в когнітивно-дискурсивній парадигмі* (Автореферат докторської дисертації). Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова, Одеса, Україна.
- Potapenko, S. (2016). Cognitive rhetoric of effect: energy flow as a means of persuasion in inaugurals. *Topics in linguistics*, 17(2), 12-25. <https://doi.org/10.1515/topling-2016-0010>.
- Radden, G. & Dirven, R. (2007). *Cognitive English grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Reagan, R. (1981). *Inaugural address*. Retrieved from <https://www.bartleby.com/124/pres61.html>.
- Slavova, L. L. (2015). *Linguistic personality in modern American and Ukrainian political discourse* (Synopsis of the dissertation for the Doctoral Degree). Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv, Ukraine. / Slavova, L. L. *Мовна особистість у сучасному американському та українському політичному дискурсі* (Автореферат докторської дисертації). Київський національний лінгвістичний університет, Київ, Україна.
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge, UK – New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Trump, D. (2017). *Inaugural address*. Retrieved from <https://www.bartleby.com/124/pres70.html>.
- Wodak, R. (2011). *The discourse of politics in action*. London: Palgrave.

Zelenskyi, V. (2019). *Inaugural address* / Zelenskyi, V. *Inavhuratsiina promova* / Зеленський, В. *Інавгураційна промова*. Retrieved from <https://www.president.gov.ua/news/inavguracijna-promova-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelensk-55489>.

Résumé

The aim of the paper is to establish a correspondence between the extralinguistic strategic hierarchy based on tactics and steps subordinated to the addressor's goal and the organization of a text. The paper proposes a two-faceted method of strategic text analysis comprising four levels: a particular genre implementing an overall strategy; strategic sections dividing a text into parts with maximal meanings subordinated to the addressor's communicative strategies; tactical moves consisting of enhanced meaning embodied in discursive and textual patterns; linguistic turns guiding the choice of units denoting minimal meaning of five types: referential, predicational, perspectival, intensificational / mitigating and argumentational.

The application of the two-faceted method of strategic analysis to the study of the inaugural addresses by American President Trump (2017) and Ukrainian President Zelenskyi (2019) reveals the following features of the two texts.

The overall strategy highlighting the policy of the new presidents is embodied in the inaugural genre. Strategic sections render the sociolinguistic maximal meanings reflecting the specificity of presidential and semi-presidential political systems of the two countries: the American President divides his speech into rallying the nation for confrontation and promissory sections while the head of the Ukrainian state splits his speech into three sections: unification for responsibility, policy outline and confrontation with the sitting authorities.

The tactical moves rendering enhanced meanings are embedded into the state of affairs at the time of inauguration which is reflected in unifying for confrontation and transfer of power in President Trump's inaugural and the path to Europe, external labor migrants and the Donbas moves in President Zelenskyi's speech.

Linguistic steps provide for the minimal meaning representing social actors from inclusive, zooming-in, and zooming-out perspectives, characterize them by predicational groups, intensify their position by repetition, use of numerals and arguments.

Key words: inaugural address, communicative strategy, tactical move, cross-linguistic study, President Trump, President Zelenskyi, two-faceted method.

Анотація

Мета статті полягає у встановленні кореляції між підпорядкованою завданням автора екстралінгвістичною стратегічною ієрархією, яка включає тактики й кроки, та організацією тексту. Запропоновано двосторонній стратегічний метод аналізу тексту на чотирьох рівнях: жанровому, що реалізує суперстратегію; стратегічних розділів, що поділяють текст на частини з максимальним значенням, підпорядкованих авторським комунікативним стратегіям; тактичних фрагментів, розширене значення яких втілене в дискурсивно-текстових моделях; лінгвальних кроків, що визначають відбір одиниць із мінімальним значенням п'яти різновидів: референційне, предикативне, перспективне, інтенсифікаційне / пом'якшувальне, аргументативне.

Застосування методу двостороннього стратегічного аналізу до вивчення інавгураційних промов американського президента Дональда Трампа та президента України Володимира Зеленського виявило особливості організації двох текстів.


Макростратегії, що окреслюють політику нових президентів, утілені в інавгураційному жанрі. Стратегічні розділи розкривають максимальне соціолінгвістичне значення, що враховує специфіку президентської та президентсько-парламентської систем двох країн: американський президент, який має реальну виконавчу владу, поділяє промову на секції об'єднання нації

зادля протистояння правлячій верхівці й обіцянок; голова української держави розбиває виступ на три секції для створення риторичного впливу –об'єднання задля відповідальності, політичних намірів і протистояння сучасним органам влади.

Тактичні фрагменти з розширеним значення відбивають стан суспільства на час інавгурації, що відображено в закликах до об'єднання задля протистояння й передачі влади народу в інавгураційній промові президента Д. Трампа та фрагментах про шлях до Європи, долю заробітчан і протистояння на Донбасі у виступі президента В. Зеленського.

Лінгвальні кроки передають мінімальний зміст, зображаючи соціальних суб'єктів у ракурсі включеної, наближеної або віддаленої перспективи, характеризуючи їх предикативними групами, акцентуючи їх статус через повторення, числівниками й аргументами.

Ключові слова: інавгураційна промова, комунікативна стратегія, тактичний фрагмент, міжмовне зіставлення, президент Дональд Трамп, президент Володимир Зеленський, двосторонній стратегічний метод.

<p>Contact data</p> <p>Serhiy I. Potapenko, DrSc (Philology), Professor, Professor of the Department of English Philology, Translation and Philosophy of Language, Kyiv National Linguistic University, e-mail: potapenkoknlu@gmail.com</p>		<p>Fields of interest</p> <p>Discourse analysis, rhetoric, media linguistic</p>
--	--	--

Received by the editorial board 30.04.2020;

Reviewed 22.05.2020. and 28.05.2020;

Similarity Index by Unicheck 12.8%