

Stylistic features of Barack Obama's State of the Union Addresses

Barbara Szczesny

S1498215

Master's thesis

MA: Linguistics: English Language and Communication

First supervisor: Dr. A.G. Dorst

Second supervisor: Mr. drs. A. A. Foster

1 June 2017

Leiden University

Abstract

This paper investigates Barack Obama's style of speech. First of all, the purpose is to examine how Obama's conceptual metaphors and other distinct style markers in his speeches frame himself and his views in terms of the three rhetorical appeals of ethos, pathos and logos. Second, it is intended to test whether the given style markers undergo any change or remain consistent over the period of his presidency. A quick review of his first and the last State of the Union Address reveals that his most recent speech makes use of humour and informal expressions like phrasal words and colloquialisms in contrast to the serious tone and official language of the first address. The methodology employed in this paper consists of the stylistic checklist by Leech & Short (2007), the Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz Group 2007) and the Conceptual Metaphor Theory by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). The theoretical framework applied is based on the concepts of canons of rhetoric, metaphor and metaphor in politics as well as framing. An analysis using the above-mentioned theories and framework reveals how Obama frames himself, Americans as people, and how he structures the American realities of life in terms of three rhetorical appeals.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework	9
1.1 What is Rhetoric?	9
1.2 The Five Canons of Rhetoric.....	11
1.2.1 Part One: Invention	11
1.2.2 Part Two: Arrangement.....	13
1.2.3 Part Three: Style	13
1.2.4 Part Four: Memory	18
1.2.5 Part Five: Delivery.....	19
1.3 Metaphor and Style.....	20
1.4 What is Metaphor?.....	21
1.4.1 Conceptual Metaphor	21
1.5 Metaphor in Politics	26
1.6 The Concept of Framing	28
Chapter 2: Method and Corpus.....	32
2.1 Methodology	32
2.2 Stylistic features	32
2.3 Metaphor.....	34
2.4 Corpus.....	35
Chapter 3: Analysis: Stylistic features related to ethos, pathos, logos	37
3.1 Ethos.....	37
3.2 Pathos.....	46
3.3 Logos.....	49
3.4 Framing of America and Americans reflected in conceptual metaphors.....	51
3.4 Future research	57
3.5 Change in Obama’s style	59
Conclusion and Discussion	60
List of References	63
Appendices	67

Introduction

Overview of previous researches

Barack Obama's rhetoric has been broadly recognized as an impressive and distinctive approach to political discourse. Leith (2012) describes him as "one of the most consciously and artfully rhetorical speakers in the recent history of American politics" (p. 218). The fact that he succeeded in the area of politics proves that his particular style of speech has an enormous influence on the audience. Political speeches are carefully arranged persuasive messages, and that is why they constitute a legitimate basis for any rhetorical examination. Obama's rhetoric has been a subject to analysis by many linguists. Escudero (2011) analyses Obama's style in terms of metaphors from his first Inaugural Address as captivating and powerful communication strategy which made Obama win the election. She claims that Obama's figurative language is particularly influential, because it creates a very positive associations with American values and reality. Addressing the problems and giving hope for a better future are metaphors that engage emotions of the citizens and celebrate Obama's political success. Gunawan (2010) also examines Obama's style from his first Inaugural Address, nevertheless, the focus of the paper is on the plot structure and stylistic and linguistic categories. His findings show frequent use of compound sentences, appositions, metaphors, synecdoche and metonymies. Three-part structural constructions create rhythm, effect of continuity and reinforcement. It shows that Obama elaborates on his ideas by using complex sentences made of relative clauses. Also, he specifically uses cohesive devices like ellipsis and co-reference pronouns. Lastly, Gunawan points that by using pronouns like 'we' and 'our', Obama stresses the importance of national unity. Mieder (2009) focuses his analysis on Obama's stylistic choices like proverbs and proverb-like phrases. He claims that his strategic communication choices inducing emotions and beliefs influence the audience. The analysis is based on Obama's books *Dreams of My Father* (1995) and *Audacity of Hope*

(2006). Mieder's goal is to present Obama's style as a powerful tool for persuasion ending the cultural wars between people in America. Cirugeda and Ruiz (2013) study Obama's stylistic choices from speeches addressed to Latino American communities from 2012 and 2013. The authors examine his figurative language as means for persuasion. The analysis shows Obama's frequent use of metaphors, personifications, repetition and synaesthesia. The most dominant source domain for metaphors is the concept of the American Dream and uniqueness of the American nation. Obama's figurative language refers to values of patriotism, justice, and joint movement. Also, he employs argumentative strategies of polarization that helps him to build a positive image of immigrants.

Furthermore, there are a few publications from magazines about politics and business that comment on Obama's style. For example, his rhetorical choices have been described in the business magazine "Business Insider" (Cambell 2014). The author notices that during Obama's interview for radio NPR in 2014, Obama explains international relations of U.S. by using sport metaphors referring to football and baseball terms. In an online magazine "Observer" ("What Makes Obama a Good Speaker?", 2008). Obama has been portrayed as one of the best contemporary orators. His style has been described as "lyrical", which means that composition of rhythm in his speeches and parallel constructions are comparable to songs. Kusnet (2016) describes Obama's style as more elevated in comparison to George Bush and less free in form than Hilary Clinton. His style is known for catchy slogans like "Yes, we can", "Let's do it" and "Pass the Bill". As a lawyer, Obama is familiar with various legal documents, and that is why he derives inspirations for his speech style from the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution and the Bible. Also, he models himself after the greatest American orators like Martin Luther King Jr., John F. Kennedy, Franklin Roosevelt, Theodore Roosevelt and Abraham Lincoln. As reported by Greene (2011), Obama uses four 'languages' to deliver a speech. First, he makes the audience see and feel his energy

(visual language), subsequently, he gives the audience an interesting story (auditory language), then, he comforts the audience by addressing a problem (auditory digital language), lastly, he inspires his listeners with a narrative (kinesthetic language). The author of the article claims that the speech on the teleprompter is the least important for Obama. It is because the former president can naturally respond to the reaction of the audience by inserting humor or adjusting his speech to the present context.

Motivation for my research

The previous researches on Obama's style motivated me to conduct a similar investigation and fill the existing linguistic gaps. The motivation to choose Obama approached me after reading his speeches full of outstanding, innovative and catchy examples of communication strategies. I realized that Obama's speeches is an interesting data which allows me to test how he managed to convince fellow countrymen that he is the most appropriate leader of the American nation through his art of speech. I have decided to analyse particularly Obama's style, because I wanted to answer the questions why and how Obama succeeded in area of political oratory? What are his determinants of style that make him so likeable and persuasive? Indeed, analysing's Obama's style will provide me with the answers for these questions. As a result, my aim is to provide a regular stylistic persuasive choices made by Obama, based on the concept of Aristotle's three stage model of persuasion (ethos, pathos and logos), and any changes of style that might have taken place through the course of Obama's presidency based on one complete and consistent corpus of State of the Union Addresses. Importantly, besides analysis of general stylistic variants used by Obama, the analysis of metaphor will be central to this paper. Metaphors are regarded to be highly effective tools for persuasion that influence an audience. As a result they constitute an important linguistic data for studying one's style (Charteris - Black, 2004, p. 87). In fact, knowing his style and

changes of style is reflective of the variation in his views over time. Regarding the linguistic gaps, there is no study that analysed the speeches of politicians that frame themselves and their points of views in terms of ethos and pathos or logos. Each paper focuses on one or two particular speeches, and deliver a few stylistic features in isolation in very specific contexts. In addition, there is no study that attempted to investigate the differences in style over a period of time. Furthermore, I have not found any research that analyses Obama's style based on the particular corpus of all the State of The Union Addresses.

Barack Obama and the corpus

Barack Hussein Obama, the 47 year-old senator from Illinois and the first African American democratic member of the U.S. Senate, was elected for the position of President of the United States (U.S.) on November 4, 2008. His presidency began in January 2009 and ended after his second term in January 2017 ("Barack Obama," 2017). This election was a revolutionary moment for the country because he was the first black American administrating the highest office in the U.S. Certainly, this could be seen as a symbolic breakthrough for a country which has struggled and still struggles with the problem of racism yet elected a black man as its leader (Falk, 2010, p. xiii).

Speeches which constitute the scope of my research are Obama's eight State of the Union Addresses. They are traditionally held each year, usually in January and delivered by the U.S. President to the Congress, presenting the information about the condition of the nation and its plans for legislation ("State of the Union Address," n.d.). The reason why I have selected these speeches in particular is because of the long-standing tradition of the State of the Union Addresses and the broad content which cover all aspects of government: finance, health, security, education etc. This broad spectrum of content allows me to analyse how Obama articulates his opinions about various subjects.

Overview of the paper

This paper is divided into four chapters. In the first chapter, I will present a fundamental theoretical framework concerning giving speeches. First, I will discuss the concept of rhetoric and the five canons of rhetoric (invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery). Second, I will discuss, central to this paper, the connection between metaphor and style and the basic concept of metaphor, as well as *Conceptual Metaphor Theory* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). The first chapter will end with a discussion on the use of metaphors in politics and the concept of framing. The second chapter will discuss the methodology i.e. *Metaphor Identification Procedure* (Pragglejaz Group, 2007) and a stylistic checklist developed by Leech and Short (2007). The third chapter i.e. analysis will provide a summary of what is notable for Obama's style, and whether his style changed over his eight years of presidency. This thesis will end with a conclusion.

My expectations and hypotheses

In my analysis, I expected to find, central to this paper, broad range of conceptual metaphors that refer to Americans and the United States of America that will help me define Obama's style and his persuasive techniques. Furthermore, as Obama is known for his rhetorical talent, I expected to find a wide variety of rhetorical figures like metonymies, personifications, similes etc. I also expect that found metaphors and rhetorical figures will correspond to Aristotelian persuasive stages of ethos, pathos and logos. As a quick review of the first and the last State of the Union Address reveals considerable changes that took place throughout the eight years of Obama's presidency, I expect that the last four speeches will contain more informal patterns such as humour, phrasal words and less elaborate rhetorical figures than in the first four speeches. In brief, my current research will examine Obama's style based most

importantly on metaphors but also on rhetorical figures and other style markers, and whether his style has changed, and how it changed.

Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework

1.1 What is Rhetoric?

Rhetoric arose as method for argumentation in ancient Greece in the fifth century B.C. At that time, Greece experienced a vast transition from oral to literate culture, which certainly contributed to the creation of rhetoric (Ilie, 2006). Three distinct approaches to classic rhetoric arose during that time, namely: the Sophistical, the Aristotelian and the Platonic. The Sophists were teachers who found the opportunity to teach citizens how to actively participate in a new democratic system. Their education provided knowledge about argument, reason and critical thinking. The Sophists are considered to be the first humanists for whom rhetoric was a tactic to transform a weaker argument into the stronger one by using creativity and experimenting with the language. Indeed, their strategy was often interpreted as a deceptive act of reasoning rather than ethical argumentation (Crick, 2014, p.4). Clearly, Aristotle, a Greek philosopher, was the first one to describe this concept in his book *Rhetoric*. He considered rhetoric to be an art rather than a study (Ilie, 2006). Furthermore, he claimed that rhetoric's objective is to persuade: "rhetoric is the faculty of discovering in any given case the available means of persuasion" (Aristotle, 2006, p.18). The teacher of Aristotle, Plato, also regarded rhetoric as a type of art. For him rhetoric was (as cited in Ilie, 2006) "the art of winning the soul by discourse". Nevertheless, Plato also believed that rhetoric was deceitful since the message is created in a way to fit the reader's mind. Aristotle was the one who restored the position of rhetoric. He argued that persuasion was a crucial aspect of speech in civic lives, which allowed people to take part in debates about their civil rights. As a result, rhetoric contributed to the founding of the democratic system. Furthermore, according to Aristotle, rhetoric was considered to be something that could be developed. Skills in rhetoric could be acquired in debating competitions which stimulate authentic situations (Charteris- Black, 2014, pp. 1-5). Contrary to Greek philosophers, the Roman philosopher Cicero perceived rhetoric as a skill

of reason and eloquence that allowed the speaker to persuade the audience by telling the truth. Various interpretations of rhetoric have led to a more complex definition of this concept. On the one hand, the primary function of rhetoric is to persuade, but on the other hand, rhetoric requires structuring, reasoning and applying communication strategies to the speech. Therefore, ancient philosophers divided the concept of rhetoric into five canons: invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery. The five canons of rhetoric represent different stages of rhetorical processes, where each canon relates to a particular division of the discourse. In brief, the canons deliver the information about the structure of the speech, and the way the speech should be delivered. Within the canon of invention, Aristotle encapsulated three rhetorical appeals: ethos, pathos and logos. The appeals represent the three strategies through which the audience is persuaded (Ilie, 2006). Rhetoric is comprised of the analysis, identification, and understanding of broad possibilities of persuasion's mechanisms. Ancient rhetoricians and philosophers had to understand when language was supposed to serve as a tool for finding the truth and when it was being used for manipulating and misrepresenting. Philosophers from ancient Greece strived for finding the truth, and that was the main motivation for the development of the theory of rhetoric

Nowadays, rhetoric is seen as a systematic study of the means of persuasion, which includes both speaking and writing. The application of rhetoric in speeches is called oratory. Transmission of information i.e. communication refers to spoken and written language (Charteris-Black, 2014, pp. 1-5). The modern definition of rhetorical public speaking has been defined as "the art of addressing public concerns by employing deliberate persuasive strategies before a public audience at a specific occasion in order to transform some aspect of a problematic situation by encouraging new forms of thought and action" (Crick, 2014, p.2). In other words, rhetoric engages a speaker in a political struggle who has to change the way an audience feels, thinks and behaves by using language as his symbolic power. Not only

politics, but also many other modern professions such as law, academia and public communication require skills in persuasive communication. Therefore, rhetorical success is something that underlies present-day political campaigns for office, debating competitions and parliamentary debates. The most persuasive speech is the most successful one, which is, in turn, assessed by the reaction of the audience i.e. reflected by voting (Charteris-Black, 2014, pp. 1-5).

Each of the five canons of rhetoric as well as rhetorical appeals will be described separately in the following sections. However, as the focus of this paper is to analyse Obama's style of speech, the canon of style will be elaborated upon more extensively.

1.2 The Five Canons of Rhetoric

1.2.1 Part One: Invention

“Aristotle said that the basic job of a rhetorician is to ‘discover the best available means of persuasion’” (Leith, 2011, p. 45). This quote concisely describes the concept of ‘invention’, namely that, instead of making things up, one needs to invent what can be said about a particular subject; it is preparing all arguments for and against and selecting the most appropriate reasoning for one's needs. In other words, this particular canon of rhetoric constitutes sources and knowledge which add value and substance to the speech (Crick, 2014, p. 10). There are usually more lines of argument available than those which are prudent or reasonable to use. The speaker needs to think about the audience's attitude, prejudice, interests, positions in life, gender, age etc. in order to justify the speech to the addressees. In agreement with Aristotle, there are three lines of argument, specifically: *ethos*, *logos* and *pathos*. They constitute a basis for spoken and written persuasion. *Ethos* obliges the speaker to establish *bona fides* i.e. credibility and connection with the audience. It is crucial how a speaker presents oneself during the initial part of the speech, because this is what lays a

foundation on which the rest of the speech is built. A speaker has to prove to be trustworthy, to act in good faith and to have a *locus standi* on the subject. Furthermore, the audience should be convinced that a speaker is one of them, having identical goals shared with the audience. The next canon, *logos*, is a way to influence the audience based on the speaker's reasoning processes (Ilie, 2006). "If ethos is the ground on which your argument stands, logos is what drives it forward" (Leith, 2011, p.57). Namely, it is a well-structured line of argumentation which not only appears to be the best one but the only one. It is said that "the most effective form of argument is one that the audience is allowed to think it has worked out itself: one whose conclusion, in other words, the listener reaches just before, or just as, the speaker makes it" (Leith, 2011, p. 57). In agreement with Aristotle, *logos* was an area of something he called *enthymeme*. The concept of enthymeme in rhetoric can be compared to syllogism in logic: they are both units of thought, that is, methods of articulating views and thoughts. An example of enthymeme is as follows 'Marilyn Monroe has to die sometime: Marilyn Monroe is mortal'. Simply speaking, enthymemes are generalisations. Finally, *pathos* appeals to human emotions. The speaker should make the audience feel pity, anger, fear or exultation and excitement. Good rhetorician should be able to arouse emotions in the audience. Such a strategy is effective only if these emotions are shared between the speaker and the audience. Feelings and emotions might not always be logical, nevertheless, having them in control is an object of rhetoric. In sum, *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* are three lines of arguments encapsulated within the concept of invention. These inherent elements form the basis of spoken and written persuasion (Leith, 2011, pp. 57-73).

1.2.2 Part Two: Arrangement

Any speech needs to be well structured. After one has invented the topic and found good arguments, the arguments need to be put into shape. Therefore, the second canon involves organizing information and arguments into an appropriate form (Crick, 2014, p.19). Well adapted structure serves to minimize weaker arguments, maximize the strong ones and provide the flow of the text to its conclusion (Leith, 2011, p. 81). “We may think of arrangement in terms of the distinct stages or parts of a speech, and how the sequence of these parts could influence an audience” (Charteris-Black, 2014, p.16). Among ancient orators, there have been discrepancies between the number of stages of the classical speech. Leith (2011) proposes a scheme consisting of six parts: exordium, narration, division, proof, refutation and peroration. During the stage of exordium, the speaker should establish rapport with an audience, for example through expression of goodwill or flattery, in order to grab its attention. The narration stage is about setting the outline of an argument. Division represents the opinions of speakers and opponents on the same subject. Next, in the proof stage, the speaker introduces arguments supporting the topic. In the following stage, the speaker refutes the opponent’s arguments (refutation). Lastly, the speaker summarizes the speech and reiterates the strongest points of the argumentation and leads to a conclusion. This provides an opportunity for a *pathos* appeal to the audience (peroration) (Leith, 2011, pp. 81-82).

1.2.3 Part Three: Style

”Style has a broad range of meanings that have largely positive associations in a wide range of creative ideas of human activity such as art, architecture, fashion, literature and leadership - as well as in language use” (Charteris-Black, 2014, p. 30). In terms of linguistic activity, style refers to a meaning of ‘identity’, a manner of behaviour and expression of thoughts which form one’s unique style. Verdonk (2006) argues that while rhetoric is primarily concerned

about what is said, style deals with form i.e. how something is said. “Style is a formal aspect of manner or expression which is inseparably interconnected with its content, and at the same time causally related to a relevant social and communicative context” (Verdonk, 2006).

Generally, style deals with modes of communication *e.g.* the choice of vocabulary, whereas delivery of speech is restricted to voice, gesture or facial expressions. In practice, delivery and style indiscreetly act together as a whole. Each speaker is in possession of his own specific style of speech, and when analysing someone’s style, one may take into consideration other semiotic modes like one’s appearance, body language, dressing style and symbolic actions. “Style is a complex interaction between personal choice and social meaning, and between the spoken mode and other means of communication. It is the semiotic effect attained by individual features of delivery and style that convey socially shared meanings” (Charteris-Black, 2014, p. 31).

- Decorum

“*Decorum* or a quality of appropriateness is not only a matter of style but of every aspect of an oration” (Verdonk, 2006). Specifically, a speaker’s style is supposed to be adapted to one’s social rank, condition in life, age, and analogous characteristics should be employed with regards to time, place, and audience.

Following Cicero, there are generally three kinds of style: the high style (or the grand style), the low style (or the plain style) and the middle style. By way of explanation, the grand style is filled with rhetorical devices, *e.g.* metaphors, extra-ordinary words and elaborate expressions. Grand style equals an elevated speech. The medium style is characteristic of the balance between simplicity and sophistication. Lastly, what defines low style is clarity, sincerity and concise expressions. Nevertheless, it is highly desired for the speaker to exploit all of these forms: “a good orator will hope to have a command of all three – and will be

capable where appropriate of mixing them up a bit in a single speech” (Leith, 2011, p. 119). In narration, for example, it is desirable to use simple style of clarity, whereas peroration (the end of speech) creates opportunity for more elaborate statements. Importantly, it is *decorum* which determines what kind of style (language) should be used in a given context. Therefore, the speaker should opt for the most appropriate style which would suit him, the audience and the given circumstances.

- Humour

In general, humour can be an effective tool for persuasion. Making jokes draws attention, introduces a less tense atmosphere and unifies a speaker with an audience as a result of a shared sense of humour. Nonetheless, orators do not use jokes just to amuse the audience. In fact, this is a rhetorical device designed to gain recognition and trust of the public. By introducing a relaxed atmosphere the speaker can obtain public sympathy.

- Sound effects

Sound effects in speeches and poetry are used for similar purposes. First of all, an impression of melodiousness of the text makes it more catchy and pleasant to listen to. Devices which make the text sound harmonious and memorable are repetition, alliteration and rhyme. Despite sound effects’ similarities in rhetoric and poetry, they share cardinal differences. Primarily, if the speeches were equally constructed like poetry, they would not sound persuasive but rather artificial. A well-composed speech should have rhythm but no meter. Otherwise, it would sound too ‘poetic’.

- The Tense

“It is an aspect of style at the level of sentence and paragraph, though, it also goes to wider logic of an argument. Controlling the tense is a very good way of controlling its direction, because it is, essentially a way of controlling which branch of oratory you find yourself in” (Leith, 2011, p. 128). For instance, a wily speaker tries to use both deliberative and judicial branches of oration. If the speaker feels uncomfortable about mistakes that took place in the past, he or she immediately moves to the future tense and forthcoming positive view on the situation as in the following example: “Mistakes have been made. But what matters now is that we stop slinging recriminations about, pull together and set about building a brighter future” (Leith, 2011, p.128). On the contrary, if the speaker does not agree with the future project, one can find a similar issue that failed in the past and focus the arguments on the unsuccessful events that took place in the past tense. If for various reasons, a speaker does not feel comfortable about referring to both past and future, he may choose to speak solely in the present context, for example by finding a topic to praise or deplore.

- The Figures

“A ‘figure of speech,’ sometimes termed a ‘rhetorical figure’ or ‘trope,’ is a word or group of words used in some deviation from the strict literal sense of the word(s), or from the more commonly used form of word order or sentence construction” (Shen, 2006). Sometimes, they are called *flores rhetoricae* – the flowers of rhetoric. Strictly speaking, these are different ways in which language becomes metaphorical, and these ways have their terminology. The study of rhetorical devices has always been exposed to much dispute about their classification, names, functions and types. For instance, there is an attempt to distinguish between figures and tropes - the former operating on the level of sentences and the latter on individual words. Yet, these discrepancies may sometimes be problematic to distinguish

(Leith, 2011, pp. 131-132). Also, there has been an attempt to differentiate between figures of thought and figures of speech, although there is an absence of any universal criteria that would help to determine the differences. For the purpose of my actual research, I am not going to make any significant distinction between figures of speech, figures of thought, rhetorical figures and tropes etc.

Among classic philosophers, it has been argued by Quintilian that figures of speech are rhetorical and grammatical by nature e.g. anaphora or antithesis. It means that they can maintain the original meaning even when subject to change. Unlike figures of speech, figures of thought are expressions that have their meaning derived from their intrinsic, literal sense e.g. irony, metaphor or synecdoche, thus, they cannot be changed.

Over the years, the study of rhetorical figures has been a subject of interest in various fields such as poetry, traditional rhetoric, and more recently cognitive linguistics and psychology. More importantly, rhetorical devices are central to poetic and non-poetic language. The figurative language has been used both by orators and poets in order to embellish their style, emphasize and clarify the meaning and persuade the addressees of the message (Shen, 2006). “The ancients frequently described rhetorical figures as capable of attracting and maintaining the attention of recipients to the message as a whole” (Mcquarrie & Phillips, 2014, p. 26). In case of political speeches which are central to the present research, rhetorical figures increase attention to arguments and make recipients more sensitive to the message as a whole - hence, the audience is able to process and analyse the arguments more carefully (Mcquarries & Philips, 2014, pp. 26- 30).

“It is a literary-critical commonplace to say that style and substance can’t be disentangled. Every stylistic element of oratory serves a purpose” (Leith, 2011, p.132). For example, figures such as parallelism and antithesis serve to frame an argument. Next, apostrophe establishes certain overtones and relation with an audience. When a sentence is

filled with rhetorical devices – it is intended to make the speech easier to memorise. There are countless figures and techniques that shape the political speech at the level of word, sentence and paragraph which, in turn, give shape to the larger purpose of the whole speech (Leith, 2011, pp. 132-133).

1.2.4 Part Four: Memory

The phenomenon of memory dates back to ancient times. The name comes from the tradition of oratory in which the speaker speaking from memory enjoyed high appreciation from the public. Certainly, the art of memory does not require the thoughtless learning of speeches by heart, but instead, the tradition of memory is a series of skills which the speaker should use during a speech. For example, one should have extensive knowledge of the presented speeches, so as to be able to improvise when necessary. Likewise, it is not just the ability to recite the beautiful speech of cards, but also the right intonation and speaking in accordance with one's convictions. Thirdly, the use of tradition called *sprezzatura*: “quality of life and spontaneity in a speech – is the thing to aim for. It is seldom achieved without practice. So memory, as it matters in rhetoric, is not simply about rote learning any more than oratory is about recitation” (Leith, 2011, p. 144). In other words, a good speaker should be convinced of what he says, so that he can easily and convincingly deliver a speech. The speech should naturally arise from his thoughts. Also, he should be in command of the presented material and arguments for and against. The reading should be adapted to the mood and attitude of the audience. The speech is more convincing when moving from one point to another and is delivered with ease. Furthermore, the moment in which the speaker does not use notes and tries to find eye contact with an audience is precisely the right moment in which the audience is convinced that the speaker, with full consciousness, knows what he says and takes responsibility for his statements. As a result, a self-confident and natural speaker who rarely

uses a manuscript or teleprompter has a particularly positive influence on the audience (Crick, 2014, p. 42). All the aspects that make up the concept of memory help the speakers to become successful orators (Leith, 2011, pp. 143-146).

1.2.5 Part Five: Delivery

Delivery, in Greek *hypokrisis*, and in Latin *actio*, refers to spoken rhetoric. It is both control of the voice and physical gestures. The voice, *i.e.* diction, should be well trained, and the speech should be presented with volume and clarity and modulated with judgement. Even if the speech delivery does not include active interaction from an audience, it should be talking *to* or *with* rather than aiming *at* an audience. There are many different techniques of voice modulation and articulation which orators can use, for instance, in the introduction, the voice should be calm, confident and composed. The conversational voice, like in every-day speech, helps to establish closer relationship with an audience. Energetic tones of debate is appropriate for argumentation and refutation, whereas the amplification tone is prescribed for moving the audience to pity (Leith, 2011, pp.172-181). Pronunciation is another important aspect of a successful speech. The speaker should avoid dialect, clearly pronounce words and speak at a moderate pace. In addition, the speaker has to adjust his position with respect to the audience and present circumstances. One has to decide whether to walk around, sit or just stand on the podium (Crick, 2014, p. 45). Regarding physical gestures, one needs to maintain control over body language. Any moves like playing with buttons or wedding ring and keeping hands loose is not desired. Resting hands on the pulpit or clasping them together on the chest is more suitable. Importantly, the last matter which is important for achieving a successful delivery is just being natural – being oneself (Leith, 2011, pp. 172-182).

1.3 Metaphor and Style

According to Charteris - Black (2007), “the primary strategy for the design of leadership style is the creation and use of metaphor” (p. 26). He claims that using metaphor involves taking the audience out of their ordinary context and putting them into a sophisticated and unexpected context – this measure allows the leader to build tension between their original and ordinary meaning of metaphor. The style of the speaker is highly influenced by the unique use of metaphors. Speakers use metaphors to prove their charisma, leadership, competence and professionalism and to show completely opposite qualities of their rivals. The charismatic leader communicates a profoundly individual view of the world through the use of metaphor and rhetorical devices (Charteris - Black, 2007, p. 26). Bennis and Nanus (1985) provide empirical evidence for the importance of metaphor:

We have found in our discussions with leaders that vision can often be communicated best by metaphors or models. The great leader seems to be able to find just the right metaphor that clarifies the idea and minimizes distortion. In fact, the right metaphor often transcends verbal communication altogether; like a good poem or song (...) (p. 50)

Metaphor is a particularly essential tool used to measure the style of the leader. Style is about *how* something is said, hence, metaphor serves to be a means to convey information. Metaphor is a rhetorical device which specifies the level of style and the quality of appropriateness (*decorum*) - grand style, middle style, plain style. Among others, it shows the speaker’s perception of the world, especially through conceptual metaphors. Metaphor does not only determine one's style, but it is also an important means of persuasion which arouses emotions, attracts attention and frames concepts.

The main focus of this paper is not only on speech style, but also on metaphor, since as one can see, metaphor is a rhetorical device determining one's style. Therefore, the subsequent sections will elaborate on the general concept of metaphor, conceptual metaphor, metaphor in politics and framing.

1.4 What is Metaphor?

“Metaphor has been variously defined in terms of substituting one word for another word with an apparently different meaning, comparing one idea to another, or creating an implicit analogy or simile” (Ritchie, 2013, p. 4). The etymological origin of metaphor comes from the Greek word *metapherein* and means ‘to transfer’. Namely, metaphor is a word or phrase that transfers meaning which differs from its basic sense. The basic sense *i.e.* literal meaning, in the context of conceptual metaphor is the ‘source domain’, whereas the metaphoric meaning is the ‘target domain’. Metaphors come into being only when there is a shift in the use of an expression or word. In other words, a word becomes a metaphor only when its meaning undergoes a change from the common use. Nonetheless, the general expectation about word sense and metaphors differs in accordance to one's personal experiences since language is an individual process of cognition (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 32).

1.4.1 Conceptual Metaphor

As a continuation of the definition of metaphor, I would like to shed light on a phenomenon of conceptual metaphor which presents how a metaphor works in every-day life. The common definition of metaphor suggests that it is an extra-ordinary rhetorical device rather than ordinary language. Nevertheless, according to the authors of *Conceptual Metaphor Theory* (CMT), Lakoff and Johnson, metaphor is omnipresent in people's conceptual systems in terms of how they think and act. As a consequence, metaphorical concepts are central to

ordinary human activities like the way people behave, perceive reality and relate to other people. In other words, everything that people think and do is largely metaphorical in nature, and language is a source of evidence which illustrates how this system works.

Conceptual metaphors consist of two conceptual domains where one domain is understood in terms of another. “The conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions to understand another conceptual domain is called source domain, while the conceptual domain that is understood this way is the target domain” (Kovecses, 2010, p. 24). In the given example of LIFE IS A JOURNEY¹ metaphor, the conceptual domain of LIFE constitutes a target domain, whereas JOURNEY represents a source domain. In other words, target domain of LIFE should be understood through the JOURNEY source domain. Furthermore, it is important to differentiate between the conceptual metaphors and metaphorical linguistic expressions. The latter represent words and expressions that refer to the particular conceptual domain (source domain). “Thus, all the preceding expressions that have to do with ‘life’ and that come from the domain of ‘journey’ are linguistic metaphorical expressions, whereas the corresponding conceptual metaphor they manifest is LIFE IS A JOURNEY” (Kovecses, 2010, p. 24).

A systematic correspondence between target and source domain is technically called mapping. That is to say, the elements of one source domain correspond to the elements of another one. The idea of mapping can be shown in the following example of conceptual metaphor: LOVE IS A JOURNEY. Namely, in the sentence “we are going nowhere”, the constituent elements of this sentence refer to travellers, a journey and a destination. Nevertheless, regarding the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, travellers signify lovers whose journey represents their relationship and where the destination signifies relationship goals. As a result, the given sentence, “we are going nowhere”, means that this particular relationship

¹ In this paper, I will use a large font defining the conceptual metaphor as Lakoff & Johnson in their book *Metaphors We Live by*.

has little chance to survive. The given correspondences between source and target domain help to understand the meaning of LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor (Kovecses, 2010, pp. 29-31).

Except from the notion of mapping, there are two other important properties of conceptual domains which are called highlighting and hiding. The former means that the focus is on the single feature of the target domain. In the metaphor: THE MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT, the focus is on the fragile attribute of one's mind similar to the phrase "my ego is very fragile" or "I am easily crushed" (Kovecses, 2010, p. 144). These examples highlight lack of mental strength, whereas it is well known that one's mind has more attributes than weakness. Highlighting and hiding always go hand in hand. It means that when one or two or more characteristics are highlighted - other ones are hidden. For instance, in the previous example of "my ego is very fragile", this metaphor highlights one's psychological weakness, whereas it might hide one's intelligence or wisdom (Kovecses, 2010, pp. 144-145).

In general, there are three types of conceptual metaphors. First, I would like to start with the structural metaphors which "are cases where one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, pp.14). For example, in the metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR the concept of ARGUMENT is metaphorically structured in terms of the concept of WAR. The given conceptual metaphor is used in a variety of daily, ordinary contexts of arguing, for example:

1. He *attacked* every weak point in my argument.
2. I've never *won* an argument with him.
3. If you use that *strategy*, he'll *wipe you out*.
4. He *shot down* all of my arguments.

(Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.4)

The above metaphors containing expressions like *attacked*, *won*, *strategy*, *wipe out* and *shot down* refer to military and warlike vocabulary. The examples show that the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor structures the substance of arguments. “It is important to see that we do not just talk about arguments in terms of war. We can actually win or lose arguments. We see the person we are arguing with as an opponent” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.4). The conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR gives one an idea of how people structure and understand the arguments. “The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.5). Indeed, arguments are not subspecies of war, instead, warlike vocabulary is used to present conflict embodied in an argument, and a conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR is used to illustrate such a conflict. The concept, activity, and language are all metaphorically structured. Furthermore, this is the ordinary way of structuring the argument. The reason why people are not aware of using conceptual metaphor is because these metaphors are deeply embedded into ordinary language. The metaphor is not a matter of language but rather a way of thinking. The language used during an argument is not poetic but rather literal. In other words, we use a metaphor, because this is the systematic way in which we think. Importantly, it is not language which is metaphorical but human thought processes (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, pp. 5-6).

Oriental metaphor is another type of conceptual metaphor. This type of metaphor “organizes the system of concepts with respect to one another” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.14). It is called ‘orientational’, because it deals with spatial orientation: in-out, up-down, on-off, front-back, central-peripheral and deep-shallow. Spatial orientation is related to the physical capabilities of the human body. More than that, orientational metaphors depict the human perception of the world. For example, the concept of HAPPY IS UP presents an orientation of being UP having positive connotations like in the English example “I’m

feeling up today” since from the physical point of view, upright posture stirs positive emotions. Therefore ‘feeling up’ means that someone feels good. In another example, SAD IS DOWN, the concept evokes negative sensations like in the expressions “My spirits sank” or “I’m feeling down”. From a physical point of view, drooping silhouette accompanies sadness and depression. Such a use of metaphor is not arbitrary – it is directly derived from cultural and natural experience of human beings. Importantly, orientational metaphors may vary in different cultures. For instance, in our culture, the future is in front of us, when in some cultures it is physically in the back.

Finally, ontological metaphor is the third type of conceptual metaphors described by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). There are metaphors which can be identified in terms of experiences as substances, entities and containers. Furthermore, “we can refer to them, categorize them, group them, and quantify them – and, by this means, reason about them. Human purposes typically require us to impose artificial boundaries that make physical phenomena discrete just as we are: entities bounded by a surface” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 25). The authors of the theory start their explanation with the following example INFLATION IS AN ENTITY. This metaphor means that rising prices can be seen as an entity as in:

1. *Inflation is lowering* our standard of living.
2. If there’s much *more inflation*, we’ll never survive.
3. We need to *combat inflation*.
4. *Inflation is backing* us into a corner.

(Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 26).

In the above example, experiencing inflation as an entity allows people to quantify it, refer to it, identify it and act with respect to it. “Ontological metaphors like this are necessary for even

attempting to deal rationally with our experiences” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 25).

Ontological metaphors present invisible boundaries like in INFLATION IS AN ENTITY that correspond to human nature, since the human body works like a bounded entity.

1.5 Metaphor in Politics

Political speeches are specific forms of expression, since they provide the audience with an idealized vision of the world or the potential of a new, better world. For this reason, the choice of metaphors in political speeches is rather conscious. The use of metaphors in politics is very effective for many reasons. They arouse emotions and allow the speaker to establish him or herself as a likeable person sharing similar views, values and goals with the audience (Charteris - Black, 2004, p. 87). It is central to political discourse that metaphor is utilized as an effective linguistic tool for persuasion. The reason for this is that “by metaphorically talking about something in terms of something else, speakers or writers foreground some aspects of the phenomenon in question and downplay others, and therefore potentially affect the receiver’s views” (Semino, 2008, p. 86). Therefore, the use of metaphors in politics is the result of the speaker’s individual collective choices.

Another elementary function of metaphor in politics is to frame a view of a given political issue. “Metaphor is an effective means for politicians to develop persuasive arguments by applying what is familiar, and already experienced, to new topics to demonstrate that they are thinking rationally about political issues” (Charteris- Black 2011, p. 35). For instance, Margaret Thatcher and George Osborne used the metaphor of an ordinary household budget in order to explain how to manage a nation’s economy. In other words, the metaphor widens the aspects of knowledge about budget, even though the domestic budget differs from the national expenditure economy.

In politics, metaphors often become part of schemes invented by politicians who frame arguments that would be favourable for themselves; they do it by foregrounding the positive aspects and putting the negative aspects into the background. To give an example, during the Second World War, Winston Churchill spoke of an “Iron Curtain Descending across Europe” which meant that Europe would be divided. This metaphor indeed reflected the reality, but it concealed information about human interference as if the curtain was supposed to descend. (Charteris- Black, 2011, p. 36). As a result, the use of metaphor allowed Churchill to convey a selected piece of information.

Some speeches employ a ‘metaphor scenario’ which is designed to explain more sophisticated context of political events in an ordinary way. For example, in the context of the European Union, the process of countries joining the Union can be called ‘marriage’, ‘getting married’, ‘getting engaged’ etc. Therefore, the metaphors here illustrate political relationships in terms of common human relationships. These relationships, like human relationships, can be complicated in nature, and therefore an obstruction of the relationship may be hence referred to as ‘divorce’, ‘separation’ etc. (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 37). Another example of a scenario illustrating European Union relationships refers to the train and its cars, whereas each car represents every country in the European Union. The message is that their economies need to travel at the same speed (Semino, 2008, p. 94). A different scenario may contain heroes, victims, villains and protagonists. Such a ‘narrative story’ may present the course of action, heroes, reasons and solutions to problems and happy or unhappy endings (Scott Mio & Katz, 1996, p. 131). Stone (1988) claims that “metaphors are important devices for strategic representations in policy analysis. On the surface, they simply draw a comparison between one thing and another, but they usually imply a whole narrative story and a prescription for action” (Stone, 1988, p. 118).

Finally, Many metaphors used in a political context are designed to stir emotions. The reason for this is that emotions bring people together and arouse confidence. In fact, it is easier to influence people who are under the influence of emotions. Emotions can be triggered by common goals, dreams and views, and they help to invite the audience to establish a closer connection with the speaker. Using metaphors that stir emotions may be more effective than logical arguments. People indeed strive to be logical, but the abundance of information does not allow them to be maximally logical. Under those circumstances, people are effectively influenced by metaphors, since they “bridge the gap between the logical and emotional camps” (Scott Mio & Katz, 1996, p. 133).

1.6 The Concept of Framing

The aim of this dissertation is to analyse the style of speech of President Barack Obama. A very important aspect of one's style is the ability to frame any kind of transmitted information. The theory of information framing was invented by Goffman who argues that “framing allows its user to locate, perceive, identify, and label a seemingly infinite number of concrete occurrences defined in its terms” (Goffman, 1974, p. 21). In other words, framing works like an invisible boundary which helps people to say how they see the world. He claims that everyone uses the intrinsic schemata of ‘primary framing’ to naturally put thoughts into a meaningful message. According to him, there are two kinds of primary framing: natural and social. The natural framing is used by everyone to describe common events and reality without additional inferences *e.g.* a weather report. By contrast, “social frameworks provide backward understanding for events that incorporate the will, aim and controlling effort of an intelligence, a live agency, the chief one being a human being” (Goffman, 1974, p. 22). By way of explanation, the speaker arranges the speech to his advantage to convince an audience of his beliefs. Both frameworks work in different contexts, and the frame of each message has

a great impact on how people perceive the message. In terms of political speeches, it is essential how information is presented to the recipients, hence 'social framework' is the one which is used to show one's goals and to influence the audience's choices and reasoning. Nevertheless, people do not always follow all information presented to them. For example when arguments are weak or when competing frames are present. Also, the success of framing largely depends on the credibility of the sources used, personal preferences, values and attitudes (Matthes, 2012, p. 250).

Frames structure the reality in which people live. Nevertheless, media do not reflect reality, because framing is subject to careful selection. Framing allows one to present selective world views that form particular culture, trends, politics, mass media, information etc. For example, in case of abortion, one can frame it as an extremely cruel act of murder of an unborn child, but on the contrary, abortion can be framed to be a free choice or a must when a mother and baby's life is endangered due to severe complications (Matthes, 2012, p. 249). Framing is also used to highlight or to separate those pieces of information that are more important than another. Entman (1993) accurately explains the functions of framing in his definition:

To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating context, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described (Entman, 1993, p. 52).

Lakoff (2004) emphasizes the role of framing in politics. He claims that decisions people make regarding politics and candidates are based on values system, and frames define these values (Lakoff, 2004, p. xiii). Furthermore, frames shape policies and thus, political and

social institutions, and, if one wants to change society, one needs to reframe the language. As a consequence, reframing changes the way people perceive the world, values and common sense. Different ideas require different language and frames.

Many studies (Mussolff 2004, Cameron 2003, Semino *et al.* 2015) claim that metaphors frame and establish specific opinions in specific contexts that influence common understanding of various matters. In the following examples, two metaphors shape completely different views of the sickness.

1. Ask your chemo nurses or your specialist if you are looking for anything that might be of help in your *fight* against cancer.
2. There are certain points in the cancer *journey* where the plan has to change.

(Semino, Demjen & Demmen, 2016, p.

The given examples demonstrate how framing of metaphor may change perspective of the same matter. The first instantiation displays dealing with cancer as a fight, where the cancer is an opponent or enemy. The second example depicts cancer as a journey which suggests the sickness to be the crossroads of life. Indeed, cancer is usually a very serious and fatal disease that requires long-term treatment. The way metaphor frames the disease, can be negative, as in the first example or more positive as in the second one. Such a diverse form of framing is of great importance to the public, because the speaker is able to transform even the most severe illness into a more natural life experience.

Based on the above examples, metaphors are rhetorical devices that play particularly important roles in framing various aspects of people's lives. Since political speeches are central to this paper, it can be inferred that the role of metaphor in framing different issues is

equally useful in the area of politics. Namely, it can reveal how Obama's frames define his values and views.

Chapter 2: Method and Corpus

2.1 Methodology

In this thesis, among metaphors, I would like to find the most characteristic features of Obama's style based on the analysis of the State of The Union Addresses delivered between 2009 and 2016. Also, I intend to find any changes of style that might have occurred over the period of his presidency. First, I will analyze general stylistic features of Obama used in his State of The Union Speeches using the stylistic checklist by Leech and Short (2007). Second, I will analyse and present the most prominent and dominant metaphors in his speeches. For metaphor analysis I will use both the Conceptual Metaphor Theory by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) described in the theoretical framework and Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz Group 2007) which will be discussed in this chapter. Finally, I will juxtapose my results according to the canons of rhetoric.

2.2 Stylistic features

In order to 'measure' the style, I am going to find fixed patterns used in the speeches. To be able to establish a collection of stylistic features, I will use the stylistic and linguistic checklist methodology. This checklist is divided into four categories: lexical category, grammatical category, figures of speech and cohesion and context. Lexical category captures elements like nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and general features *e.g.* whether the vocabulary is formal or informal, or if the adjectives are visual or auditory etc. Next, the grammatical category deals with *e.g.* sentence types, sentence complexity, clause types, verb phrases etc. The subsequent category includes all types of figures of speech. Finally, the last category studies context and cohesion *e.g.* linking adverbials and pronouns (Leech & Short, 2007, pp. 61-64). For the purpose of my research, I will not use all categories. Instead, I will select the most predominant and outstanding features of the text. In fact, these selected

features are called ‘style markers’ of the text. The choice of these particular ‘style markers’ are based on the concept of prominence and foregrounding. Simply speaking, prominence is the concept of highlighting, *i.e.* those features which stand out in the texts. In contrast to prominence, “foregrounding may be qualitative, *i.e.* deviation of the language code itself (.) or it may simply be quantitative, *i.e.* deviance from some expected frequency” (Leech & Short, 2007, p. 39). The methodology aims at specifying types of particular linguistic categories, for example nouns, verbs, questions etc. and stylistic categories like for example metaphors, personifications, alliterations etc. Simultaneously, on the basis of the frequency of linguistic and stylistic choices, I will analyse the characteristics of style. In principle, the checklist is dedicated to fictional texts, nevertheless it can be applied to any prose text, because it contains universal guidelines for any textual analysis. Therefore, every text type can be studied in terms of style. Speeches are meant to be spoken, but they are always carefully composed and written on paper, and that is why they differ from natural and spontaneous speech. Notably, this kind of methodology is particularly useful and relevant, because it allows to analyse text in a more systematic way. Van Leeuwen (2009) has employed this checklist to analyse the style of speech of a Dutch politician Geert Wilders. In his scholarly publication, he admitted that this checklist provides all significant linguistic means for any analysis of style.

For the analysis, I will try to deliver the most frequent and distinct features of Obama’s style which can be explained by means of concepts of rhetoric. To obtain these results, I will count them manually. Due to lack of an appropriate computer program, there will be no possibility to determine the exact number of particular features. The choice of my examples was influenced by relevance and frequency of occurrence.

2.3 Metaphor

To identify metaphorically used words in the speeches, I will use the MIP (Metaphor Identification Procedure) invented by Pragglejaz Group (2007). MIP is the procedure that step by step allows to establish metaphors in different contextual meaning. Figure 1 shows the stages of the procedure.

1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
 - (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be
 - More concrete [what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste];
 - Related to bodily action;
 - More precise (as opposed to vague);
 - Historically older;
 Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.
 - (c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual

meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.

4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical

(Pragglejaz Group, 2007, p. 3).

To briefly sum up the steps of the procedure, first, I will carefully read the text to have a basic knowledge of its content. Next, I will choose particular words and determine their basic meaning and other contextual meaning. If the basic meaning contrasts with the contextual meaning, I will classify the lexical unit as a metaphor. With regard to the dictionary meanings, I will use the popular online version of *Macmillan Dictionary for Advanced Learners*, *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English Online* and *Oxford Living Dictionary Online*. I have chosen these particular dictionaries, since they are internationally recognised corpus.

2.4 Corpus

The corpus of this thesis consists of eight State of The Union Addresses delivered by Barack Obama during his two presidential terms between 2009 and 2016.

The following table presents information about the word count of each speech.

State of the Union Address	Word count
2009	5.913
2010	7.459
2011	7.043
2012	7.158
2013	6.931
2014	6.791
2015	6.873
2016	6.205

Table (1). The word count of each State of the Union Address delivered by Barack Obama

The speeches were stored and analysed in Microsoft Word. They were retrieved from the American Presidency Project website which provides reliable information about presidential documents (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php>). State of the Union Addresses are comprehensive material for the study of style, because they are individually and carefully composed utterances. They form a sufficient material for analysis, because they contain rather expanded opinions on various matters.

Chapter 3: Analysis: Stylistic features related to ethos, pathos, logos

This section is devoted to the analysis of Obama's style markers from the State of the Union Addresses. The analysis will be based on the notions of three rhetorical appeals: *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*, where the first two form most of the analysis. These determinants of rhetoric's canon elaborate on the three lines of argument and constitute ingredients for the efficient persuasion (Ilie, 2006). This subsection will show what makes Obama likeable, what kind of emotions he commands, and how he forms his logical argumentation. In addition to rhetorical appeals, the analysis also contains a separate section on framing of conceptual metaphors. The examples of framing reveal how Obama frames Americans as people, and how he structures the American realities of life.

As a matter of evidence, each section contains only a few demonstrational examples that are most distinct and significant, because the speeches contain an immense number of similar examples. It must be admitted, that some rhetorical appeals might overlap in meaning. Yet it is natural, since language is a mixture of various rhetorical features that cannot be entirely separated and analysed. If applicable, each quotation or set of quotations contains a year of the given State of the Union Address. Relevant words in quotations are italicized.

3.1 Ethos

A contemporary interpretation of *ethos* can mean presenting oneself as a likeable person where the speaker needs to establish a common ground with the audience. *Ethos* reveals whether the speaker can be credible and reliable. Furthermore, sharing similar values and views between the speaker and the audience builds mutual trust. There are different techniques which make the speaker friendly and appealing. Obama achieves that by using humour, colloquialism, imperative, direct address via imperatives and pronouns, slogan, metonym, antithesis,

compounds and idioms. In fact, *ethos* can be found in Obama's framing of conceptual metaphors, but this will be shown in a separate section.

a) Humour

Jokes play an important role in political speeches. First of all, they attract the attention of the audience and relax the serious political tone. In general, people like easy-going and happy people who can make jokes. Good and tactful humour may impress people and arouse positive emotions. Whenever people react with laughter at a joke – it means that they share a similar sense of humour with a speaker. In other words, they already establish a common ground - a promise of a successful cooperation. In addition, making jokes proves one's intelligence. Simultaneously, such a speaker is very likely to be treated with respect and support, because leaders who are smart and witty are most desirable. In fact, using jokes is a very persuasive and universal tactic that draws people's attention. Obama uses jokes in almost every speech. I have selected a few most entertaining jokes from his speeches.

- “That is why I asked Vice President Biden to lead a tough, unprecedented oversight effort – because nobody messes with Joe” (Obama, 2009).

In his first presidential speech, Obama dares to make a humorous comment about the Vice President. Such a joke could only be made by someone who knows that person very well. ‘Nobody messes with Joe’ proves that the relationship between the President and the Vice President is very good. Obama unwittingly confirms that Joe Biden is a resolute man at a suitable position. Such a sense of humour carries a positive connotation

- “And in there is one thing that has unified Democrats and Republicans, and everybody in between, it’s that we all hated the bank bailout. I hated it. I hated it. You hated it. It was about as popular as a root canal” (Obama, 2010).

This excellent compilation of catchy repetition, irony and extra-ordinary comparison between bank bailout and dental treatment certainly caused a sudden gale of laughter. Furthermore, phrases like ‘unified Democrats and Republicans’, ‘I’, ‘You’, ‘We’, mean that all American people equally agree on the same matter. In fact, people feel united whenever their views are compatible.

- “Within 25 years, our goal is to give 80% Americans access to high speed rail. This could allow you to go places in half the time it takes to travel by car. For some trips, it will be faster than flying –without the pat-down” (Obama, 2011).

This intriguing joke is not as obvious as it seems to. Obama hints that traditional travel by car and rail might be faster only because there is no security control, which is an accurate combination of clever humour and dry facts about introducing high speed rails. This joke proves Obama’s sharp intelligence.

- “There are twelve different agencies that deal with exports. There are at least five different agencies that deal with housing policy. Then there’s my favourite example: The Interior Department is in charge of salmon while they’re in fresh water, but the Commerce Department handles them when they’re in saltwater. I hear it gets even more complicated once they’re smoked” (Obama, 2011).

In this example, Obama playfully reveals the absurdities of the laws which prevail in the United States. He literally laughs at this state of affairs. Later in his speech, he ensures that he will conduct reorganizations in that department.

- “And for this final one, I am going to try to make it a little shorter. I know some of you are antsy to get back to Iowa. I’ve been there. I’ll be shaking hands afterwards if you want some tips” (Obama, 2016).
- “But tonight, I want to go easy on the traditional list of proposals. Don’t worry, I’ve got plenty” (Obama, 2016).
- “A little applause right here” (Obama, 2016).
- “It’s not too much of a stretch to say that some of the only people in America who are going to work the same job, in the same place, with a health and retirement package for 30 years are sitting in this chamber” (Obama, 2016).

In the above examples from the last State of the Union Address, Obama proves to be very relaxed, self-confident and less official ensuring that he ‘can give some tips’, if necessary and plenty of proposals for the upcoming year. He proves his confidence by asking for more applause, however, he links irony and humour when he reminds that the only people with a safe future in America are politicians. By compiling truth with humour, Obama commands respect and trust.

b) Colloquialisms

Using colloquialisms in official speeches removes the boundaries between ordinary citizens and political elite. By using colloquialisms, the speaker intends to unite with the audience.

Namely, a speaker wants to be seen as a normal person sharing the same views, feelings and attitude. Every day language may shorten the distance between the speaker and the audience proving that the speaker is just like everyone else. According to Leith (2011), Obama usually drops from his high style, and this so called ‘folksiness’ is borrowed from Abraham Lincoln (p. 224).

- “Parents and students can use to compare schools based on simple criteria – where you can get the most bang for your educational buck” (Obama, 2012).

Colloquialisms in expression ‘bang for the buck’ (“Bang for the buck”, Oxford English Dictionary, 2017, def.7) mean that parents and students try to find the best possible college (bang) for the money (buck) they are able to spend, namely, the best possible education in exchange for money. In this example, Obama consciously uses slang words, because these problems involve students that use such language on a daily basis. As a result, these colloquialisms are more appealing to the younger audience which makes them feel that Obama is ‘cool’.

- “We need to set our sights higher making sure government doesn’t screw things up” (Obama, 2015).

This rather rough comment ‘screw things up’ shows Obama’s anger shared with other Americans. He wants all nationals to be involved in politics to ensure that the government will not make any more mistake. Calling for cooperation and saying the truth makes Obama trustworthy.

- “A better politics is one where we debate without demonizing each other; where we talk issues and values, and principles and facts, rather than ‘gotcha’ moments” (Obama, 2015).

Obama openly expresses his dissatisfaction about the American politics. This excerpt indicates that politicians do not focus on work but quarrels, division and conspiracies.

In the aforementioned examples, Obama is not afraid to speak truthfully about reality of American politics. The combination of truth and simple and straightforward words is very persuasive.

Other informal colloquial phrases and words used by Obama include: “over the top claims” meaning extraordinary claims, “folks” instead of people, “kids” instead of children, “by the way” instead of rarely used linking words, “Gas under two bucks a gallon ain’t bad either” (‘ain’t’ instead of ‘isn’t’).

c) Direct address via imperatives and pronouns

By using direct address via imperatives and pronouns, a speaker desires to establish closer relations and an incentive for joint cooperation. The use of imperatives provokes subconscious reactions. Obama’s speeches show that this type of motivational inclusions break plain text and encourage an unconscious audience to cooperate. Similar to colloquialisms, imperatives reduce the distance between the speaker and the audience resulting in closer relations.

Below, I present a few examples of direct address via imperatives and direct reference to the audience. As a matter of explanation, imperatives are commands *i.e.* those examples that start with a verb, for example, first person plural imperative – ‘let’s’ in “Let’s get this done”. Beyond the meaning of a direct reference I encapsulate phrases that contain the possessive adjectives ‘your’ and subject pronouns ‘you’ of the second person singular and plural, for example ‘your’ in ‘your country needs you’.

- “*Talk* to the small business in Phoenix that will triple its workforce because of the Recovery Act” (Obama, 2010).
- “*Your* country needs you” (Obama, 2011).
- “*You’re* the ones who need relief” (Obama, 2012).
- “*Let’s* streamline the process, and help our economy grow” (Obama, 2013).
- “*Let’s* get it done” (Obama, 2013).
- “*Let’s* do it” (Obama, 2013).

- “*Let me tell you why*” (Obama, 2014).
- “Tonight, together, let’s do more to restore the link between hard work and growing opportunity for every American” (Obama, 2015).

It can be inferred that Obama acts like a motivational coach who motivates all citizens of America to shape a better future together. He not only unifies people but also emphasizes the significance of a collective cooperation. The given expressions are usually used at the end of each elaborated argument. Furthermore, expressions like “let’s do it” may imitate Obama’s iconic slogan from his presidential campaign that made him help win the election – “yes, we can”. Such slogan may draw its effectiveness from the three syllable rhythm (Leith, 2011, p. 231).

d) Antithesis of metonym

Metonym is a rhetorical figure which substitutes another thing, object, person. Antithesis is a figure that contradicts two different concepts, objects etc. (“Metonym”, Oxford English Dictionary, 2017). A combination of metonym and antithesis is used by Obama to juxtapose two contrary parties. The compound ‘Wall Street’ represents people who work for the Stock Exchange, and a street where ordinary people run their businesses is called ‘Main Street’. Both compounds represent a figure of metonym, and a phenomenon of contradicting these two metonyms is antithesis.

- “*Wall Street* is rewarded, but hard work on *Main Street* isn’t” (Obama, 2010).
- “I’ve talked tonight about the deficit of trust between *Main Street* and *Wall Street* (Obama, 2012).
- “This year, let’s all come together – (...) businesses from *Wall Street* to *Main Street*” (Obama, 2014)

In the first quotation, Obama would like to provide ordinary Americans with equal chances and rewards. Also, Obama is concerned about the proportion of distrust between Americans and people who work for the government, hence, in the last excerpt, he expresses the desire to transfer jobs ‘from Wall Street to Main Street’ and to create a balanced labour market. The use of antithesis is considered to be a high level of modality where Obama as a confident leader is able to contradict two groups of people and make sure to act in the interest of them all. It is a nature of ethos that Obama shares a similar value system with the audience. (Charteris-Black, 2011, pp. 288-289).

e) Compounds and idioms

By referring to the rules of the game, Obama regularly promotes a universal system of values which constitutes an important role in human lives. “In a rousing passage in the Audacity of Hope, Obama wrote that to abandon our values and ideas would be to relinquish our best selves” (Leith, 2011, p. 224). In fact, Obama embodies values of justice, equal treatment and opportunities knowing that the following compounds and idioms appeal to the audience. ‘Fair play’ means “fair treatment of people without cheating or being dishonest”(“Fair play”, Longman Dictionary Online, 2017, def.2). The full compound ‘fair shot’ is absent from the Longman Dictionary, and I have analysed its parts separately, namely ‘shot’ in this context refers to “an attempt to do something or achieve something, especially something difficult”, (“Shot”, Longman English Dictionary Online, 2017, def.6) which in combination with a word ‘fair’ means an honest chance to achieve something. Both compounds have been used metaphorically since they do not refer to their most basic meaning which is placed in the first dictionary definition. An idiom ‘level the field’ means “to make a situation in which people are competing fair, with no one having special advantages” (“Level the field”, Longman Dictionaries Online, 2017, def.2). The idiom 'play by the rules' is absent from Longman

Dictionary, instead Oxford Dictionary was used: “Follow what is generally held to be the correct line of behaviour” (“Play by the rules”, Oxford English Dictionary Online, 2017, def. 1). Indeed, these examples of ethos makes Obama particularly likeable because he not only would like to provide equal opportunities for all but also spread respect for universal human values. Below are presented the extracts from speeches that contain previously explained compounds and idioms:

- “But realizing those benefits also means enforcing those agreements so our trading partners *play by the rules*” (Obama, 2010).
- “To secure our borders and enforce our laws, and ensure that everyone *who plays by the rules* can contribute to our economy and enrich our nation” (Obama, 2010).
- “We can restore an economy where everyone gets *a fair shot*, and everyone does their *fair share*, and everyone *plays by the same set of rules*” (Obama, 2012).
- “Now, a return to the American values of *fair play* and shared responsibility will help protect our people and our economy” (Obama, 2012).
- “ That’s why I’ve been asking CEOs to give more long-term unemployed workers a *fair shot* at that new job” (Obama, 2014).
- “We should write those rules. We should *level the playing field*.” (Obama, 2015).
- “First, how do we give everyone *a fair shot* at opportunity and security in this new economy?” (Obama, 2016).

Another set of compounds that were observed during the analysis is a specific manner of referring to any governmental expenses. Obama has a preference for using compounds consisting of the word ‘single’ and a synonym for money. The synonyms - penny or dime both mean a small amount of money (“Penny”, “Dime”, English Oxford Living Dictionary, 2017).

Such comparison might show great respect for money, honesty and fulfilment of the promise regarding not raising taxes. In fact, careful spending generates public sympathy.

- “If your family earns less than \$250,000 a year, you will not see your taxes increased *a single dime*. I repeat: not one *single dime*” (Obama, 2009).
- “I will not spend *a single penny*” (Obama, 2009).
- “And we haven't raised income taxes by *a single dime* on a single person. Not *a single dime*” (Obama, 2010).
- “Let me repeat - nothing I'm proposing tonight should increase our deficit by *a single dime*” (Obama, 2013).

3.2 Pathos

Pathos belongs to the part of rhetoric that evokes a wide variety of emotions, and by using emotions, the speaker makes an attempt to persuade the audience. Importantly, emotions do not have to be positive to be efficiently persuasive. In addition to love, amusement or patriotism, it can be fear, anxiety or sadness that makes the audience engaged in the speech. Analogously, the message is most appealing when the frequency of emotive words and phrases is relatively high. Furthermore, the impact on one's emotions is stronger when the speaker and the audience share similar values (Leith, 2011, pp. 57-73). *Pathos* can be represented in various forms. Frequent pronouns ‘we’ and ‘our’, and stories about successful Americans are techniques that provoke emotions. Each speech contains countless examples of stylistic features that can be related to pathos, therefore this section will not contain each example of *pathos* that has been found in the speeches. Instead, the analysis will provide a significant number of instances of a particular feature. Notably, *pathos* can be found in Obama's framing of conceptual metaphors,

but this will be shown in a separate section.

a) Frequent pronouns: “We” and “our”

Barack Obama prefers using the pronoun “We” rather than “I” when speaking of various matters involving the country.

State of the Union Address	Occurrences of <i>We</i>	Occurrences of <i>I</i>	Word Count
2009	130	74	5.913
2010	170	108	7.459
2011	189	69	7.043
2012	115	73	7.158
2013	150	33	6.931
2014	127	67	6.791
2015	187	79	6.873
2016	152	73	6.205

Table (2). Occurrences of words *we* and *I* in each State of the Union Address delivered by Barack Obama

The data shows that as long as the context allows Obama to use ‘we’ instead of ‘I’, he prefers to use the former version. Such attitude makes American people feel like one, big and united family where each member of the American family is equally important. Furthermore, ‘we’ means that everybody needs to be engaged in the process of shaping a better future. This tendency can be seen in each inaugural address, however, it is most symbolic in the first address delivered by Obama in the midst of the crisis. The first speech opening his presidency is abound in ‘we’ expressions that create the dominant voice in all speeches (Leith, 2011, p. 233). From that speech onwards, Obama continues to emphasize ‘we’ – Americans as a joint

collaboration of people that are supposed to restore the country: “we will rebuild”, “we will recover”, “we will act”, “we re-start” (2009) .

Analogically to the use of ‘we’, Obama is inclined to say “our problems”, “our savings” and “our kids” suggesting that everything is shared – just like in a family.

b) Framing through the narrative

Obama inclines toward passionate deliveries of inspiring stories about ambitious, courageous and hard-working Americans that struggle with a harsh reality. These examples are supposed to frame the greatness of the national character and self-confidence of the Americans. Such inspiring stories can be found in each inaugural address, for example:

- “Seven years ago, Rebekah and Ben Erler of Minneapolis were newlyweds. Their first child, Jack, was on the way. They were young and in love in America. As the crisis worsened, Ben’s business dried up, so he took what jobs he could find, even if they kept him on the road for long stretches of time. Rebekah took out student loans and enrolled in community college, and retrained for a new career. They sacrificed for each other. And slowly, it paid off. They bought their first home. They had a second son, Henry. Rebekah got a better job and then a raise. Ben is back in construction - and home for dinner every night. *America, Rebekah and Ben’s story is our story. They represent the millions who have worked hard and scrimped, and sacrificed and retooled*” (Obama, 2015).

In this excerpt, Obama frames Americans as hard working people who are rewarded for their effort. Also, he believes that sacrifice and hard work are the qualities of the American people. The part of the text in italics is the essence of what Obama wants to convey in each of the short story. All people who experience difficulties in their lives can identify with this story, and just like in an American dream the story has a happy ending.

c) Comparison

As was shown in the previous examples, Obama usually attempts to provide the audience with positive feelings, however, Obama occasionally adds some diversity of emotions i.e. jealousy. Obama evokes jealousy when he compares American and other countries' technological achievements and other disciplines in which America is less successful. Such critical comparison should arouse humility and motivation to work. In fact, too much flattery might sound unconvincing, because there is always some space for improvement:

- “We invented solar technology, but we’ve fallen behind countries like Germany and Japan in producing it” (Obama, 2009).
- “Right now, countries like Germany focus on graduating their high school students with the equivalent of a technical degree from one of our community colleges. So those German kids, they're ready for a job when they graduate high school (...) We need to give every American student opportunities like this” (Obama, 2013).
- “We need to work together on tools like bipartisan trade promotion authority to protect our workers, protect our environment, and open new markets to new goods stamped ‘Made in the USA.’ China and Europe aren’t standing on the sidelines. Neither should we.” (Obama, 2014)

3.3 Logos

Simply speaking, *logos* refers to a well-structured argumentation that is in agreement with the audience's view and values. Nevertheless, according to my findings, there are no explicit stylistic features that directly relate to *logos*. The only feature that is supported by logical arguments and universal truths is framing of Americans as equal people. This particular type of framing has been identified as *logos*, because the idea of equality comes from the American

Constitution i.e. legal, widely respected and recognized document. As a result, Obama, by referring to the equality of people invokes the U.S. Constitution, which is an undeniable argument.

a) Framing Americans as equal people

Obama regularly claims that origin, skin colour or social status do not matter in America. Every American is given an identical set of human rights for pursuing a good and qualitative life in America. This type of framing carries universal and undeniable truths that are found in the US Constitution. In fact, for Obama - a lawyer and politician, the American Constitution is a type of sanctity (Leith, 2011, p. 226).

- “We believe that in a country where every race and faith and point of view can be found, we are still bound together as one people” (Obama, 2011).
- “It doesn’t matter if you are black, or white; Asian, Latino, Native American; conservative, liberal; rich, poor; gay, straight” (Obama, 2012).
- “Voices that help us see ourselves not, first and foremost, as black or white or Asian or Latino, not as gay or straight, immigrant or native born, not as Democrat or Republican, but as American first, bound by a common creed” (Obama, 2016).

These instances invoke the memory of Dr. King, from whom Obama draws his inspirations. Inequality between people with various backgrounds has been mentioned by Obama multiple times long before his presidency (Leith, 2011, p. 226).

3.4 Framing of America and Americans reflected in conceptual metaphors

The material for this analysis consists of eight speeches that include metaphors of various topics. Nevertheless, metaphors that were chosen for this paper reflect framing of America and American people. This section is divided into three parts: framing life in America as the American Dream, framing Americans as an exceptional and leading nation, as well as framing Americans as people who make progress. In brief, in the first instantiation of framing, Obama persuades Americans that their country is a place where anything is possible. In the second part, he makes Americans feel they are strong, powerful and exceptional leaders. In the third one, Americans are praised for their capabilities to address any problem. Indeed, by being flattered and motivated, Americans feel sympathy to Obama, and as a result, the feeling of sympathy covers two rhetorical appeals - *ethos* and *pathos*. Although this part focuses on the analysis of metaphor and framing, it must be noted that all of the metaphors that can be found in this section arouse sympathy (*ethos*) and positive feelings (*pathos*).

a) Framing life in America as the American Dream

First of all, what drives Obama's rhetoric is the myth of the *American Dream*. This is a universal myth that appeals to people of different origin, religion, group identity and political views where he undeniably models himself after Martin Luther King's views. Since Obama's and King's ethnicity is African American, they both combine the myth of 'black' and 'white' people who deserve an equal level of life in America. Obama frames the American reality as if it was 'a dream' – a perfect country to live where everything is possible. In the following examples, Obama's metaphors representing the concept of the American Dream convey shared analogous interpretations; first, the myth symbolizes future which thanks to motivation and hard work will result in a great success. Also, it is a belief that life can always be improved, and anything depends on one's individual ambitions regardless ethnicity and social background.

The myth of the American Dream is the most ‘American’ myth, because it is an idea that simply appeals to everyone and thereby is linked to the myth of *Everyman i.e.* ordinary people. It is important to understand Obama’s symbolic significance through his language, because he is the example and embodiment of the metaphor LIFE IN AMERICA IS A DREAM. He especially identifies himself with the concept of the American Dream, because he transformed his life difficulties into strength and power. Namely, he earned the highest possible position in the United States despite his ancestry and a single mother family. In fact, his first book has ‘dream’ in the title *Dreams from my Father* (Obama, 2007). Whenever Obama speaks of dreams he means that a better future is a gratification for an effort (Charteris-Black, 2011, pp. 280-282). As a result, the American Dream metaphors become the leitmotif of framing in Obama’s speeches.

The word ‘dream’ occurs thirty times in the corpus of the speeches. Below are a few examples of LIFE IN AMERICA IS A DREAM metaphors.

- “The only reason we are here is because generations of Americans were unafraid to do what was hard; to do what was needed even when success was uncertain; to do what it took to keep the dream of this nation alive for their children and their grandchildren “ (Obama 2009).

In the first address, Obama refers to the past achievements occupied with hard work for the sake of future generations. This may also mean that any private good transforms into the public success. The combination of metaphor and personification “to keep the dream of this nation alive”, means that despite obstacles, American ancestors managed to do everything to improve and maintain the quality of life in America. In other words, “Obama uses the figure of the American Dream to relate to America’s accomplishments to future hopes and enables

the American Dream to become the basis for acting in the present” (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 284).

- “We are part of the American family. We believe that in a country where every race and faith and point of view can be found, we are still bound together as one people; that we share common hopes and a common creed; that the dreams of a little girl in Tucson are not so different than those of our own children, and that they all deserve the chance to be fulfilled” (Obama 2010).

The given example contains an iconic framing of Americans according to Obama, i.e. LIFE IN AMERICA IS A DREAM usually coexists with AMERICAN NATION IS A FAMILY metaphor – the belief that Americans are connected as one nation who share common values and visions. Also, Obama regularly declares that all Americans are equal. (Charteris-Black, 2011, pp. 280-284)

- “We may have different backgrounds, but we believe in the same dream that says this is a country where anything is possible. No matter who you are. No matter where you come from” (Obama 2011).

Again, Obama refers to the unity wherein everyone believes in American exceptionalism *i.e.* a concept meaning that America is a country based on democracy where everyone is free and equal. The repetition ‘no matter’ additionally underlines the fact that one’s origin in America is irrelevant, and all people deserve even chances.

In the given examples, Obama does not speak of the basic meaning of a *dream* “something that you experience in your mind while you are sleeping” (“Dream”, Macmillan Dictionary

Online, def. 1). Instead, he makes a reference to the future that can be improved: “something good that you hope you will have or achieve in the future” (“Dream”, Macmillan Dictionary Online, def. 2). Both definitions are distant in meaning, because the former presents an abstract notion of a dream that people have during their sleep which has no link to reality. Alternatively, Obama’s metaphorical use of the word dream refers to the achievement of life goals - something real that can take place in America. As a consequence, the use of the word *dream* is metaphorical in each example.

b) Framing Americans as an exceptional and leading nation

The second most prevailing concept presented by Obama through conceptual metaphors is *American exceptionalism*. It is a myth that originates from the times when Puritans and Founding Fathers arrived to America. Namely, it is a tradition which describes very quick cultural, political and economic development of a new country. The concept is based on liberty, egalitarianism, democracy, republicanism and individualism. Furthermore, Americans are the ones whose mission is to spread these values across the world. In fact, this theory constitutes an important element of American identity which make them feel special (Madsen, 1998, p. 1). By using this ideology, Obama consciously reminds Americans of the best values of their national character. Constant framing Americans as leaders and strong and independent people indeed make them believe in having such qualities. In other words, Obama demonstrates American exceptionalism through the qualities of strength, power and leadership. The following examples present AMERICANS ARE STRONG LEADERS metaphors.

- “We sustain the leadership that has made America not just a place on a map but the light to the world” (Obama 2011).

The most basic dictionary definition of *light* defines it as “ brightness from the sun or from a light, which allows you to see things” (“Light”, MacMillan Dictionary Online def. 1). Because Macmillan and Longman dictionary do not contain the metaphorical meaning of light, Oxford dictionary was used: “A person eminent in a particular sphere of activity” (“Light”, Oxford Dictionary Online def. 7), which means the Americans are framed as the eminent leaders in any field. By referring to the ‘place on the map’, Obama describes America not just as an ordinary country which takes care of its internal policy but ‘the light to the world’ which occupies the position of the absolute authority for other countries. Comparing America to the ‘sun’ i.e. eminent authority, gives the audience impression that America is something that world cannot live without, just like people and nature would not exist without sun.

- “Despite our hardships, our union is strong” (Obama 2010).

The most basic sense of the word *strong* refers to the physical capabilities “physically powerful and healthy” (“Strong”, MacMillan Dictionary def. 1), whereas the context in which it was used requires understanding the metaphorical meaning i.e. “someone who is strong, has confidence, determination and emotional strength” (“Strong”, MacMillan Dictionary def. 5). The given metaphor frames Americans as people who can bear any life obstacle by dint of their character qualities.

- “There is no force in the world more powerful than the example of America” (Obama 2009).

Similarly to the previous example, Obama does not refer to the basic sense of the word *force* which is “physical strength or violence or the power or energy produced by one thing hitting another” (“Force”, MacMillan Dictionary Online, def. 1). Instead, by using this word he means “the influence or powerful effect that someone has” (“Force”, Macmillan Dictionary Online,

def. 2). The metaphorical combination of *powerful* and *force* frames Americans as extremely important and influential people in the world. Obama does not always precisely specify in which aspects of life Americans are leaders. In the first excerpt, Obama defines Americans as the highest authority for the rest of the world. Then, the second example portrays Americans as people who can survive any life hardships. Finally, the third metaphor can mean that Americans lead in every aspect of life that includes economy, science, lifestyle etc. All instances of AMERICANS ARE STRONG LEADERS conceptual metaphors exemplify how Obama frames prominence and superiority of American people against other nations.

c) Framing Americans as people who make progress

The last type of conceptual metaphor used by Obama illustrates framing of Americans as nation that can survive anything and address any problem. In metaphors AMERICANS MOVE FORWARD, the metaphorical expression *move forward* in the examples below does not mean “to change position, or to make someone or something change position” (“Move forward”, MacMillan Dictionary Online def. 1). Instead, it means “to progress or develop in a particular way” (“Move forward”, MacMillan Dictionary Online def. 2), or “to begin doing something in order to achieve an aim or to solve a problem” (“Move forward”, MacMillan Dictionary Online def. 4).

- We are called to *move forward* with the sense of confidence and candor that serious times demand” (Obama 2009).

In the first State of the Union Address, the speaker urges the audience to progress in spite of challenges of difficult times, since Obama took his office in in the midst of an economic crisis.

- “And despite all our divisions and disagreements, our hesitations and our fears, America prevailed because we chose to *move forward* as one nation, as one people” (Obama 2010).

Establishing unity in spite of cultural diversity is a cult slogan of Obama. The speaker as usual wants to unite the nation to achieve prosperity.

- “After all, that’s the spirit that has always moved this nation forward” (Obama 2014).

Beyond the word *spirit* Obama conveys “an enthusiastic attitude” (“Spirit”, MacMillan Dictionary Online def. 2) which contrasts the basic meaning “the attitude to life” (“Spirit”, MacMillan Dictionary def. 1). The metaphorical *spirit* signifies the power of enthusiasm that American people have always used to improve any state of being. It is the demonstration of motivation, hard work and individual achievements that build the success of America.

3.4 Future research

Anaphora, which is the repetition of words or phrases in the initial parts of the sentence, is definitely the most favourite rhetorical figure used by Obama (Leith, 2011, p. 222).

Nevertheless, anaphora does not suit any rhetorical appeal presented in the former sections. It is a rhetorical device which does not necessarily make a speaker likeable (*ethos*), also, it does not arouse emotions (*pathos*). Lastly, anaphora has nothing to do with logical argumentation (*logos*). The main feature of anaphora is making some particular words of the speech more memorable. Yet, I allowed myself to present a few findings of anaphora, since Obama uses them in a great abundance. In fact, my additional findings might be a helpful basis for any future research regarding Obama’s favourite rhetorical figures.

Features like anaphora can be found in African rhetorical traditions from which Obama draws his inspirations. Repetition of words demonstrate features which are prominent in African oratory tradition – rhythm, timing and intensity. Such an intense rhythm could be seen

in a popular tricolon (three parallel words) used by Obama during his presidential campaign ‘yes, we can’, which formed a type of repetition at the beginning (anaphora) or at the end of each section (epiphora) (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 291). Each speech contains an abundance of anaphora examples. As evidence, the following examples come from only a single page of the second State of the Union Address delivered by Obama in 2010. Any kind of repetition adds a catchy rhythm and highlights which information is important according to Obama.

- d) “*We do not* give up. *We do not* quit. *We do not* allow fear or division to break our spirit.”
- e) “*I hated it. I hated it. You hated it.* It was as popular as a root canal.”
- f) “*We cut taxes. We cut taxes* for 95 percent of working families. *We cut taxes* for small business. *We cut taxes* for first-time homebuyers. *We cut taxes* for parents trying to care for their children. *We cut taxes* for 8 million Americans paying for college.”

Other traditional repetitions found on the same page:

- g) “But if these firms *can afford* to hand out big bonuses again, they *can afford* a modest fee.”
- h) “For while the people who sent us here have *different* backgrounds, *different* stories, *different* beliefs.”
- i) “It’s because of this spirit – this *great* decency and *great* strength.”

3.5 Change in Obama's style

After careful reading and analysing Obama's State of the Union Addresses, it must be admitted that the use, frequency and variety of style markers by Obama is rather consistent and has not changed. In my initial hypothesis I assumed that the last four speeches will contain more informal patterns like e.g. jokes, phrasal words and less elaborate rhetorical figures than in the first four speeches. The analysis shows that the last and the first speech might differ from each other, because of different circumstances that took place, and not because Obama's style has changed. The general tone of the last State of the Union Address delivered in 2016 is rather less serious than the first one. It is not surprising, since the presidential term of Obama is coming to an end, and this fact makes Obama sound happy and informal. Experience gained through the course of presidency allows him to make a few jokes in the very beginning of the speech: "And for this final one, I'm going to make it a little shorter (Applause). I know some of you are antsy to get back to Iowa (Laughter). I'll be shaking hands afterwards if you want some tips (Laughter)" (Obama 2016). Perhaps, the last speech reveals his satisfaction about his achieved goals during the presidency, stabilized economic situation in the country, ending career and general well-being. The rest of the speech maintains the ordinary structure, however it is shorter and contains a few more jokes. Compared to the last speech, the first Union Address takes place in different circumstances. Although Obama just won the election, the tone of the first State of the Union Address is rather serious. The first address was delivered in the midst of the global economic crisis because of which many Americans lost their jobs and properties. He opens the speech with words expressing dismay: "I know that for many Americans watching right now, the state of economy is a concern that rises above all others" (Obama 2009). In this speech, Obama is honest by uncovering various reasons for the crisis. Nevertheless, he focuses on proposing reasonable solutions for particular problems. He carefully explains the plan invented by the government to improve the situation in the country.

The first speech is serious but also realistic. Obama supports Americans giving them solutions and hope for a better future. Furthermore, by using a serious tone in the first address, Obama wants to establish his importance and authority. The rest of the speeches does not manifest any considerable changes. To conclude, Obama's style has not changed, it were circumstances that shaped the content of these two particular speeches.

Conclusion and Discussion

My thesis contains an analysis of eight State of the Union Addresses delivered by the former president of the United States Barack Obama during his two presidential terms between 2009 and 2016. I testified Obama's style based on determinants of rhetoric which constitute a basis for persuasion: *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*. My paper also contains analysis of conceptual metaphors and framing. Furthermore, the aim of this paper was to find whether the style of Obama has changed during the course of his presidential term.

The *ethos* argumentation used by Obama reveals that he intends to earn people's trust through rather less formal rhetoric techniques which make him sound like an average American. Colloquialisms, direct address via imperatives and pronouns and slogan words are the means by which Obama appears to be straightforward and trustworthy. In this section, Obama shows that he shares particular values and views with an audience. In addition, clever jokes embellished with irony and unusual antithesis of metonyms particularly endear him to the audience. Obama's style of discourse shows that his style markers are not used to add diversity into speeches. They rather naturally emphasize the structure of the accurate reasoning.

By means of *pathos*, Obama generates a wide variety of feelings that include empathy, trust, respect, patriotism, humility, unity as well as pride. Among other features, Obama

persuades people by framing Americans as brave and hardworking. He makes everyone feel like one family by using *we* instead of *I* pronouns.

Although stylistic features found in the speeches do not directly relate to *logos*, I have found that Obama's framing through logical argumentation might correlate to this last appeal. In this paragraph, it is shown how Obama uses a type of rhetoric that originates from Dr. King's speeches. Namely, he claims all Americans to be equal regardless one's origin and beliefs. He draws his arguments from the American Constitution.

Pathos and *ethos* can also be found in the analysis of metaphors. In fact, metaphors are means of rhetoric that have an extensive emotional impact on people. Furthermore, metaphors that make Americans feel strong and powerful make them sympathise with the speaker. I hypothesized that the speeches will contain plenty of metaphors that relate to America and its citizens. The analysis proves that my hypothesis was accurate. The former president communicates his individual world view through framing life in America as the American Dream, framing Americans as an exceptional and leading nation, and framing Americans as people who make progress. He finds himself in the tradition of rhetoric by using the myth of the *American dream* and *American exceptionalism*. These ideologies structure Obama's worldview which is reflected in his metaphors. The myth of the American dream is derived from Martin Luther King, whereas American exceptionalism is an American ideology with a long tradition.

Any changes of Obama's style of speech might be apparent when the first and the last address are compared. Nevertheless, both speeches were given in distinct circumstances, and these speeches do not constitute prove of any change. The style of Obama remains quite systematic and consistent.

For further research, it might be interesting to measure Obama's favorite devices regardless correspondence to rhetorical appeals. Indeed, repetitions are very characteristic

rhetorical figures of Obama's speeches, however, they do not coincide with any mode of persuasion. African tradition of rhythmic and intense anaphora's as well as the concept of the Afro-American Dream which refers to an African tradition of oratory have much in common with Obama's ancestry. Perhaps, it would be compelling to test which other Afro-American traditions are employed in his speeches.

My research focuses on the analysis of a very vast corpus of speeches which was analysed manually. As far as limitations are concerned, due to the human factor, some stylistic features may have been accidentally omitted. Furthermore, because of the considerable volumes of the material, I did not have the chance to analyze other speeches that could have contributed to my paper. Perhaps, it would be interesting to test if Obama's style has changed since the beginning of his political career and compare stylistic features in Obama's campaign speeches to the features found in speeches from his presidency period. Perhaps, this can be a proposal for future research.

Notably, my results further the discussion about style in political speeches. The analysis shows that rhetorical appeals, enhancing emotions (pathos) and likeableness (ethos) are the most predominant characteristics of the speeches, whereas there are almost no features that relate to logical argumentation (logos). It also turns out that framing and metaphor plays an invaluable role in creating the reality that affects the audience. Examples of framing and metaphors also generate emotions and make the speaker likeable. My research shows that there are not many stylistic features that correspond with logical argumentation (logos) in political speeches.

List of References

- Aristotle (2012). *Rhetoric*. (W. R. Roberts, Trans.). New York, NY: Dover.
- Barack Obama. (2017). In *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*. Retrieved from <http://academic.eb.com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/levels/collegiate>
- Bennis W., & Nanus B. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York, NY: Harper Row.
- Cambell, C. (2014, May 29). Obama Can't Stop Using Sports Metaphors To Explain Foreign Policy. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/obama-foreign-policy-sports-metaphors-2014-5?international=true&r=US&IR=T>
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris- Black. J. (2007). *The communication of Leadership: The Design of Leadership Style*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2014). *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cirugeda, I. L. &, Ruiz R. S. (2013). Persuasive Rhetoric in Barack Obama's Immigration Speech: Pre- and Post- Electoral Strategies. In *Journal of Camino Real*, 5(8), 81-99.
- Crick, N. (2014). *Rhetorical Public Speaking*. Louisiana, USA: Pearson.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. In *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Escudero, M. P. G. (2011). Barack Obama's Inaugural Address: Metaphor and Values as Captivating Strategies to Celebrate a Presidency. In *Pragmalinguistica*, 19, 44-55.

- Falk, A. (2010). *The Riddle of Barack Obama*. Santa Barbara, California: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Goffman E. (1986). *Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Greene, R. (2011, November 25). Obama is America's Third Greatest Presidential Orator in Modern Era. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/richard-greene/obama-is-americas-3rd-gre b 813868.html>
- Gunavan, S. (2010). Style of Obama's Inaugural Speech. In *K@ta*, 12 (1), 92-107.
- Kovecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kusnet, D. (2016, January 12). Obama is the nation's orator-in-chief, and he deserves the title and the accolades. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jan/12/obama-orator-in-chief-he-deserves-title-accolades-final-state-of-the-union-address>
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't Think of an Elephant! Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live by*. London: The University of Chicago Press
- Leech, G., and M. Short (2007). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Leith, S. (2011). *You Talkin' To Me? : Rhetoric from Aristotle to Obama*. London, UK: Profile.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. (2017). Online edition, <http://www.ldoceonline.com/>

Macmillan Dictionary. (2017). Online edition, <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/>

Madsen, L. D. (1998). *American Exceptionalism*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Mätthes, J. (2012). Framing Politics: An Integrative Approach. In *American Behavioural Scientist*, 56 (3) 247–259.

McQuarrie, E. F., & Phillips B. J. (2014). *Go Figure! New Directions in Advertising Rhetoric*. London, UK: Routledge

Mieder, W. (2009). *Yes We Can: Barack Obama's Proverbial Rhetoric*. New York: Peter Lang.

Obama, B. H. (2009). *State of The Union Address*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=85753>

Obama, B. H. (2010). *State of The Union Address*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=87433>

Obama, B. H. (2011). *State of The Union Address*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=88928>

Obama, B. H. (2012). *State of The Union Address*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=99000>

Obama, B. H. (2013). *State of The Union Address*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=102826>

Obama, B. H. (2014). *State of The Union Address*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=104596>

Obama, B. H. (2015). *State of The Union Address*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=108031>

Obama, B. H. (2016). *State of The Union Address*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=111174>

- Oxford Living Dictionary. (2017). Online edition, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/>
- Oxford English Dictionary. (2017). Online edition, <http://www.oed.com/>
- Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. In: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. *Metaphor and symbol*, 22(1), 1 – 39.
- Ilie, C. (2006). Rhetoric. In *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/science/referenceworks/9780080448541>
- Ritchie, D. L. (2013). *Metaphor: Key Topics in Semantics and Pragmatics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott Mio J., Albert N. Katz. (1996). *Metaphor. Implications and Applications*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Shen, Y. (2006). Figures of Speech. In *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/science/referenceworks/9780080448541>
- State of the Union Address. (n.d.). In *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/>
- Stone A. D. (1988). *Policy Paradox and Political Reason*. New York: Harper Collins.
- What makes Obama a Good Speaker? (2008, February 13). Retrieved from <http://observer.com/2008/02/what-makes-obama-a-good-speaker/>
- Verdonk, P. (2006). Style. In *Encyclopaedia of Language & Linguistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/science/referenceworks/9780080448541>

Appendices

The appendix contains +100 pages and can be found in a separate document