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**INTRODUCTION**

The master paper studies nomination of power relations in American presidents’ inaugurals.

The inaugural address is a speech delivered by president-elect on inauguration day. In the speech, for the first time, the newly elected president officially announces that he takes up the responsibility as the highest executive of the country in the next four years [32, p. 2408]. Inaugurals are of great significance because of what they reveal about the fundamental political values, particular political principles, and enactment of a presidential persona [32, p. 2408].

The inaugural address is rhetorical by nature, as the newly elected President aims at persuading the audience of his suitability for this role [32, p. 2408]. For this purpose, the speaker uses rhetorical modes of persuasion and refers to image schemas for force that represent power relations [28, p. 42] and depict the dominance of one entity over the other.

The **topicality** of the work results from the importance of political discourse in general due to its strong appeal to the audience so as to motivate people to act, to persuade them of correctness of the speaker’s beliefs and ideas. The topicality also embraces the significance of the inaugural address as a kind of political oratory that delivers the fundamental political values, particular principles, and enactment of a president.

The **aim** of the paper is to distinguish the linguistic means of naming power relations in President Obama’s and President Trump’s inaugurals.

This aim presupposes the solution of the following **tasks:**

* to define rhetoric as a means of persuasion;
* to distinguish the canons of rhetoric;
* to outline modes of persuasion;
* to define image schemas as a means of representing the relations of power;
* to characterize rhetorical styles of the presidents;
* to single out patterns of power relations in President Obama’s and President Trump’s inaugurals;
* to reconstruct the overall models of power relations in the inaugurals;
* to compare the models of power relations in the two presidents’ inaugurals.

The **object** of the study is the verbal means of representing power relations in President Obama’s and President Trump’s inaugurals.

The **subject** of the paper is the cognitive reconstruction of power relations in President Obama’s and President Trump’s inaugurals.

The **novelty** of the paper consists in revealing naming cognitive means of representing power relations in President Obama’s and President Trump’s inaugurals. It is found that the common patterns which dominate in the presidents’ inaugurals embrace uniting and dividing the nation, its development, equality, representing America as an attraction for the whole world and appeal to the audience. The different patterns include the collective as a source of success in Obama’s inaugural and the individual as a source of prosperity in Trump’s one.

The **material** of the investigation is President Obama’s inaugural delivered on 21 January 2013 and President Trump’s inaugural delivered on 20 January 2017.

The **methods** of rhetorical analysis of text with respect to invention, disposition, elocution and cognitive analysis with application of image schema were applied to reveal how the Presidents employ power relations to influence their audience.

The **theoretical importance** of this master paper consists in developing rhetoric as an art of persuasion and political linguistics by enriching it with the methods of cognitive analysis.

The **practical importance** of this work lies in the use of its results while teaching a number of disciplines: Theoretical English Grammar, Stylistics and Discourse Analysis.

The **discussion** of the master paper took place at the First International Scientific and Practical Conference “Pereiaslav Linguistic Convention” (19-20 September 2019, Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi Hryhorii Skovoroda State Pedagogical University” in Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi) [41, p. 61-65].

The **approbation** of the work is represented in the article “Uniting and Dividing Americans: a Case of Obama’s and Trump’s inaugurals”, that is being prepared to be published in the academic periodical *Molodyi Vchenyi,* № 12(76) [42].

The **structure** of the master paper comprises the introduction, two parts, the conclusion and the list of sources cited.

The **first part** of the master paper gives a definition of rhetoric, determines its structure and modes of persuasion, distinguishes image schemas as a means of revealing power relations in Obama’s and Trump’s inaugurals and emphasizes the most prominent features of their speeches.

The **second** part offers the results of analysis of the power relations employed in Obama’s and Trump’s inaugurals.

This paper comprises 55 sources cited, including 6 dictionaries and 2 illustration sources.

**PART ONE**

# **THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF STUDYING TEXTUAL NOMINATION OF POWER RELATIONS IN AMERICAN PRESIDENTS’ INAUGURALS**

Rhetoric is a means of persuasion that is the basis of any speech. Therefore, it rests on the notion of power relations modeled by image schemas. Power relations *in communication* stem from forces *behind* the language; thus, they transform the extralinguistic experience into the communicative context [34]. The inaugural is a form of communication of the speaker who *possesses* *power* and the addressee (the nation) led by. The inaugural is a prepared public speech with rhetorical canons and modes of persuasion used to compose and deliver it. The power relations evoked by lexical units in a speech are triggered by image schemas stemming from the speaker’s perception of reality. The dominance of one schema and the subordinate role of the other one evoke *power relations* that at the same time embody the dominance of one phenomenon in real life and the subordinate role of the other one.

Hence, a solid background for analyzing power relations in B. Obama and D. Trump’s inaugurals is formed by rhetoric, its canons and modes of persuasion with image schemas embodying power relations.

* 1. **Rhetoric as a means of persuasion**

Rhetoric can be defined drawing on the so-called ‘common sense’ and scientific definitions.

 The common-sense definitions are given by a number of dictionaries. Having analyzed the most popular of them – Oxford [53], Merriam-Webster [52], Cambridge [49] – we can make a conclusion that all of them are unanimous in defining rhetoric. It is the art of effective or persuasive speaking or writing, using various figures of speech and other compositional techniques to influence people [49, 52, 53].

As for the scholarly definitions, rhetoric studies means of persuasion [8, p. 10], instrumental use of language [25, p. 2-3] and manner of thinking that invents possibilities for persuasion, conviction, action and judgement [18].

To sum up, the ‘common sense’ definitions of rhetoric coincide with the scientific ones. They connect rhetoric with persuasive techniques of communication that aim at influencing the audience. To specify the role rhetoric has played in communication so far and to compare it with the modern one, we should study this phenomenon in details.

* + 1. **Notion of rhetoric.** Rhetoric has been developing since ancient times. The Greek philosophers, who actually distinguished rhetoric as a separate branch of knowledge, didn’t have a unanimous view on it. Such prominent philosophers as Aristotle and Plato had radically opposite approaches to this phenomenon. While Aristotle defined rhetoric as a faculty of observing the available means of persuasion [8, p. 10], Plato denied the mere existence of rhetoric. Aristotle used the term *technē* to underscore that rhetoric is *an art* [38]. Plato opposed him stating that it was not a *technē*, but merely *a knack* [38, p. 27]. For Aristotle, the practical use of rhetoric was in influencing the audience, making it think like the speaker and follow him or her [8, p. 10]. On the contrary, Plato defined it as a form of entertainment without any practical use [38, p. 27].

In this research, we will stick to Aristotle’s definition, as an inaugural is rhetorical by nature because its aim is to persuade the audience of the speaker’s readiness to lead the country [32, p. 2408].

Valuable for this research are the modern definitions of rhetoric because they broaden the original one given by Aristotle and “common sense” explanations given in dictionaries. For instance, G. Hauser states that rhetoric is communication that attempts to coordinate social action. For this reason, rhetorical communication is explicitly pragmatic – to manipulate human choices on specific matters that require immediate attention [25, p. 2-3]. As we see, the initial goal of rhetoric “to persuade” is specified in Hauser’s definition. In political discourse, the speaker (especially the newly elected president) tries to make the audience follow his or her course, make decisions that bring benefits to his or her political career. Thus, the social action coordination is relevant to studying inaugurals.

The original definition is improved by R. Toye [46, p. 71-72], who explained the modern role of rhetoric. The thing is that the speaker gathers people together to deliver his or her speech. The speaker replaces the variety of views and beliefs by those he or she represents. Hence, according to R. Toye the key term for rhetoric is “identification”, which can include a partially “unconscious” factor in appeal. People are inherently divided from one another but experience a powerful desire to belong [46, p. 71-72]. When an inaugural is delivered, the president appeals to unity, to the common hardships this unity faces, and in such a way meets the belongingness need.

To conclude, the definition of rhetoric that we intend to use in this paper is that it is a powerful means of persuasion aimed at sustaining the speaker’s pragmatic need of imposing his or her views on the audience and to replace the variety of views and beliefs by the ones that he or she represents. Any public address has its own organization conforming to five rhetorical canons and three modes of persuasion which help the speaker to appeal to the audience and determine the structure of texts.

* + 1. **Five canons of rhetoric** determine the order of forming any speech [46, p. 36]. The five canons of rhetoric are 1) invention/discovery; 2) arrangement; 3) style (elocution); 4) memory; 5) delivery [33].

Invention / discovery refers to the process of selecting the arguments according to the situation. This involves reflecting on the nature of the audience. If the subject matter of a speech is controversial, invention/discovery also involves deciding what is really at issue. This may cause the discussion as to the facts, or, significantly, over the interpretation of the facts [46, p. 37].

The arrangement is the organization of different arguments into a coherent speech that contains a beginning, middle and end. The arrangement represents giving order to a speech. Consequently, the arrangement generally consists of templates that indicate where certain types of things should go and in what sequence [13, p. 19]. However, the speaker can shift the order of components or omit some of them to make his or her speech more impressive. But the structure should be present, since it’s the spine of any speech. It’s important to be conscious of structure, because it is intimately related to its capacity to persuade [33]. The arrangement is tied to the rhetorical appeal to logos, being oriented to *what really* an author would say rather than *how* this might be said. The arrangement describes the gradation of the speaker’s views: more important ideas stand first [10].

The elocution deals with [word choice](https://www.thoughtco.com/word-choice-composition-1692500), [sentence structures](https://www.thoughtco.com/sentence-structure-english-grammar-1691891), and [figures of speech](https://www.thoughtco.com/what-are-figures-of-speech-1690858). More broadly, elocution is considered a manifestation of the person speaking or writing [36]. The elocution is subdivided into the following components: virtues of style that include correctness of speech, clarity of arguments, their evident nature; whether the word choice is proper, i.e. suitable to use on specific occasions, and whether the speaker’s language is full of figures of speech [10]; levels of style that are subdivided into low, that aims at teaching the audience; medium, that pleases it; and high or grand, which has the purpose to move the addressee [10]. As the purpose of inaugurals is to persuade the audience of the President’s suitability for the role and inspire them to support the new political regime, it is possible to conclude that inaugurals belong to the grand level of style.

The elocution canon of rhetoric, dealing with the vocabulary of the speaker, is connected to the theory of nomination, or onomasiology.

The act of nomination is a combination of the speech and cognitive processes of choosing an already formed name for the thing or phenomenon from the linguistic units in hand, or defining a new name for it [30, p. 79]. In present time, nomination is viewed as the process of forming linguistic units with nominative function. Nominative function is considered as the ability to name and distinguish fragments of the reality, and to form the corresponding concepts as words, word combinations and sentences [2, p. 26]. The process of nomination includes the speaker’s intention combined with the details of the surrounding reality, and the linguistic units that embody it [1, p. 43].

In the act of nomination, different pragmatic factors are important: emotional, evaluative and social [30, p. 80]. Valuable for nomination is the lexicon of the speaker, or the lexical competence, based on the vocabulary of the language. Both the vocabulary of the language in general and the speaker’s lexicon are structured according to semantic and formal-morphological principles [30, p. 80].

Semantic structures stem from sense relations between the linguistic units, on the basis of which one gets the set of lexemes sharing the common meaning (lexical fields) [2, p. 26].

Formal-morphological structures result from the ability of already existing linguistic units to combine with other lexical items or with bound morphemes, forming semantically new item. In this way, the original linguistic units are called “primary”, and the new ones deriving from them represent the “secondary” group [30, p. 80].

There are two approaches within the nomination theory. They are onomasiological and semasiological. The choice between them is made according to the purposes of the nomination analysis and the state of the studied discourse fragment [2, p. 26].

Onomasiological approach represents the relations between the reality (referent) and the sense (significatum) of the name. In other words, the analysis starts from the thing or phenomenon, moves to the thought of it and results in naming the referent [2, p. 26]. The division has to be made between the denotative names, that have the concrete referent *(we, America),* and significant ones, that include abstract nouns *(freedom, happiness, equality etc.)* [2, p. 26].

The semasiological approach goes in the opposite direction: it begins with concrete sense of a particular name and ends up naming reality [2, p. 26].

In this research, we stick to the onomasiological approach, going from the idea to the linguistic units that represent it.

Prominent is the connection of the nomination theory to the human cognition. Reality is depicted in our mind as a generalized image, or a concept that sums up the most essential features of a given class of objects. Generally, concepts are similar to all people, as they denote the real world irrespective of the language use by communicators. Specific concepts reflect the reality common for the representatives of a certain culture [6, p. 173]. In this research, we may account for the specific values, beliefs and references that belong to American nation and are reflected in the inaugurals.

The qualities of style describe general characteristics of the speaker’s elocution: whether it is energetic, inspiring etc [10]. For an inaugural, as a representative of rhetorical addresses, qualities of style gain special significance.

Memory is considered to be more than just learning a speech by heart. In the past, it was a container for the language and vocabulary, sentence patterns and syntax, image schemas and tropes that the speaker stored in mind to deliver the message [40]. Memory served as a medium between elocution and delivery.

Due to the technological progress, the role of memory has decreased now. The speaker does not need to memorize the text, as all he or she needs to say is displayed on the teleprompter. As a result, delivery gains a special prominence representing the management of voice and gestures in oral discourse [36]. It “has the sole and supreme power in [oratory](https://www.thoughtco.com/oratory-rhetoric-term-1691458) since without it a speaker of the highest mental capacity can be held in no esteem; while the one of moderate abilities, with this qualification may surpass even those of the highest talent” [14, p. 255]. Delivery obviously has much to do with how one establishes ethos and appeals through pathos, being in this sense complementary to the invention, which is more strictly concerned with logos [10]. In modern written discourse, delivery “means only one thing: the format and conventions of the final written product as it reaches the hands of the reader” [15].

Technical advancements have changed the role of delivery. Without the need to memorize the speech, the speaker pays more attention to the *form* in which his or her words reach the addressee. In this way, we may connect delivery with ethos and pathos, as the speaker relies much on his or her credibility while delivery, and on the emotions the speech invokes.

To conclude, all canons of rhetoric are important for the influence the speaker produces on the audience. The invention lays the foundation for the future speech, as it defines *what* will be said. At the stage of invention, the speaker picks up the arguments which, when united, will form power relations. The arrangement defines the succession of power relations between the key ideas in order to influence the addressee. The elocution refers to the choice of verbal content embodying the most prominent by predicates for they denote action that connects the source of power and the target. Relative to elocution is the nomination theory that explains the process of naming objects and phenomena of the real world. We stick to the onomasiological approach to nomination, starting from the idea and then nominating it in terms of linguistic units. Due to the technical advancements, the role of memory has decreased, while delivery has gained special prominence as it has a wide variety of different formats in which the information reaches the addressee and influences his or her views, beliefs and choices.

* + 1. **Three modes of persuasion,** or ethical strategies are devices in rhetoric that represent the speaker's appeal to the audience [10]. They include three rhetorical elements: ethos, the character, credibility and trustworthiness of the speaker; pathos, the emotional appeal; and logos, the logic and reasoning in the address [8, p. 236].

Ethos embraces persuading by means of the speaker’s credibility, i.e. trustworthiness that the speaker establishes in communication. It is the degree to which the speaker is ethical, believable, trustworthy, competent, responsible, and sincere [9].

Credibility is revealed in three main ways:

1) quality of the message. The message is “worthy of belief” when it meets the audience’s needs and motivations; includes all the necessary facts; meaningful, clear, logical; avoids mistakes; honest and ethical [9];

2) audience’s perception of a speaker. It’s important for the speaker to have confidence; to dress appropriately; to know the subject; to be well prepared; to build rapport with the audience [9];

3) reputation can be shown by referring to rank, goodwill, expertise, image, or common ground [9].

The traditional treatment of pathos views it as an appeal based on passion or emotion [22, p. 574]. In Greek rhetoric, the term pathos referred to the state of the human soul resulting from what it has experienced and extending to the kind of language that can induce such a state [22, p. 574]. Aristotle linked pathos to motives determining particular behavior and in conjunction with human needs responsible for pushing us into action [8, p. 137]. The simplest way to determine the most effective emotional appeal is to analyze the audience’s needs and concerns [9].

Logos is an appeal to logical reason, thus the speaker wants to present an argument that appears to be sound to the audience [29]. Aristotle stated that an argument should prove something or at least it should appear to prove something [8, p. 9]. The ability to apply logos is to express arguments in the appropriate form for the given communication method and audience [29].

To sum up, the unity of ethos, pathos and logos anticipates the use of particular words and word combinations. The credibility of the speaker comes from the power relations *outside of the communicative context.* The president is the source of power, the audience is the target. The specific word choice embodies power relations that reach the addressee and invoke particular emotions and feelings. The order of words and word combinations defines the power relations that occur rendered by different image schemas and relations between them.

* + 1. **Three branches of rhetoric** embrace the variety of addresses with regard to the aim they are oriented on. Originally presented by Aristotle, three branches of rhetoric are deliberative, judicial and epideictic [7, p. 62].

Deliberative rhetoric includes written word or discourse the intention of which is to persuade people to act or dissuade them in taking some actions. This branch of rhetoric deals with the future ideas and intentions [7, p. 62]. Some scholars call deliberative rhetoric “legislative” oratory, as this sort of speaking is typical for policy makers [10]. According to Aristotle, core topics of invention of deliberative appeal include:

* the concepts of the good and the unworthy, that refer to ethical and philosophical dimensions [7, p. 63];
* the concepts of the advantageous and the disadvantageous, that represented pragmatic dimensions [7, p. 63].

Deliberative rhetoric comprises political speeches, formal presentations, proposals, social justice campaigns and advertising [10].

Judicial rhetoric embraces written word or discourse that considers whether somebody is innocent or guilty; or whether some event was just, legal or ethical. This branch of rhetoric can be found not only in the court, but also in any communication when a person tries to justify his or her actions, beliefs etc. Judicial oratory aims at the past [7, p. 64].

Epideictic rhetoric is the kind of oratory that aims at praising (or blaming) a person for their accomplishments. This branch of rhetoric deals with the present: its main goal is to highlight the qualities and characteristic features of a person or thing that make them or it good or bad [7, p. 63]. The main topics for invention of such rhetoric address include:

* virtue (noble) concepts that refer to some values or beliefs that are considered to be virtuous and right [10];
* vice (base) concepts denote the generally accepted vicious and evil ideas [10].

The brightest examples of epideictic oratory are nomination speeches and funerals.

Generally, inaugurals are considered to combine the features of both deliberative rhetoric and epideictic one. Features that characterize the inaugural as a deliberative address include its political character, persuasion aim, reference to the future and the use of ethical and pragmatic concepts. The ceremonial character, the reference to the present and the implementation of virtue and vice concepts define epideictic nature of inaugurals.

To recapitulate, three branches of rhetoric include deliberative, judicial and epideictic oratory. Their differences come from the aim they reach, either referring to the past, the present or future. The inaugural is a fusion of deliberative and epideictic oratory.

* 1. **Image schema as a means of representing the relations of power**

The progressive tendencies emerging in our life lead to rethinking of the original rhetorical fundamentals. With more up-to-the-minute studies occurring in the sphere of linguistics, one can define rhetoric in the full view of interdisciplinary theories. By these we mean, first and foremost, cognitive linguistics that rests upon the human faculties of perception, categorization, memory, reasoning, communication etc [39, p. 7]. Cognitive linguistics helps us to understand the mechanism of human perception and thinking and thus it is possible to invent more progressive ways of persuading the audience.

In the sphere of cognitive linguistics image schemas occupy the solid position as they represent patterns of our experience that help us to make sense about this experience [39, p. 33]. According to the recent studies, there are about a dozen of image schemata within our cognition that account for our thinking, perception, orientation etc. They are subconscious and abstract, but their significance lies in the formation of people’s behavior, i.e., making decisions and taking actions.

In communication, image schemas are named with the help of various linguistic units that trigger the particular patterns in our mind. Presidents uttering their inaugurals deliberately invoke specific patterns to persuade us of their views and beliefs [39, p. 13]. That is why image schema apparatus is relevant to this study.

### 1.2.1. Notion of image schemas covers the definitions given by the apologists of the image schemas study. Prominent are the notions suggested by Talmy [44, p. 409], Johnson [28, p. 19] and Lakoff [31, p. 459]. They view image schemas as abstract images or structures of images that embody perceptual origins of human language and thinking [44, p. 409, 28, p. 19, 31, p. 459].

Distinction has to be made between image schemas and mental schemas. The latter are dynamic cognitive structures that act as a framework of human processing the information one encounters on a daily basis [47]. Unlike mental schemas, image schemas are permanent; deriving from actual human perceptive and motor experience, they are just representation of this experience. Image schemas are peculiar due to their gestalt structure, or the ability to express more than one concept at the same time [28, p. 19].

Modern researcher B. Hampe adds some more features to the original definitions:

* image schemas are *meaningful*, i.e., *experiential,* stemming from human recurrent bodily motion in space; perception and manipulating objects [24, p. 1];
* image schemas are represented by gestalts that integrate information from different phenomena [24, p. 1];
* image schemas exist prior to other concepts [24, p. 1];
* image schemas are internally structured, or made of related parts, and highly flexible, or apt to transformations during experience [24, p. 1].

To sum up, image schemas are abstract permanent structures within human cognition that are prior to our understanding and reasoning and stem from bodily experience, perception and manipulating objects.

### 1.2.2. Force image schemas as the embodiment of power relations are the subgroup of the dynamic schemas that stem from force relations between the objects or phenomena [19, p. 2]. According to C. Forceville, forces play a central role in actions we perform and physical events we experience. The most essential bodily actions taken to achieve goals include moving towards the place and manipulating objects [19, p. 2].

 Riabtseva and Zemlianova echo Forceville in this approach to power, adding that power is a start, a source and a cause of changes in the world [5, p. 92]; power is driven by some conflict [48, p. 77], that occurs as a result of disagreement, fight, war or situations, when a person has two opposite feelings [51, p. 325].

Generally, the relations of power derive from force embodied in image schemas of COMPULSION, ATTRACTION, ENABLEMENT, COUNTERFORCE, BLOCKAGE, RESTRAINT REMOVAL [28, p. 42] which consist of a source, a target and of a direction (vector) of an action, subordinated to the achievement of some goal or intention [28, p. 42].

Because of their power origins, force image schemas have certain peculiarities:

1. force image schemas are experienced through interaction, for they affect humans through specific perceptual field [28, p. 42];
2. they include motion through space in particular direction [28, p. 43];
3. there is s specific path of movement, that a person or thing subject to the force follows [28, p. 43];
4. forces have their origins, and under the certain influence of agents can direct their action on a target [28, p. 43];
5. forces have degrees of intensity [28, p. 43];
6. they preserve their structure that can be reconstructed in communication [28, p. 43].

The relations that occur between the agents of force image schemas are those of power. The intensity of force / power and its direction are differentiated by various image schemas [20, p. 71].

ATTRACTION represents a goal following the source [28, p. 47], e.g. *We recall that* ***what******binds this nation together*** *is not the colors of our skin or the tenets of our faith or the origins of our names* (Obama [54]). The source of attraction relations is embodied by the concept of the nation’s unity, expressed by the adverb *together.* The target following the source is represented by the reference to the nation *(this nation).* The vector of movement is named by the predicate *binds* which has the meaning *to put together* [52].

ENABLEMENT is characterized by the presence of some inner force vector and the absence of any barriers and restraints for moving [28, p. 47], e.g. ***Politicians prospered*** *– but the jobs left, and the factories closed* (Trump [55]). The source and the target of enablement of success are denoted by the subject *politicians.* The vector of enablement is denoted by the predicate *prospered,* that shares the meaning of *success* [52].

COUNTERFORCE is formed under the influence of the experience of head-on collision of two powerful, nasty, determined power centers as a result of which neither of them can move further [28, p. 47]. That is why it represents the potential threat, as in such a situation the consequences are difficult to foresee. In Obama’s inaugural, the example of using counterforce relations is as follows: ***This generation of Americans*** *has been tested by* ***crises*** *that steeled our* ***resolve*** *and proved our* ***resilience***(Obama [54]). One power center is denoted by the subject *this generation of Americans*, the other one – by the object *crises.* The collision between them is represented by the predicate *has been tested*.

COMPULSION reflects the experience of movement under the influence of such external powers as wind, water, physical objects, people [28, p. 45], e.g. *We* ***must speak******our******minds*** *openly* (Trump [55]). In this example, the pronoun *we* refers to unity treated as a source and a target. Compulsion relations are represented by the modal verb *must*.

BLOCKAGE is formed by the vector of power, which stops or changes the trajectory of movement as a result of collision with a restraint [28, p. 45], e.g. *This American* ***carnage******stops*** *right here and* ***stops*** *right now* (Trump [55]). The repetition of the predicate *stops* ends the movement of the entity denoted by the subject *carnage*, that represents both the source and the target of blockage.

DISABLEMENT reflects the inability to act [28, p. 47]. In the following example, the source of disablement of the ability is expressed by the concept of separation *(alone)*, targeted at *American people:*

*For the* ***American people******can no more meet*** *the demands of today’s world by acting* ***alone*** *than* ***American soldiers******could have met the forces*** *of fascism or communism with* ***muskets and militias*** (Obama [54]).

In the same utterance, the vector of disablement is represented by the negation in the predicate *can no more meet (could have met). Muskets and militias* with the same semantics of *alone,* shows the disablement relations as well, mirroring the structure of the main clause. The target of disablement is expressed by the subject *American soldiers*, that is included into the concept of *American people.*

RESTRAINT REMOVAL reflects the removal of a barrier, which opens a way to power application [28, p. 46]. Trump’s inaugural offers аn example of restraint removal relations: *When* ***America*** *is united, America* ***is*** *totally* ***unstoppable***(Trump [55]). The subject *America* expresses both the source and the target. The predicate *is unstoppable* shows the absence of a barrier and opens a way for *America* to apply its power.

To sum up, image schemas as a means of representing power relations serve as a tool used to render actions in a social context. Image schemas of force help to reveal the power relations in a speech in general and on the level of an utterance due to their structure: the source, the vector and the target.

**1.3. American inaugural as a rhetorical address**

The inaugural address is rhetorical by nature, as a newly elected President aims at persuading the audience of his suitability for this role [32, p. 2408]. As head of the nation, he possesses power, while “the people” – the addressees – are led by. The purpose of any inaugural is to determine the President’s further course of actions *that solves* the issues the nation faces. Inaugurals aim at inspiring the audience to support the president’s course, to invoke emotions [11]. Power is their strong catalyst, so the speaker relies on the relations of economic, social, military and environmental power represented by contrasting image schemas.

Before analyzing the relations of power in Obama and Trump’s inaugurals, we should single out the peculiarities of such address and define its structure.

### 1.3.1. Notion of inaugurals. The inaugural address is the speech delivered by a president-elect on inauguration day [32, p. 2408]. As we have singled out earlier, the inaugural is the combination of deliberative and epideictic oratory. However, in this research we pay more attention to the epideictic features, as they distinguish inaugurals from other types of political speaking.

According to Aristotle, inaugurals are a form of rhetorical addresses that is enunciated on ceremonial occasions, appeals to an audience that evaluates the rhetor's skill [7, p. 2-4], recalls the past and speculates about the future while focusing on the present [7, p. 18-20], employs a noble, dignified and literary style [7, p. 15] and amplifies or rehearses admitted facts [7, p. 27].

The special character of the inaugural is defined by the features given by Aristotle with regard to epideictic addresses (interpreted by Campbell and Jamieson [11]), and by the nature of the inauguration ceremony. Inauguration is a rite of passage, a ritual of transition in which the newly-elected President is invested in the office of the Presidency [26, p. 282]. The inauguration is witnessed by many audiences: the entire nation, Congress, foreign representatives and journalists. In the speech, for the first time, the newly elected president officially announces that he or she takes up the responsibility as the highest executive of the country in the next four years [32, p. 2408].

The aim of the President is to persuade the audience that he is suitable for such elevation. More specifically, the President must show that he understands the principles of a democratic-republican system of government and the limits it imposes on executive power, and he or she must manifest rhetorically the ability to lead and to be the symbolic head of state who is President of all the people [11].

The characteristic qualities that distinguish the inaugural from any other rhetorical address are as follows:

1) an inaugural unifies the audience as “the people” who can witness and ratify this ceremony [11];

2) it rehearses common values drawn from the past [11];

3) it sets forth the political principles that will govern the new administration [11];

4) it demonstrates that the President appreciates the requirements and limitations of his or her executive functions [11];

5) it calls for support and loyalty to a political regime [32, p. 2409];

6) it transforms the present audience into the audience loyal to the president and ready to assist [12, p. 7].

To conclude, inaugurals are a specific genre of rhetorical address delivered on a special occasion (inauguration) by newly elected Presidents. The inaugural’s aims to persuade the audience that the President is fit for this role and to invoke support and loyalty to his political regime. For these purposes, the speaker uses rhetorical modes of persuasion and force image schemas that represent the power relations.

### 1.3.2. Structure of inaugurals. Structurally, political speaking is organized according to the so-called “hamburger style” [43]. It is a writing technique with an introduction, a “meaty middle” and a conclusion. In general, inaugurals usually start with a report on why things need to change, followed by a call to action. The beginning usually paints a somewhat dark picture of the current state of things but also throws in a dash of hope to keep people engaged. The “meaty middle” is about the issues themselves: what to change. And the end is often about promises and reassurances [43].

Fang Liu defines the inaugural structure according to *moves*, that are the parts of the text, written or spoken, which achieve a particular purpose within the speech [32, p. 2408].

Any American inaugural is supposed to consist of the following moves:

1. *Salutation.* All of the presidential inaugural addresses begin with a salutation that formally announces the beginning of this event and directs the attention of the audience to the content of the address. The salutation of the inaugurals takes two forms: addressing the audience as a whole, e.g. *Fellow-citizens*, *My Fellow-citizens*, *My countrymen*, *Fellow-citizens of the United States*, *Fellow-countrymen* etc [32, p. 2410], and separate representatives referred by titles, e.g. *Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama* (Trump [55]).

2. *Announcing entering upon office.* New presidents usually make announcement at the very beginning of their speech. But there are some who declare that they accept the office near the close [32, p. 2410]. For instance, President Trump announced entering upon office somewhat in the middle of the inaugural: *The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans* (Trump [55]).

 3. *Articulating sentiments on the occasion.* During the inaugural ceremony, new presidents utter their sentiments on the occasion when they formally assume the responsibility as the chief executive of the country. In most cases, they express their acknowledgements to American people for their trust and also to the predecessors for what they have done to this country [32, p. 2410]. President Trump expressed his sentiments in the following way: *Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world:* ***thank you****.* *Every four years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and* ***we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent*** (Trump [55]). Linguistic units with the meaning of *gratitude (thank you, are grateful)* name the sentiments. The use of epithets *(gracious, magnificent)* strengthens the speaker’s emotions.

4. *Making pledges.* The new president carries out this move to win the addressee’s confidence in the new leader and his or her government [32, p. 2410]. For example, President Obama expresses this move in the following way: *My fellow Americans, the* ***oath I have sworn*** *before you today, like the one recited by others who serve in this Capitol,* ***was an oath to God and country****, not party or faction – and we must faithfully execute that pledge during the duration of our service* (Obama [54]). Making pledges move is represented by linguistic units expressing *pledges (an oath, have sworn).*

5. *Arousing patriotism in citizens.* The function of this move is to invoke love for the country and confidence concerning the audience’s future. These feelings help the new president to successfully unite all the Americans. A good way to do it is to review the American history [32, p. 2410]. This move occurs in Obama’s 2013 inaugural: *The patriots of 1776 did not fight to replace the tyranny of a king with the privileges of a few or the rule of a mob. They gave to us a Republic, a government of, and by, and for the people, entrusting each generation to keep safe our founding creed* (Obama [54]).

6. *Announcing political principles to guide the new administration.* This move sets forth political principles of the President. Generally, they are subdivided into basic principles on which the American political institutions stand and the main policies that will shape the coming administration. The basic principles include American Constitution, union, freedom and democracy [32, p. 2410]. They are voiced in Obama’s 2013 inaugural: *What makes us exceptional – what makes us* ***American*** *– is our allegiance to an idea, articulated in a* ***declaration*** *made more than two centuries ago: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created* ***equal****, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are* ***Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness***(Obama [54]). In the given example, the President refers to the pivotal for the American nation values that are entrenched in American mentality. They include the concepts of *equality (equal),* and human rights resting upon the principles of *life, liberty and happiness.*

The second group of principles embraces solutions to the problems [32, p. 2410]. President Trump views them as follows: *We will* ***get our people off of welfare and back to work*** *– rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor* (Trump [55])*.* Judging from this utterance, there is a problem of insufficient American labor, because of the necessity to make people work *(back to work).* The solution to the fallen supply on labor market, according to Trump, lies in eliminating *welfare (get our people off of welfare).*

7. *Appealing to the audience*. The audience can never be ignored. There is always a general appeal for aid or assistance, sacrifice and dedication made to the addressee [32, p. 2411]. President Obama presents this move in the following way: ***You and I****,* ***as citizens****,* ***have the power*** *to set this country’s* ***course.******We must act****,* ***we must act*** *knowing that our work will be imperfect* (Obama [54]). The appeal to the audience lies in voicing the necessity to act.

8. *Resorting to religious power.* Every president refers to God many times in the inaugural address as God is the common religious belief for nearly all Americans. The function of this move is to unite the American people [32, p. 2411]. Both Obama and Trump finish their inaugurals asking for God’s blessing: *Thank you, God Bless You, And God Bless America* (Trump [55]).

To sum up, the structure of inaugurals reveals the so-called “hamburger style” with introduction, “the meaty middle”, which contains the main political principles of the new President, and the conclusion. Inaugurals may be also divided into moves that are the parts of the speech which achieve a special purpose within the address. Generally, there are eight moves in the American inaugural: salutation, announcing entering upon office, articulating sentiments on the occasion, making pledges, arousing patriotism in citizens, announcing political principles to guide the administration, appealing to the audience and resorting to religious power. All these moves represent a succession of power relations rendered by image schemas that represent economic, social, military and environmental issues employed by the President to persuade the audience.

### 1.3.3. Rhetorical style of President Obama’s and President Trump’s inaugurals. While delivering an inaugural message, newly elected presidents use rhetoric as a means of persuasion and power relations to influence the audience. [27]. Canons of rhetoric determine the structure of their addresses; modes of persuasion: ethos as a means of the speaker’s self-presentation; pathos interacting with the addressee’s emotions, feelings and needs; and logos expressed by argumentation chase the purpose of persuading the audience [39, p. 12]. Though this aim is the same for presidents, the contents of their inaugurals, i.e., *what exactly* they want to persuade the audience of, can differ. These differences lay the basis for the specific power relations rendered by force image schemas.

Though in general Obama and Trump’s inaugurals share commonalities on the level of invention (uniting the nation, referencing to American development, equality issue, American dominance and appeal to the audience) [45, p. 61], the differences occur on the level of elocution, or picking up the linguistic units to denote the mentioned issues.

Generally, President Obama uses units with stronger degree of representing American unity and the nation’s development; richer vocabulary stating the grandeur of equality issue and persuading the audience in the necessity to act.

For example, the following utterances present the comparison of two presidents’ reference to unity:

*Each time* ***we******gather*** *to inaugurate a President* ***we*** *bear witness to the enduring strength of* ***our*** *Constitution.****We*** *affirm the promise of* ***our*** *democracy.****We*** *recall that what* ***binds******this nation together*** *is not the colors of* ***our*** *skin or the tenets of* ***our*** *faith or the origins of* ***our*** *names* (Obama [54]).

***We****, the citizens of* ***America****,* ***are*** *now* ***joined*** *in a great national effort to rebuild* ***our*** *country and to restore its promise for all of* ***our*** *people* (Trump [55])*.*

Both presidents use the lexical items denoting unity: *we, our, together.* However, the notion of the verb *to bind,* given by Obama, is stronger [52] than the meaning of the verb *to join*, used by Trump.

However, when it comes to presenting the state of American society, Trump uses relatively stronger and darker words, than Obama, who reaches for a language of positivity and non-partisanship [21]. In the following paragraphs from Trump’s inaugural it is possible to trace the examples of his harsh and direct style:

*We must protect our borders from* ***the ravages*** *of other countries making our products****, stealing*** *our companies****, and destroying*** *our jobs*(Trump [55])*.*

*This American* ***carnage*** *stops right here and stops right now* (Trump [55]).

*Mothers and children* ***trapped*** *in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories* ***scattered like tombstones*** *across the landscape of our nation* (Trump [55])*.*

In these utterances, linguistic units *ravages, to steal, to destroy, carnage, to trap; scattered like tombstones* bear the strong destructive meaning, evoking powerful emotions of shock and protest in the audience [35].

The linguistic units denoting the theme of ecology, are absent in President Trump’s inaugural [17]; obviously, this topic doesn’t bear any significance for him. In Obama’s speech, however, it is possible to trace words and word combinations regarding environment protection:

*That’s how we will* ***maintain*** *our economic vitality and our* ***national treasure***–***our forests and waterways****, our* ***crop lands and snow-capped peaks****.  That is how we will* ***preserve our planet****, commanded to our care by God* (Obama [54]).

In this utterance, ecological issue is named using the linguistic units denoting nature preservation: *to maintain national treasure (forests, waterways, crop lands, peaks), to preserve planet.*

Instead, the 45th president speaks more frequently of concepts related to protection and nationalism [17]. In Trump’s speech, *American* and *America* are the most frequent words. To compare, Obama’s speech highlights the concepts of *work* and *generation*. Trump’s patriotic appeal of *American* is more relevant than in Obama’s speech [17].

According to the speech, the future Trump envisions for the United States is one that is inward-looking, seeking to concentrate on how America can help its own people and withdrawing from the world [21]. For instance, the following utterances illustrate Trump’s strictly protectionist views:

*From this moment on, it’s going to be* ***America First*** (Trump [55])*.*

***Every decision*** *on trade, on taxes, on* ***immigration****, on* ***foreign affairs****, will be made* ***to benefit American workers and American families*** (Trump [55])*.*

 From this example we may see the repetitive use of the units *America* and *American*. Withdrawal from the world is embodied by the reference to *immigration and foreign affairs* with the aim to *benefit the Americans,* not to cooperate.

At the level of arrangement there are still more differences between the inaugurals. The reference to American history stands at the beginning of Obama’s address, while Trump refers to it only once and at the end, cf:

 ***The patriots of 1776*** *did not fight to replace the tyranny of a king with the privileges of a few or the rule of a mob* (Obama [54])*.*

*It is time to remember* ***that old wisdom our soldiers*** *will never forget: that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots, we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms, and we all salute the same great American Flag* (Trump [55])*.*

From this comparison we may see that while Obama gives the clear reference to the historic date, Trump relies on rather unclear mentioning the past *(old wisdom).*

The opposition between the lower and the upper class is placed in the middle part of Trump’s inaugural, while in Obama’s speech the reference to it is not so prominent and occurs closer to the end, cf:

*For too long,* ***a small group*** *in our nation’s Capital* ***has reaped the rewards*** *of government while* ***the people******have borne the cost***(Trump [55])*.*

*We do not believe that in this country* ***freedom is reserved for the lucky****, or* ***happiness for the few*** (Obama [54])*.*

In these utterances, Trump’s opposition between the upper class *(a small group, lucky, few)* and the lower class *(the people)* is voiced clearer than in Obama’s one, due to the use of the active voice of the predicates and of the adversative conjunction *while.*

Instead, Obama places the economic crisis issue in the “meaty middle” of his inaugural, while Trump touches economy very shallowly at the end:

*Together, we determined that* ***a modern economy*** *requires railroads and highways to speed travel and commerce, schools and colleges to train our workers* (Obama [54]).

*We will bring back our* ***jobs****. We will bring back our* ***wealth***(Trump [55]).

In the paragraphs mentioned above we may see that while Obama clearly names *economy,* Trump uses more common words referring to it: *jobs (labor market issue)* and *wealth (economic growth issue).*

It has to be mentioned, that Trump’s inaugural seems to be more successful, than Obama’s one [35]. This statement is made according to the features of effective modern English political speaking, given by G. Orwell. He claims that the use of meaningless words and pretentious diction invokes stronger emotions in the audience [37].

Meaningless words, according to Chinese researcher M. Ngai, include Trump’s campaign slogan, “Make America Great Again”. In the chain of such buzz-phrases, he does not elaborate *how* actually he will make America great (wealthy, strong etc.) [35]:

*Together, We Will Make America Strong Again.*

*We Will Make America Wealthy Again.*

*We Will Make America Proud Again.*

*We Will Make America Safe Again.*

*And, Yes, Together, We Will Make America Great Again* (Trump [55]).

The intention of using meaningless words is to entrench the idea in the audience’s mind and invoke the confidence in the president’s actions [35].

The use of pretentious diction, according to Orwell, includes not only strong and emotionally colored words denoting *disruption,* but also the general style of speaking in short utterances and short linguistic units [37].

Donald Trump’s inaugural address is one of the shortest in history, and one of the most combative [27]. He uses shorter sentences in comparison with his predecessor and shows a preference for shorter words. Short and distinct utterances are like a series of fast hits, they evoke an immediate reaction of the audience and stronger emotions [17]. Both presidents use common vocabulary, however, Trump employs a greater number of nouns and adjectives. In terms of the audience’s perception, more adjectives make his speech more understandable, than Obama’s [17].

There is one more characteristic that distinguished Trump’s inaugural address. It is a speech with unusually specific promises, eschewing Obama’s abstract uplift. Toward the end of his speech he warned, *We will no longer accept politicians who are all talk and no action, constantly complaining but never doing anything about it* (Trump [55]). That can be read as a warning to the other leaders on the dais, but it is also, he seemed to acknowledge, a challenge to himself [21].

 To conclude, we may observe similarities and differences between Trump and Obama’s inaugurals at three main levels: invention, arrangement and elocution. At the level of invention there is the biggest number of commonalities mostly because the presidents share the same values being representatives of one nation. Arranging the inaugural, Obama places the reference to history and economic crisis at the beginning of his address, while Trump starts with separating the nation into the upper and the lower classes. At the level of elocution, Trump’s inaugural is shorter, more energetic, delivered in simple sentences and simple vocabulary and thus considered to be more effective due to stronger emotions the speech invokes. While Obama uses words with milder and calmer meaning, Trump’s vocabulary consists of blunt and sharp vocabulary. Further analysis of the presidents’ inaugurals explains in details why they use specific words and structures and what they intend to persuade the audience of.

## Conclusions on part one

Rhetoric studies means of persuasion which aims to satisfy the speaker’s pragmatic need of forcing his beliefs on the addressee and to entrench the ones that he represents in the audience’s mind. Any public address has its own organization containing five rhetorical canons and three modes of persuasion which help the speaker to appeal to the audience and determine the structure of texts.

Canons of rhetoric represent a sequence of rhetorical address composition. There are five of them: invention/discovery, arrangement, style (elocution), memory and delivery. The main devices in rhetoric that classify the speaker’s appeal to the audience are called modes of persuasion: ethos, that defines the trustworthiness of the communicator; pathos, or reference to the audience’s emotions, feelings and needs; and logos, i.e. the art of argumentation. Judging from the qualities any inaugural possesses, it is possible to define its belongingness to both deliberative and epideictic oratory. Deliberative characteristics include: political nature, the aim to persuade the audience, the use of ethical and pragmatic concepts and the reference to the future. The epideictic traces can be found in the ceremonial character, the reference to the present issues and mentioning the virtuous and vice ideas.

Together rhetorical canons and modes of persuasion presuppose the organization of the text and use of particular linguistic units governed by image schemas which stem from the speaker’s interaction with reality and bodily experience. The dominance of one schema and the subordinate role of another invoke *power relations* that simultaneously show the dominance of one entity and the secondary role of another.

In inaugurals presidents refer to the following force image schemas that embody power relations: COMPULSION, ATTRACTION, ENABLEMENT, COUNTERFORCE, BLOCKAGE, RESTRAINT REMOVAL.

 The inaugural address is rhetorical by nature, as the president aims to persuade the audience of his suitability for this role. For this purpose, the speaker applies rhetorical modes of persuasion and force image schemas that represent power relations. The structure of an inaugural denotes the succession of power relations with the help of image schemas to represent common issues concerning the nation as a whole, and specific principles showing the presidents’ individual beliefs and their future political courses.

Inaugurals have a “hamburger style”: they include introduction, “the meaty middle” with the prominent views the president possesses, and the conclusion. Inaugurals are divided into moves which achieve special targets. Generally, there are eight moves in the American inaugurals: salutation, announcing entering upon office, articulating sentiments on the occasion, making pledges, arousing patriotism in citizens, announcing political principles to guide the administration, appealing to the audience and resorting to religious power.

According to the studies performed Trump’s rhetoric is more straight and abrupt than Obama’s. The use of short words and sentences in combination with emotionally colored linguistic units denoting *destruction* makes better impression on the addressee, invoking stronger emotions of shock and protest. Judging from the arrangement of arguments in his address it is possible to predict his course on nationalism and protection of American interests. Obama, on the contrary, cares about alliances with the world, refers to the economic, social and ecological issues. Trump’s inaugural reaches the aim to persuade the addressee more effectively, playing upon the slogans of his political campaign which are well perceived by the audience.

The analysis of power relations in Obama’s and Trump’s inaugurals will be organized according to the onomasiological approach of the nomination theory. It means that the analysis starts from the idea the presidents want to voice and then we find the linguistic units that embody this idea.

Knowing the rhetorical basis of the inaugural; having singled out force image schemas that embody power relations within the speech; having defined the peculiarities of the inaugural as a specific rhetorical address, its structure, and peculiarities of Obama and Trump’s inaugurals, we can come to the analysis of power relations in their addresses.

**PART TWO**

**COMMON VS DIFFERENT POWER RELATIONS IN BARACK OBAMA’S AND DONALD TRUMP’S INAUGURALS**

This part singles out the common and different relations of power in Obama’s and Trump’s inaugurals defining the verbal means of their realization. The presidents share six common groups of power relations: uniting the nation; dividing the nation; its development; equality as the source of enablement of success; America as a centre of attraction and appeal to the audience that is the source of enablement of the nation’s success. However, Trump and Obama have different views on the source of prosperity: Obama represents *the collective* as the source of prosperity, while Trump emphasizes at the dominant position of *the individual,* that correlates with the blockage of the world for the sake of securing America’s prosperity.

## 2.1. Common power relations in Obama and Trump’s inaugurals

There are more common power relations in Obama’s and Trump’s inaugurals than different. It may be explained by the stable structure of inaugurals that all American presidents stick to. Besides, political figures voice views and beliefs that are specific and common for the American nation. For instance, inseparable from America are the values of unity, patriotism, human rights defending etc. Consequently, newly elected presidents draw upon these values, making the audience trust the speaker.

However, the hierarchy of values is different for the two presidents. The position of specific concepts within the speech may reveal much about their importance for the speaker. In particular, Obama speaks about the nation’s development and equality earlier, than Trump; Trump, in his turn, is more concentrated on dividing the nation and presenting America as the centre of attraction.

**2.1.1. Uniting the nation** is the main point of the beginning of President Obama’s and President Trump’s inaugural addresses.

Uniting the nation is activated by the verbs that name attraction relations. Pronouns *we* and *our* and the adverb *together* that point to the unity represent the source of attraction relations. In Obama’s address, the object *the nation* stands for the target of attraction. In Trump’s speech, the target of attraction is expressed by two levels: the level of the nation and the level of the establishment, cf.

*Each time* ***we******gather*** *to inaugurate a President* ***we*** *bear witness to the enduring strength of* ***our*** *Constitution.****We*** *affirm the promise of* ***our*** *democracy.****We*** *recall that what* ***binds******this nation together*** *is not the colors of* ***our*** *skin or the tenets of* ***our*** *faith or the origins of* ***our*** *names* (Obama [54]).

***We****, the citizens of America,* ***are*** *now* ***joined*** *in a great national effort to rebuild* ***our*** *country and to restore its promise for all of* ***our*** *people* (Trump [55])*.*

In these utterances, the predicates *gather,* *binds* and *are joined* share the common meaning of *putting together* [52]and represent the vector of attraction relations. However, the predicate *binds* expresses а greater degree of attraction, as *to bind* means *to tie together* [52]*,* while *to gather* and *to join* stand for *bringing together* [52]being weaker in meaning.

Unity as the source and establishment as the target of attraction relations are expressed by the pronoun *we:*

*Every four years,* ***we******gather*** *on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and* ***we*** *are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition* (Trump [55])*.*

The disposition of the predicate *gather,* that represents the vector of attraction relations, is different in the two inaugurals. Obama starts uniting the nation with this predicate, and Trump uses *gather* to assemble the establishment at the end of the uniting move.

To sum up, the introduction of both inaugurals is represented by uniting the nation move with unity forming the source of attraction relations. In Obama’s inaugural, the target is represented by the nation, while in Trump’s inaugural the target is expressed by both the nation and the establishment. The predicates that denote attraction relations share the common meaning of putting together, though Obama uses units with relatively stronger degree of attraction.

### 2.1.2. Dividing the nation shows the split of the nation into two different entities opposed to each other: the upper class and the lower class.

The prosperity of the upper class is expressed by units with the meaning of *success* that activate the image schema of ENABLEMENT. The misery of the lower class is denoted by the words with the notion of *the absence of success* that name the image schemas of DISABLEMENT and BLOCKAGE.

The opposition between the upper and the lower classes is expressed by the adversative conjunctions *but* and *while.*

The upper class social group is named by the units referring to *small amount* *of people* *(the small group, few),* units referring to the *high society (Washington, politicians, the establishment),* and the deictic units *they* and *their.* The lower class is verbalized by the units denoting *the big amount of people (many), the ordinary people (the people, the citizens, struggling families),* and the deictic unit *your.*

The privileged position of the upper class and the deprived status of the lower class are underlined by reference to contrast between the linguistic units that express *success* and activate ENABLEMENTand those that name its *absence* and thus point to DISABLEMENT*.* The ENABLEMENT image schema shows the *opportunity* for the upper class*.* The DISABLEMENT image schema expresses *loss of opportunity* for the lower class. Words and word combinations that name the upper class perform the role of the source and the target of enablement, as well as the source of disablement affecting the lower class, cf.

*For too long,* ***a small group*** *in our nation's Capital* ***has reaped*** *the rewards of government while the* ***people have borne the cost****.* ***Washington flourished*** *– but* ***the people did not share in its wealth. Their victories*** *have not been* ***your*** *victories;* ***their triumphs*** *have not been* ***your*** *triumphs; and while* ***they celebrated*** *in our nation's capital, there* ***was******little to celebrate*** *for* ***struggling families*** *all across our land.* (Trump [55])*.*

*For we remember the lessons of our past, when twilight years were* ***spent******in poverty*** *and parents of a child* ***with******a disability*** *had nowhere to turn* (Obama [54])*.*

In both utterances, the predicate *has reaped* and the subject *victory* express the meaning *to* *own something, be the owner* [52]*;* the predicates *flourished* and *celebrated,* as well as the subject *triumph* share the notion of success: *to develop successfully, to honor success* [52]*.* All these units refer to the concept of prosperity and embody the vector of enablement relations for the upper class. The predicates *have borne the cost, did not share wealth, was little to celebrate, spent in poverty;* the attribute *with a disability* mean *misery* and denote the vector of disablement relations for the lower class.

In Trump’s inaugural, the dominating position of the upper class and the humiliating status of the lower class is strengthened by linguistic units that denote *the obstacle to success* for the lower class and *support of success* for the upper class. These units activate theBLOCKAGE image schema The upper class becomes the source of BLOCKAGE aimed at the lower class:

*Politicians prospered – but* ***the jobs left****, and* ***the factories closed*** (Trump [55])*.*

In this paragraph, the predicates *left* and *closed* express the shared meaning *to block* [52], in this context, they *block* *the employment* for the lower class, and embody the vector of blockage relations.

The upper class taken together with the predicates meaning *protection* expresses the BLOCKAGE image schema that represents the *support of success:*

***The establishment******protected itself****, but* ***not the citizens*** *of our country* (Trump [55])*.*

In the utterance above, the predicate *protect* expresses blockage relationsstopping the undesirable forces and empowering the enablement for the upper class.

In Obama’s inaugural, linguistic units denoting the enablement of success for the upper class form the opposition to units meaning the disablement of the opportunity for the lower class. This opposition becomes the source of success disablement for the whole country:

*For* ***we, the people****, understand that* ***our******country******cannot succeed*** *when a shrinking* ***few******do very well*** *and a growing* ***many******barely make it*** (Obama [54])*.*

In this utterance, the predicate *do very well* expresses success enablement for the upper class, while the predicate *barely make it* denotes its disablement for the lower class. The predicate *cannot succeed* triggers opportunity disablement for the *country.*

To sum up, both inaugurals divide the nation into the upper class and the lower class. Linguistic units with the meaning of prosperity activate the relations of enablement concerning the upper class. Words and word combination with the notion of misery and obstacle to prosperity refer to disablement and blockage relations that refer to the lower class. The upper class is the source and the target of enablement relations; and the source of disablement relations, aimed at the lower class. In Trump’s inaugural, the units meaning an obstacle to success for the lower class and the units denoting supporting success for the upper class express the relations of blockage. Obama makes the opposition between the enabled upper class and the disabled lower class the source of success disablement for the whole country.

### 2.1.3. Nation’s development is represented in both inaugurals with the help of linguistic units that imply motion.

In Obama’s address, development represents the movement to success that starts in the past and continues into the future. Trump relies only on future development of the nation.

In Obama’s inaugural, the use of a concrete historic date, *1776*, and the Past Indefinite Tense of the verbs name the starting point of the nation’s development. The use of negation in the predicate *did not fight* eliminates the cycle character of development i.e., when the start coincides with the end, expressed by the adverbial modifier of purpose *to* *replace* that bears the notion of *repetition.* In this way, the object *tyranny* that denotes the moving object of the CYCLE image schema and hinders the nation’s development, is disabled:

***The patriots*** *of* ***1776******did not******fight to replace*** *the* ***tyranny*** *of a king with the privileges of a few or the rule of a mob* (Obama [54])*.*

Instead, in Obama’s inaugural, development of the nation is expressed by linguistic units with the notion of *opportunity,* which activate the relations of enablement. The source of enablement of prosperity is represented by the subjects *the patriots,* used in the previous utterance, and *they,* used in the next one, that refer to *heroic people.* The target of success enablement is denoted by the pronoun *us* that expresses *the nation:*

***They******gave*** *to* ***us*** *a republic, a government of, and by, and for the people, entrusting* ***each generation******to keep safe******our*** *founding* ***creed*** (Obama [54])*.*

In this paragraph, the nation’s development is encoded in shifting the position of the nation from representing the target of the enablement of the *opportunity* to denoting the source of it. This idea is supported by the use of the predicate *gave* that depicts the vector of enablement coming from the subject *they,* which stands for the source, and targeted at the object *to us* which refers to the nation. The object *to keep safe* represents the vector of the opportunity enablement, the source of which is denoted by the object *each generation,* referring to the nation, and the target is expressed by the object *creed,* that includes the American values.

Both Obama and Trump turn to the future of the nation. However, Obama refers to the evolutionary movement of the nation from the past into the future, while Trump concentrates only on future development.

The evolutionary movement of the nation denoted by the pronoun *we* is expressed in Obama’s inaugural by the linguistic units with the meaning of *movement* that activate the PATH image schema. The nation embodies the moving object:

*Today* ***we******continue*** *a never-ending* ***journey******to bridge*** *the meaning of those words with the realities of our time. We made ourselves* ***anew****, and vowed to* ***move forward*** *together*(Obama [54])*.*

In this paragraph, the predicates *continue* and *move forward* together withthe object *journey* represent motion and development. The adverbial modifier of purpose *to bridge,* due to the meaning *to tie,* connects the past and the future. The development of the nation is indicated by the adverb *anew* that means the *change.*

In the paragraph from Trump’s inaugural, given below, the future development of the nation is represented by the use of the Future Indefinite Tense of the verbs.

According to Trump, the development of the nation is expressed by the predicates in the meaning of *opportunity* that trigger enablement relations. The source of enablement is represented by the subject *we* and the adverbial modifier of manner *together,* that refer to the nation. The target is denoted by the object *America,* that names the country, cf:

***Together****,* ***we******will determine******the course of America*** *and the world for years to come* (Trump [55]).

***We******will face******challenges****.* ***We******will confront******hardships****. But* ***we******will get******the job******done*** (Trump [55]).

In these utterances, the vector of the enablement of the opportunity is expressed by the predicate *will determine* meaning *cause (something) to occur in a particular way* [52], and the predicate *will get [the job] done*, that point to *opportunity.*

In the same paragraphs, Trump mentions the presence of the forces that form *obstacles* to the nation’s development. In this way, the nation, represented by the subject *we,* acts as the source of counterforce named by the predicates in the meaning *to defeat,* which include *will face and confront.* The objects *challenges and hardships* express the force the nation defeats and represent the target of the counterforce relations.

To recapitulate, the nation’s development is represented in both speeches with the help of the linguistic units that point to movement to success. Obama shows development as the motion from past into future. The evolution is expressed with the help of linguistic units meaning opportunity that represent the nation’s shifting from denoting the target of enablement of success to expressing both the source and the target of it. Trump concentrates on the future development of the nation. Development is shown by linguistic units denoting opportunity that represent the the nation’s ability to express the source of enablement for the further course; and by the predicates that mean to defeat and express the vector of counterforce, where the nation acts as the source, and the units that name obstacles show the target.

### 2.1.4. Equality as a source of the enablement of success pierces Obama’s inaugural being evoked in Trump’s address. However, in Obama’s inaugural equality rests on more force relations than in Trump’s address which concentrates on the equality at the end of the inaugural, while Obama constantly refers to it in different parts of the speech which shows that it is more important for him.

Equality is named by the quantifiers denoting similarity: *every, all, the same, any, equal:*

 *It is time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget**that whether* ***we*** *are black or brown or white,* ***we******all*** *bleed* ***the same*** *red blood**of patriots,* ***we******all*** *enjoy* ***the same*** *glorious freedoms, and* ***we all*** *salute* ***the same*** *great American Flag* (Trump [55])*.*

*And whether a child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the windswept plains of Nebraska, they look up at* ***the same*** *night sky, they fill their heart with* ***the same*** *dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by* ***the same*** *almighty Creator* (Trump [55]).

Prominent is the idea of the presence of equality not only in time of the nation’s success, but also in time of misery.

Linguistic units that express equality mainly represent the source of enablement for the country and for the people, named by the words and word combinations with the notion of *success*; and the source of restraint removal, targeted at the nation, represented by the linguistic units meaning *the absence of restraints to success*, cf:

*We know that* ***America******thrives*** *when* ***every person******can find******independence*** *and pride in their work; when the wages of honest labor* ***liberate*** *families from the brink of* ***hardship*** (Obama [54])*.*

*We are true to our creed when a little girl born into* ***the bleakest poverty*** *knows that she* ***has*** *the same* ***chance to succeed*** *as anybody else, because she is an American; she* ***is free****, and she* ***is equal****, not just in the eyes of God but also in our own* (Obama [54])*.*

In the utterances above, the vector of enablement of prosperity for the country and the people, motivated by equality, is expressed by the predicates that share the meaning of *thriving,* which are: *thrive, has the chance [to succeed].* The absence of restraints for success, brought by equality, is represented by the linguistic units with the notion of *liberty*, they are: *liberate, free, equal.* The restraint that equality removes has the meaning of *misery* and include the objects *the brink of hardship* and *the bleakest poverty.*

The ever-present character of equality is highlighted by showing it not only as the source of success, but also as the phenomenon that accompanies the people’s misery. In this way, equality becomes the target of disablement relations, expressed by the linguistic units meaning *the loss of opportunity*:

*We recognize that no matter how responsibly we live our lives,* ***any one of us*** *at any time may face* ***a job loss****, or a sudden* ***illness****, or* ***a home swept away*** *in a terrible storm*(Obama [54])*.*

In this utterance, the vector of disablement targeted at the equality is expressed by the objects *a job loss, illness, a home swept away.*

Equality is present in the whole life of the nation. The idea of equality’s *ever-presence* is named by the linguistic units with the meaning of *connection* that activate the relations of attraction. In this way, equality, represented by the predicate *are equal,* expresses the source of attraction, and the nation, depicted by the pronouns *we* and *us,* denotes the target:

***We****, the people, declare today that the most evident of truths – that* ***all of us******are*** *created* ***equal*** *– is the star that* ***guides******us*** *still; just as it* ***guided*** *our forebears through Seneca Falls, and Selma, and Stonewall; just as it* ***guided******all those men and women****, sung and unsung, who left footprints along this great Mall, to hear a preacher say that we cannot walk alone; to hear a King proclaim that* ***our*** *individual freedom* ***is*** *inextricably* ***bound to*** *the freedom of* ***every*** *soul on Earth* (Obama [54])*.*

In this paragraph from Obama’s inaugural, the vector of attraction shown by the verbs with the meaning of *connection* include *to guide* and *to bind.*

In the same utterance, the equality’s ever-presence is given still more prominence by the use of both The Past and The Present Indefinite Tenses. The variety of grammatical tenses shows the role of equality as the source of attraction in the past and the same role in the present.

In Obama’s inaugural, the idea of the equality’s ever-presence is supported with the help of showing equality as the ending point of nation’s movement, expressed by the noun *journey.* The ending point of this movement is marked by the linguistic units denoting success that trigger the relations of enablement of prosperity for all social groups, including *mothers and daughters, gay brothers and sisters,* that are the parts of the nation. The necessity to preserve equality is represented by the linguistic units expressing *obligation,* that activate the COMPULSION image schema, aimed at the nation:

*For our* ***journey*** *is not complete until our wives, our mothers and daughters* ***can earn*** *a living* ***equal*** *to their efforts. Our* ***journey*** *is not complete until our gay brothers and sisters* ***are treated like anyone else*** *under the law – for if we are truly created* ***equal****, then surely the love we commit to one another* ***must be******equal*** *as well* (Obama [54])*.*

In this example taken from Obama’s inaugural, equality motivates the enablement of success for the nation represented by the predicate *are treated* and the adverbial modifier of manner *like anyone else.* Taken together, they refer to the meaning of *success and prosperity.*

In the same utterance, the necessity to follow equality is named by the predicate *must be equal,* where the modal verb *must* denotes *obligation* and activates the compulsion relations.

To conclude, equality as a source of enablement of success in both presidents’ inaugurals is viewed as ever-present*,* i.e., piercing the nation’s thriving and misery. In the addresses, equality is named by the linguistic units denoting similarity. Referring to the nation’s success, equality is viewed as the source of enablement of prosperity for the nation. The idea of the nation’s misery comprises equality as the target of disablement of the opportunity. The ever-presentcharacter of equity is strengthened by the attraction relations, where the nation as the target follows equality as the source. The grandeur of this attraction is represented by the PATH image schema expressed by the verbs meaning motion, that embraces following equality through the past, the present and future. Equality represents the ending point of this movement.

### 2.1.5. America as the centre of attraction is the prominent concept of both inaugurals structured by center-periphery and attraction. America is represented as the centre associated with power, dominance and action. The rest of the world belongs to the political periphery, i.e. led-by and passive.

In both inaugurals, power relations between the centre and periphery are represented by the image schemas of PATH, RESTRAINT REMOVAL, ENABLEMENT, ENABLEMENT-DISABLEMENT and COUNTERFORCE.

The leading role of the centre and the led-by status of the periphery are emphasized the linguistic units with the notion of *movement* that activate the PATH image schema, cf.

***The path*** *towards sustainable energy sources will be long and sometimes difficult. But* ***America*** *cannot resist this* ***transition****, we* ***must lead*** *it* (Obama [54])*.*

***We*** *do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone**but rather to let it shine as* ***an example*** *for* ***everyone******to follow*** (Trump [55])*.*

In these utterances, the centre expressed by the subjects *we* and *America* denote the American nation as the leader of the movement to the future success. The periphery, expressed by the object *everyone*, follows the centre. The nouns *the path* and *transition,* the verbs *must lead* and *follow* share the notion of *the path* and *motion* and represent the movement to success that America as the centre is leading, and the rest of the words as the periphery following.

In both inaugurals, the centre expressed by the subjects *we, the people* and *America* referring to the USA removes the war restraint for both the centre and the periphery. Linguistic units with the notion *to defeat* activate restraint removal relations:

*But* ***we*** *are also heirs to those who* ***won the peace*** *and not just the* ***war****; who* ***turned*** *sworn* ***enemies into the*** *surest of* ***friends*** *– and we must carry those lessons into this time as well. We will show the courage to try and* ***resolve*** *our differences with other nations* ***peacefully*** *– not because we are naïve about the dangers we face, but because engagement can more durably lift suspicion and fear* (Obama [54])*.*

In the paragraph above taken from Obama’s inaugural, restraint removal relations motivated by the centre, are expressed by the predicate *won* that has the meaning *to defeat* [52] and the predicate *resolve,* that means *to clear up*. The restraint is expressed by the object *war.* The predicate *turned*, thatimplies *elimination of one entity and appearance of another one* [52], expresses the removal of *enemies* and the emergence of *friends.*

The centre represented by America as a power that eliminates war restraint is revealed in Trump’s inaugural: ***We******will seek friendship*** *and* ***goodwill******with the nations of the world*** *– but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first*(Trump [55]).

In this utterance, the predicate *will seek,* that has the meaning *to aim at* [52] shows the vector of movement towards *friendship and goodwill,* that express the absence of war restraint, removed by the centre.

The idea of the centre’s dominance over periphery is expressed by the linguistic units denoting *giving opportunities* that activate the enablement relations, targeted at the periphery. The periphery is named by the linguistic units that refer to *the world:* *in every corner of the globe; abroad; from Asia to Africa, from the Americas to the Middle East; to the poor, the sick, the marginalized, the victims of prejudice; planet; all nations)*:

***America******will remain the anchor******of strong alliances******in every corner of the globe****.  And* ***we******will renew*** *those institutions that extend our capacity to manage crisis* ***abroad****, for no one has a greater stake in a peaceful world than its most powerful nation.  We* ***will support democracy******from Asia to Africa, from the Americas to the Middle East****, because our interests and our conscience* ***compel*** *us to act on behalf of those who long for freedom.  And* ***we******must be a source*** *of hope* ***to the poor, the sick, the marginalized, the victims of prejudice*** *– not out of mere charity, but because peace in our time requires the constant advance of those principles that our common creed describes:  tolerance and opportunity, human dignity and justice.**That is how* ***we will preserve******our planet****, commanded to our care by God* (Obama [54]).

*We will seek friendship and goodwill with the nations of the world – but* ***we*** *do so with the understanding that it* ***is the right*** *of all nations* ***to put their own interests first*** (Trump [55]).

In the abovementioned paragraphs from both president’s inaugurals, the centre as the source of opportunities for the periphery is represented by the predicates *will remain the anchor, will renew, will support, must be a source, will preserve, is the right* that share the general meaning of *enablement* [52] and express the enablement relations.

The dominating position of the centre and the secondary position of the periphery is highlighted by ENABLEMENT-DISABLEMENT opposition. Linguistic units denoting *success* embody enablement of thriving, that refers to the centre; and the units expressing *the loss of opportunity* name disablement relations, targeted at the periphery. The centre represents the source of disablement of advance for the periphery: ***We******cannot cede to other nations*** *the* ***technology*** *that* ***will power new jobs and new industries****,* ***we******must claim*** *its* ***promise*** (Obama [54])*.*

In Obama’s utterance, the negation of the predicate *cannot cede* with the meaning *to deny* points to the absence of the opportunity for the periphery, represented by the object *other nations*.

In the same paragraph, the centre, expressed by the pronoun *we*, in its turn, becomes the target of the enablement relations represented by the linguistic units meaning *the ability or opportunity.* The predicate *will power* represents *capacity* [52]. The predicate *must claim* shows the opportunity, for the meaning of the verb *claim* is *to take as a rightful owner* [52].

The centre expressed by the pronoun *we* leads the confrontation between *the civilized world* and *Islamic terrorism,* named by the preposition *against.* This collision is shown by the COUNTERFORCE image schema, that results in the disablement of the opportunity, expressed by the predicate *will eradicate,* denoting *the loss of opportunity* for *Islamic terrorism,* motivated by the centre*:*

***We*** *will reinforce old alliances and form new ones – and* ***unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism****, which we* ***will eradicate*** *completely from the face of the Earth* (Trump [55])*.*

To sum up, the center-periphery relations in both presidents’ inaugurals are depicted with the help of the linguistic units denoting enablement, restraint removal, enablement-disablement and counterforce relations, which present the leading position of the centre, and the subordinate role of the periphery. The centre is expressed by pronouns and nouns referring to America, and the periphery is named by the words and word combinations that refer to other countries. The leading position of the centre embodies the source of success for the periphery, as well as the force that removes the war restraint and leads the opposition against *Islamic terrorism*. The periphery is depicted as the passive target of power relations of enablement of prosperity and disablement of opportunity.

### 2.1.6. Appeal to the audience as the source of enablement of success for assistance, sacrifice, dedication and action makes the addressee the source of power relations. The presidents transfer the power to the citizens’ hands in order to reach the success for the whole country.

The audience, or the citizens, expressed by the subject *we,* the object *Americans* and the attribute *your,* is the source of enablement of the nation’s future development, named by the objects *destiny, course* and *America:*

***You and I****,* ***as citizens****,* ***have the power*** *to set this country’s* ***course***(Obama [54])*.*

*So to* ***all Americans****, in every city near and far,**small and large, from mountain to mountain, and from ocean to ocean, hear these words.* ***Your voice****,* ***your******hopes****, and* ***your******dreams******will define******our*** *American* ***destiny*** (Trump [55])*.*

*Together,* ***we******will make America strong*** *again.*

***We******will make America wealthy*** *again.*

***We******will make America proud*** *again.*

***We******will******make America safe*** *again.*

*And yes,* ***together****,* ***we will make America great*** *again* (Trump [55])*.*

In the paragraphs above from both presidents’ inaugurals, the audience as the source of success is expressed by the predicate group *have the power;* the predicates *will define, will make strong, wealthy, proud, safe, great* denote *giving opportunity* and thus denote the vector of enablement relations which highlight the transition of power from the establishment to the citizens.

The citizens, expressed by the attribute *your,* are viewed as the source of attraction relations, named by the predicate meaning *to lead*, where the nation represented by the object *us* as the target follows the citizens:

*And* ***your courage*** *and* ***goodness*** *and* ***love will*** *forever* ***guide us*** *along the way*(Obama [54])*.*

In this utterance from Obama’s inaugural, the predicate *will* *guide* in the meaning *to lead* denotes the relations of attraction.

The leading position of the citizens as the source of enablement of success for the nation is strengthened by the linguistic units referring to the necessity and in this way, representing the COMPULSION image schema. The idea is that the outer forces named by the subject *progress* compel the citizens, expressed by the deictic units *us, we, our, you and I,* to be the source of enablement:

***Progress*** *does not compel us to settle centuries-long debates about the role of government for all time, but it* ***does require******us to act*** *in our time* (Obama [54])*.*

 *We* ***must act****, knowing that our work will be imperfect. And* ***we******must*** *faithfully execute that pledge during the duration of* ***our*** *service* (Obama [54])*.*

***You and I,*** *as citizens****, have the obligation to shape the debates*** *of our time – not only with the votes we cast, but with the voices we lift in defense of our most ancient values and enduring ideals* (Obama [54]).

In the abovementioned utterances from Obama’s inaugural, the appeal to the audience for taking the power to define the nation’s success is given the obligatory character by the predicates *does require, must act, have the obligation,* that share the meaning *to make somebody do something,* referring to the COMPULSION image schema*.*

To conclude, appealing to the audience for taking the power to grant the nation’s success, presupposes viewing the citizens as the source of enablement of prosperity for the nation. The position of the citizens as the source of prosperity is strengthened by the relations of attraction with the nation as a target. The appeal to the audience obliges the citizens to take responsibility for the future American thriving by the use of linguistic units in the meaning of necessity that triggers the COMPULSION image schema, where the outer forces, progress in particular, compel the citizens to act.

## 2.2. Different power relations in Obama and Trump’s inaugurals

Aside from the values common for all Americans, the presidents have specific views that highlight their future policy. For President Obama, the collective is the source of the nation’s success; President Trump, on the contrary, relies on the individual efforts of the Americans. Such separation from the world is supported by the relations of blockage that aim at other countries.

### 2.2.1. Obama: the collective as a source of the nation’s prosperity. The collective as the source of the nation’s success rests upon the linguistic units that activate the image schemas of ENABLEMENT-DISABLEMENT, BLOCKAGE, RESTRAINT REMOVAL, COUNTERFORCE and COMPULSION.

To present the collective as the source of the nation’s prosperity, Obama relies on the opposition between *the collective* and *the individual.*

*The collective,* expressed by the subject *we,* the adverb *together,* and the adverbial modifier of manner *as one nation and one people,* is the source of enablement of the nation’s prosperity, named by the object clause *that* *free market thrives*:

***Together****,* ***we******discovered*** *that a* ***free market*** *only* ***thrives*** *when there are rules to ensure competition and fair play* (Obama [54])*.*

***Together****,* ***we******determined*** *that a modern* ***economy******requires*** *railroads and highways to speed travel and commerce, schools and colleges to train our workers* (Obama [54])*.*

***Together****,* ***we******resolved*** *that a great nation* ***must care*** *for the* ***vulnerable,*** *and* ***protect*** *its people from life’s worst* ***hazards and misfortune*** (Obama [54])*.*

*My fellow Americans, we are made for this moment, and we* ***will******seize*** *it – so long as we seize it* ***together*** (Obama [54])*.*

*Now, more than ever,* ***we******must do*** *these things* ***together****,* ***as one nation and one people*** (Obama [54])*.*

In these utterances from Obama’s inaugural, the idea of the collective as the catalyst of prosperity is highlighted by the predicates *determined, discovered* and *resolved* that share the common meaning *to enable things happen,* and by the predicate *will seize* with the notion of *being an owner.* All these predicates trigger the enablement relations targeted at the nation’s success.

In the same utterances, the idea of the collective being the source of the nation’s opportunity is strengthened by the use of the predicate *must protect* meaning *a barrier* that triggers the BLOCKAGE image schema, for *the collective* is represented as the obstacle that hinders *hazards and misfortune.* Predicates *must care and protect, must do, requires* with the notion of *necessity* activatethe image schema of COMPULSION that shows the obligatory character of blockage, *compelling* *the collective* to stand for the source of enablement for *the vulnerable.*

The individual, represented by the subject *single person,* the adverb *alone* and the object *central authority*, in its turn, is expressed as the source of disablement of prosperity for the nation. The relations of disablement are named by negation units disabling words and word combinations with the notion of *opportunity*:

*For the* ***American people******can no more meet the demands*** *of today’s world by acting* ***alone*** *than American soldiers could have met the forces of fascism or communism with muskets and militias* (Obama [54])*.*

***No single person can train*** *all the math and science teachers we’ll need to equip**our children**for the future, or* ***build*** *the* ***roads and networks and research labs*** *that will bring new jobs and businesses to our shores* (Obama [54])*.*

*Through it all,* ***we have never relinquished our skepticism of central authority****,* ***nor have we succumbed to the fiction*** *that all society’s ills can be cured through government* ***alone*** (Obama [54])*.*

In the utterances above from Obama’s inaugural, the vector of disablement, initiated by the individual, is shown by the negation units *never* and *no* used with the linguistic units denoting *opportunity*, expressed by the predicates *can meet the demands, can train, can build.* The individual’s impossibility to secure the nation’s success is also named by the objects *skepticism* and *fiction* that express *non-existing, imaginary enablement of success,* that trigger the DISABLEMENT image schema.

The idea that the collective represents the source of success is underlined by the linguistic units that activate the ATTRACTION and PATH image schemas. The collective, expressed by the pronoun *we,* functions as the target of attraction relations, named by the adverbial clause of time *when* *times change,* that has the meaningof *the progress, development* and *prosperity.* Moreover, Obama views the collective as the active force, making it the source of counterforce, expressed by the object *responses*, meaning *fighting back*, targeted at *challenges:*

*But* ***we*** *have always understood that when* ***times change****, so* ***must******we****; that fidelity to* ***our*** *founding principles requires* ***new responses to new challenges****; that preserving our individual freedoms ultimately requires* ***collective*** *action* (Obama [54]).

If we analyze the following utterance together with the previous one, we see that success motivated by the collective, is brought by the linguistic units that point to *removing the obstacles* and activate restraint removal relations:

***A decade of war is*** *now* ***ending.*** *An economic* ***recovery has begun*** (Obama [54]).

In this way, the predicates *is ending* regarding *war* and *has begun* concerning *recovery* represent the vector of restraint removal relations, targeted at the collective, expressed by the pronouns *we* and *our,* represented in the previous utterance.

Then the collective, expressed by the attribute *America’s* and the subject *we,* becomes the source of restraint removal relations, expressed by the linguistic units that denote *the absence of barriers* that are targeted at the enablement of success for the nation, represented by the linguistic units meaning *opportunity*:

*America’s* ***possibilities are limitless****, for we* ***possess*** *all the* ***qualities*** *that this* ***world without boundaries*** *demands:  youth and drive; diversity and* ***openness****; an endless* ***capacity for risk*** *and* ***a gift for reinvention***(Obama [54]).

In this paragraph, restraint removal relations, targeted at the collective, are depicted by linguistic units denoting *the absence of obstacles,* i.e., *are limitless, without boundaries, openness.* The nouns meaning *opportunity* and *ability: possibilities, capacity, gift;* and the verb *possess* name the enablement of the nation’s prosperity.

To sum up, Obama views the collective, expressed mainly be pronouns referring to American consolidation, as the source of the nation’s success. He voices this idea using the contrast between the collective and the individual, named by nouns and adverbs that have the meaning alone. The collective becomes the source of enablement of the nation’s success, and the single represents the source of disablement of the nation’s prosperity. The collective is named in terms of the powerful force, that is the source of blockage, named by verbs in the meaning of obstacle, for the hazards; counterforce denoting fight with challenges; and restraint removal, named by linguistic units characterized by the meaning of opening the way to the prosperity enablement.

### 2.2.2. Trump: the individual as the source of the nation’s prosperity. Unlike Obama, Trump concentrates not on *the collective* as the source of the nation’s prosperity, but on the *individual* that enables the success of America.

The concept of *the individual* rests mainly upon the relations of blockage that separate America from the rest of the world, concentrating on the internal issues of the country.

Trump motivates the prevalence of the individual using the subject *we,* the attributes *our* and *American,* and the object *our country,* referring to the American nation and presenting it as the source of the enablement of prosperity, named by the linguistic units meaning *success,* and blockage of the external threats, represented by the predicates sharing the meaning of *protection,* for other countries. Other countries are named by the attribute *foreign,* the object *other countries, other nation,* and the adverb *overseas* and represent the source of disablement of success, denoted by the units with the notion of *misery,* and removal the restraints that stops the external threats for America, represented by the units meaning *the absence of protection*. That is why other countries need to be blocked:

*For many decades,* ***we've enriched foreign industry******at the expense of American industry****;* ***subsidized the armies of other countries*** *while* ***allowing*** *for the very* ***sad depletion of our military****; we've* ***defended other nation's borders*** *while* ***refusing to defend our own****; and* ***spent trillions of dollars overseas*** *while* ***America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay*** (Trump [55])*.*

 *We've* ***made other countries rich*** *while* ***the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country have disappeared over the horizon.*** *The* ***wealth of our middle class has been ripped*** *from their homes and then* ***redistributed*** *across the entire world* (Trump [55])*.*

In these utterances, the individual triggers the prosperity enablement aimed at other countries, named by the predicates meaning *to enable, i.e., have enriched, subsidized, spent [trillions of dollars], made rich, redistributed.* The individual represents the source of BLOCKAGE image schema that supports the enablement of prosperity for other countries and is expressed by the predicate *defended* denoting *protection.*

In the same utterances, the necessity to preserve the individual is explained by the use of linguistic units sharing the meaning of *being unable, i.e., at the expense of, allowing for the depletion, has fallen into disrepair and decay, have disappeared, has been ripped*, targeted at America and activating the disablement relations. Trump justifies the necessity of concentration on the individual, using the predicate group *refused to defend* that has the meaning *not to protect* and triggers the restraint removal relations that correlate with disablement of success for America at the expense of success for other countries.

 The individual is depicted in contrast to the rest of the world. Other countries are characterized by linguistic units with the meaning of *the obstacle to success* that activate the blockage of success for *American workers:*

*One by one,* ***the factories shuttered and left our shores****, with not even a thought about the millions upon millions of* ***American******workers left behind*** (Trump [55])*.*

In this utterance, other countries trigger the blockage relations expressed by the predicate *is shuttered* meaning *an obstacle* that activatesthe loss of opportunity for the *American workers,* represented by means of the predicates *left; left behind.*

The individual, expressed by the subjects *new vision* and *protection,* refers to the separation from the rest of the world. In this way, the individual is viewed as the solution, i.e., the source of attraction, named by the linguistic units with the meaning of *guidance,* that will lead to the nation’s prosperity:

*From this day forward, a* ***new vision will govern our land****. From this moment on, it's going to be* ***America First. Protection******will lead*** *to great* ***prosperity and strength*** (Trump [55])*.*

In this paragraph, the individual’s guiding America to *prosperity and strength* is represented by the predicates denoting *leading,* they include *will govern* and *will lead.*

In the following utterance, the idea of the prevalence of the individual is expressed by the linguistic units representing *separation* and *protection* that activate the blockage relations. The linguistic units with the notion of *necessity* justify the separation and protection of America and activate the COMPULSION image schema. The disruptive effect of other countries on America is named by the units meaning *taking the opportunity away*:

***We******must protect******our borders*** *from the ravages of* ***other countries*** *making our products****, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs*** (Trump [55])***.***

In the utterance above, the obligatory character of the individual is expressed by the modal verb *must* that means *necessity* [52] and triggers the relations of compulsion. The devastating influence of other countries on America is shown by the linguistic units that share the meaning of *taking the opportunity away*, that are *stealing and destroying* and trigger disablement relations.

Later on, the President underlines the idea of the individual, expressed by the subjects *America* and *we,* with the help of linguistic units meaning *advance* and activating enablement relations targeted at America:

*America* ***will start winning again, winning like never before*** (Trump [55])*.*

***We******will bring back******our*** *jobs.* ***We******will bring back******our*** *borders.* ***We******will bring back******our*** *wealth. And* ***we******will bring back******our*** *dreams.* ***We*** *will follow two simple rules: Buy* ***American*** *and hire* ***American****. Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made* ***to benefit American workers and American families*** (Trump [55])*.*

In these utterances, the advance the individual motivates is expressed by the linguistic units denoting *having success.* They include the predicates *start winning, will bring back;* and the adverbial modifier of purpose *to benefit.*

To recapitulate, President Trump views the individual, expressed by linguistic units referring to America, as the source of enablement of prosperity for the country, represented by verbs and nouns nominating success. Trump motivates the necessity of separation using the linguistic units that embody contrasting enablement-disablement relations. Pronouns and nouns referring to America are used together with the linguistic units meaning advance that activate the enablement of success for other countries, which, in their turn, express the source of America’s disablement, named by verbs that denote the loss of opportunity. That is why they need to be blocked. The verbs implying protection trigger the BLOCKAGE image schema that aims at other countries as the external threat.

## Conclusions on part two

There are more common power relations in both presidents’ inaugurals than different. Common relations include uniting and dividing the nation, its development, equality as the source of success enablement, America as the centre of attraction and appeal to the audience as the source of enablement of success. The differences embrace two groups of power relations: Obama’s view on the collective as the source of American prosperity, and Trump’s idea of the individual representing the source of the nation’s prosperity. Larger amount of similarities comparing to differences is motivated by the conventional structure of the inaugurals, and values all Americans share.

The nation’s unity and appeal to the audience are expressed by the linguistic units with the meaning of putting together that rest on attraction relations. In both addresses, unity is named by nouns and pronouns referring to America serving as the source of the attraction. Appeal to the audience makes the citizens, expressed by the linguistic units meaning people, name the source of attraction, and the units referring to the country embody the target. The guiding position of the citizens is strengthened by the verbs meaning thriving that activate the relations of success enablement for the nation. The necessity for the citizens to lead the nation is named by the verbs denoting obligation evoking the COMPULSION image schema.

The nation’s division into upper and lower classes is represented by the enablement-disablement opposition. The high position of the upper class, depicted by the units with the semantics of small amount of people and high society, is expressed by verbs denoting bringing success which rests on the enablement of prosperity. The miserable state of the lower class, expressed by the units with opposite semantics denoting big amount of people and the regular people, is represented by the verbs denoting loss of opportunity triggering the disablement relations. The lexical units with the semantics of protection activate blockage relations underlying the presentation of the success of the upper class. Units denoting obstacles to advance refer to the blockage relations.

In Obama’s address, the nation’s development is expressed by verbs that have the meaning of motion related to the PATH image schema. Obama shows the nation’s development by the linguistic units denoting prosperity that activate the enablement relations. The nouns and pronouns referring to the nation name the target of the enablement of success in the past. In Obama’s address, the same units that embody nation denote the source and the target of enablement in the present and future. Trump concentrates on the future development of America, using the verbs denoting bringing success in the Future Indefinite Tense that trigger the enablement relations. For Trump, the nation’s development is embodied by the units meaning fighting, based on the counterforce relations between the nation and hardships.

Equality as the source of the nation’s enablement is named by linguistic units denoting similarity, that represent the source of success enablement for the nation. Its ever-present character is voiced by the nouns and verbs that refer to the absence of opportunity, triggering success disablement and making equality its target. The prominent role of equality is represented by the verbs denoting guidance, that activate attraction relations, where equality acts as the source, and the nation, named by the units that refer to America, represents the target.

The units referring to America denote the active centre of the world, and nouns referring to other countries imply the passive periphery. The leading position of America is highlighted by the linguistic units with the semantics of success that trigger enablement relations for other countries; by verbs with the meaning of freedom that activate war restraint removal; and by units denoting the absence of opportunity, that express disablement relations for the periphery.

Different power relations in two presidents’ inaugurals stem from Obama’s and Trump’s various political courses.

In Obama’s view, the collective, expressed by the pronouns and nouns meaning solidarity, taken together with verbs denoting bringing success for the nation, activate the enablement relations. On the contrary, the individual, named by the linguistic units meaning alone, in combination with units naming the absence of the opportunity, trigger the disablement of the nation’s prosperity. The beneficial position of the collective is shown by the linguistic units meaning the absence of restraints, that trigger restraint removal relations, and by the units denoting protection, that activate the blockage of obstacles to success.

Trump’s idea of the individual is represented by the units with the meaning of alone, together with the verbs denoting thriving, express prosperity enablement for the nation. Nouns and adverbs naming other countries combine with the units meaning opportunity loss and triggering the relations of disablement of advance for America. In this way, Trump motivates the use of verbs and nouns meaning protection that activate the blockage relations, targeted at other countries to secure American success.

# **GENERAL CONCLUSIONS**

The inaugural address is a public high-levelled speech which the presidents pronounce while taking the position of the head of the country. The main inaugural’s aim is to persuade the audience that the speaker is suitable for the responsibility he takes; and to impose his beliefs on the addressee. Judging from these targets, we may account for the rhetorical nature of the inaugural.

Image schemas show the patterns of the presidents’ manipulation. Obama and Trump mainly use force image schemas as they show the interaction between the dominant source and subordinate target. The relations that occur between the source and the target are the relations of power embodied by the image schemas of ATTRACTION, ENABLEMENT, DISABLEMENT, RESTRAINT REMOVAL, BLOCKAGE, COUNTERFORCE and COMPULSION.

We’ve analyzed both the common and different power relations in both presidents’ inaugurals. Uniting and dividing the nation, its development, equality as the source of success enablement, America as the centre of attraction and appeal to the audience as the source of success enablement belong to common relations. Obama and Trump have different views on the source of prosperity: Obama relies on the collective as the source of American prosperity, and Trump accounts for the idea of the individual representing the source of the nation’s prosperity. The prevalence of similar relations comparing to different ones is motivated by the stable structure of the inaugurals, and values all Americans share.

Linguistic units meaning putting together name the attraction relations and represent both the nation’s unity and appeal to the audience. Unity is expressed by nouns and pronouns referring to America, and the citizens are embodied by the same units, but meaning the people. They act as the source of the attraction. The units referring to the country embody the target of attraction relations. The verbs that mean thriving show the enablement of success for the nation, motivated by the citizens, whose leading position is secured by the verbs denoting necessity that activate the compulsion relations.

In both inaugurals, the nation is split into two classes: the upper and the lower. This division is expressed by the contrast between enablement and disablement relations. The upper class is named by the units with the semantics of small amount of people and high society and used together with verbs denoting bringing success that activate enablement relations. The lower class is characterized by the units with opposite semantics denoting big amount of people and the ordinary people; it is used together with the verbs meaning loss of opportunity. These verbs trigger the disablement relations. Verbs with the meaning of protection activate blockage relations underlying the presentation of the success of the upper class. Units denoting obstacles to advance for the lower class refer to the blockage relations.

The nation’s development is represented by verbs meaning motion related to the PATH image schema. In Obama and Trump’s addresses, the verbs denoting success represent the enablement relations. In Obama’s speech, nouns and pronouns that express the nation embody both: the source of enablement in the past and source and the target of enablement in present and future. Trump uses linguistic units meaning nation together with the verbs implying success only with reference to the future. In his address, the nation’s development is voiced by verbs meaning fighting that show the counterforce between the nation and hardships.

Equality as the source of the nation’s enablement is expressed mostly by quantifiers denoting similarity. The verbs that mean bringing success represent enablement relations, and the equality expresses the source of these relations. The ever-present character of equality is voiced by the nouns and verbs that refer to the absence of opportunity, triggering success disablement and making equality its target. The leading role of equality is expressed by the verbs meaning guidance, that activate attraction relations, where equality acts as the source, and the nation, named by the units that refer to America, represents the target.

America is shown in both inaugurals as the active centre of attraction, and nouns referring to other countries present the passive periphery. The guiding role of America is represented by the verbs meaning thriving that embody the enablement of advance for the periphery. American dominance is voiced by verbs naming removal of the war restraint; and absence of opportunity for the rest of the world that trigger disablement relations.

Different political courses of the two presidents are embodied in various power relations groups.

In Obama’s inaugural, the enablement of prosperity for the nation is expressed by verbs meaning success, with the pronouns and nouns referring to the collective as the source. Contrast to enablement relations are the relations of disablement, named by the verbs with the meaning of the absence of success. The source of disablement of prosperity for the country is the individual, voiced by nouns, pronouns and adverbs denoting the separate. To show that the collective brings benefits to the nation, Obama uses the collective as the source of restraint removal relations, named by the verbs and nouns meaning the absence of restraints, and the source of the relations of blockage, presented by the verbs denoting protection. Both these relations support the nation’s prosperity.

In Trump’s inaugural, the individual represents the source of the enablement of prosperity, expressed by the verbs meaning success. Nouns and adverbs referring to the rest of the world express the source of disablement of America’s thriving, represented by the verbs denoting the absence of success. Trump uses linguistic units meaning protection to trigger the blockage relations that form the barrier for other countries to cut them off and in this way secure American prosperity.

# **АНОТАЦІЯ**

У магістерській роботі проаналізовано мовні одиниці, які активують відношення сили, що ілюструють ідеї об’єднання та роз’єднання нації, її розвитку; рівності як джерела забезпечення можливості; Америки як центру притягання; та звернення до аудиторії як до джерела забезпечення можливості в інавгураційних промовах американських президентів Обами і Трампа.

Для проведення дослідження застосовано апарат силових відношень, які включають притягання, забезпечення / позбавлення можливості, перешкоду / її усунення, примушення та протидію.

Встановлено, що ідея об’єднання нації передається номінативними одиницями з семантикою притягання. Контраст між вищими й нижчими класами американського суспільства відображений дієсловами на позначення забезпечення / позбавлення можливості й перешкоди. Розвиток нації в Обами ілюструється дієсловами з семантикою забезпечення можливості, в Трампа – як дієсловами на позначення забезпечення можливості, так і протидії. Рівність в обох президентів показано за допомогою дієслів з семантикою забезпечення можливості та притягання. Провідне положення Америки представлено дієсловами на позначення забезпечення можливості та усунення перешкоди. Звернення до аудиторії проілюстровано дієсловами з семантикою притягання, забезпечення можливості та примушення.

Обама розглядає колективне як джерело забезпечення можливості, та усунення перешкоди. Трамп, навпаки, вбачає джерело забезпечення можливості в індивідуальному.

**Ключові слова:** відношення сили, інавгураційна промова, Барак Обама, Дональд Трамп.

# **SUMMARY**

The master's thesis analyzes linguistic units that activate power relations, illustrating the ideas of uniting and dividing the nation, its development; equality as the source of enablement of success; America as the center of attraction; and appeal to the audience as the source of enablement of success in the inaugurals of US Presidents Obama and Trump.

In this paper, the analysis is conducted on the basis of the conceptual relations for force, which include attraction, enablement / disablement, blockage / restraint removal, compulsion and counterforce. It is found that the idea of uniting the nation is transmitted by nominative units with the semantics of attraction. The contrast between the upper and lower classes of the American society is reflected by verbs to denote enablement / disablement and blockage. The nation’s development in Obama’s inaugural is illustrated by verbs with the semantics of enablement, while in Trump’s address development is shown by verbs to denote enablement and counterforce. Equality in both presidents is demonstrated by verbs with the meaning of enablement and attraction. America's leading position is represented by verbs to indicate the enablement and restraint removal. The appeal to the audience is illustrated by verbs with the semantics of attraction, enablement and compulsion.

Obama views the collective as the source of opportunity and restraint removal. Trump, on the contrary, sees the source of opportunity in the individual.

**Keywords:** power relations, inaugural, Barack Obama, Donald Trump.
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