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1. Introduction

On a cold January day, the nation was gathered to witness not only the inauguration of a new President, but the arrival of a new phase in American politics. The man on the podium had risen from a young, light-weight contender to a national favorite; had overcome prejudicial barriers; and had invigorated the nation with a message of transformation, delivered with a combination of personal charisma and rhetorical grace. The nation and the whole world watched and rejoiced as he took the Presidential Oath.

The scene in question could have been set in 2009 – or in 1961. The man on the podium could have been John F. Kennedy or Barack Obama; the occasion, their inaugurations as President of the United States, on either January 20, 1961 or January 20, 2009, respectively. The election of Barack Obama as the President of the United States has sparked many comparisons of the two men in the media, pointing to similarities not only in the societal and historical significance of their election as President but their message and personal histories as well (for a few media commentaries with varied opinions on the subject, see, for instance, Rich 2008, Harnden 2007, Vennochi 2007, Remnick 2008 and Steele 2009). The aim here is to investigate an expression of American identity on two occasions of national and historical significance, by two individuals who, according to many, seem to share common points of reference but who lived in very different times.

The focal point of the analysis is the Inaugural Address. The aim of the analysis is not to pinpoint general tendencies applicable to all inaugural addresses made by American presidents; nor is it to find a “true” American identity, unchanged through time, or to argue that the way national identity is conceptualized in the speech directly reflects the speaker’s own conceptions. The point is to analyze the way national identity is presented in the two speeches, how it is interwoven into the text, and to do all this in a way that is methodologically and theoretically sound and systematic. For the theoretical framework, this essay leans heavily on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) by Norman Fairclough, though with some caveats that will be explored in more detail below. Fairclough’s
approach is a remarkable synthesis of social theory and linguistic methods. For
the analysis itself, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), developed by M.A.K
Halliday, will be used.

Certain concepts will be featured prominently in the analysis, concepts such as discourse, power, ideology, nation and national identity. These
are all dangerous concepts that cannot be thrown around casually, that need to be
explicitly picked apart: power and discourse most of all, as they lurk behind the
others, and the way they are defined inevitably affects the way estimations of
moral responsibility can be made. Since our chosen theoretical approach here is
discourse analytical, it naturally privileges certain kinds of conceptual definitions
and thus affects the tools available in the analysis itself. Discourse analysis is in
itself a varied field, encompassing both linguistic and social elements within a
variety of approaches. First, the five terms mentioned above will be placed in an
appropriate theoretical framework. Second, the systemic functional method of
language analysis will be presented, with a discussion of how it relates to
discourse analytical research. Third, the issues of political rhetoric and rhetorical
persuasion will be addressed. After this, the focus shifts to American cultural and
political issues, followed by succinct biographies of Presidents Kennedy and
Obama and, lastly, the analysis itself. Now, however, the theory.

2. In Theory: A Discursive Construction of National
Identity

This section approaches the construction of national identity from a discursive
point of view. Much of the upcoming theory can be attributed to Norman
Fairclough, whose approach to discourse analysis is a blend of linguistic and
social theory. Discourse, for Fairclough, is a socially constructive force, capable
of both transforming society and maintaining the position of those in power. In his
theoretical framework, Fairclough makes frequent allusions to the ground-
breaking work of Michel Foucault – not necessarily always as a point of origin
but frequently as a point of reference. Fairclough acknowledges Foucault’s
contributions to the analysis of discourse (1992: 37–38), particularly in the study of the discursive constitution of social subjects and knowledge and the relationship between discourse and power.

In the section concerning power, the framework laid out here departs somewhat from Fairclough’s approach. Foucault conceptualizes power in a way that does not presume domination of one part of society over another, which makes it more appropriate for the purposes of the analysis here. This, in turn, will have implications for the way ideology is approached in the following segment. The sections on power, discourse and ideology refer primarily to Fairclough and Foucault. For the concept of nation and national identity, the paper refers to theories presented in Wodak et al. (1999). As a whole, this chapter treats discourse, its analysis and its constructive potential largely on the level of social groups. A later chapter will address discourse as a cognitive concept, approaching it from the viewpoint of an individual speaker.

2.1. Discourse and Its Analysis

“Discourses constitute part of the resources which people deploy in relating to one another, keeping separate from one another, cooperating, competing, dominating – and in seeking to change the ways in which they relate to one another.” (Fairclough 2004: 124)

Discourse is a tricky word. It is used in a variety of linguistic and social studies, with a variety of distinct or overlapping meanings and theoretical approaches. Norman Fairclough conceptualizes the term “discourse” essentially as a social practice (Fairclough 1989, 1992, 1995). He makes a distinction between the process of social interaction (discourse) and the actual event, the final “product”, which he, following M.A.K. Halliday, calls a “text” (Fairclough 1989: 24). Discourse, in turn, is a process of interaction in which both social conditions of text production and text interpretation are continuously renegotiated (ibid.: 25). In his own approach to discourse, Fairclough (1992: 4) identifies and uses three separate ways in which he himself uses the term: “Any discursive event (i.e. any
instance of discourse) is seen as being simultaneously a piece of text, an instance of discursive practice, and an instance of social practice”.

Fairclough (1992: 65-66) emphasizes that while discursive practice plays a part in both the reproduction and transformation of social structures, it does not wholly constitute social practice. Discourse plays an important role in a number of social fields, but none of them are completely reducible to discourse, though some might come close. Both discourse production and consumption “have a partially socio-cognitive nature, in that they involve cognitive processes of text production and interpretation which are based upon internalized social structures and conventions” (ibid.: 71). Thus, in his own approach to discourse and its analysis, Fairclough (ibid.: 2-3) has sought to balance linguistic analysis with social theory. He has also utilized a number of perspectives on discourse from the work of Michel Foucault, whose role in popularizing the concepts of discourse and discourse analysis is difficult to overstate. Though the match is not wholly seamless in theoretical terms, Foucault’s work provides important contributions to the “social theory of discourse in such areas as the relationship of discourse and power, the discursive construction of social subjects and knowledge, and the functioning of discourse in social change” (Fairclough 1992: 39).

The overview here is brief; Fairclough (1992: 37-61) provides a more thorough examination. Firstly, discourse is constitutive of social reality, as well as the objects and relations in it; “discourse is in an active relation to reality, that language signifies reality in the sense of constructing meaning for it” (Fairclough 1992: 42) rather than merely referring to pre-given objects in it. Discursive formations are always constrained by other discursive formations and non-discursive practices. Furthermore, discursive and non-discursive constraints interact with context. (Fairclough 1992: 43-47.) Power has a discursively constructive aspect and there is a constant “‘power struggle’ over the determination of discursive practices” (ibid.: 51). Finally, discourse plays an important role in social and cultural transformation; but “to what extent”, Fairclough (1992: 55) wonders, “do discursive practices constitute these wider social and cultural changes, as opposed to merely ‘reflecting’ them? And how far, therefore, can wider processes of change be researched through analysis of
changing discursive practices?” This relates also to the ability of individuals to consciously affect these practices, and the extent to which one can claim that individuals are shaped by these practices.

Fairclough himself seeks to make his own approach three-dimensional, incorporating “analysis of the text, analysis of the discourse processes of text production and interpretation (including the question of which discourse types and genres are drawn upon, and how they are articulated), and social analysis of the discursive ‘event’ in terms of its social conditions and effects at various levels (situationally, institutionally, socially)” (ibid.). Though discourse is present to some extent in all fields of social practice, Fairclough is particularly concerned with the mode of political and ideological practice. This is because political practice, as discourse, “establishes, sustains and changes power relations and the collective entities (classes, blocs, communities, groups) between which power relations obtain”. Ideological and political practices naturalize certain conventions of representing the world, and are therefore both a tool and a site of continuous power struggle. (Fairclough 1992: 67.)

2.2. Power

"At least in developed capitalist countries, we live in an age in which power is predominantly exercised through the generation of consent rather than through coercion, through ideology rather than through physical force, through the inculcation of self-disciplining practices rather than through breaking of skulls." (Fairclough 1995: 219)

A thorough investigation of power is critical for this study, not only because it lurks behind the other concepts discussed in this section, and, by extension, affects the way the other concepts can be sensibly defined, but also because the way we conceptualize power will inevitably limit its explanatory potential to a particular set of tools in the analysis itself. Additionally, one central function of analyzing power is the establishment of a “moral context”, in which assigning power can be equated with responsibility (Lukes 1974: 66–67). For Fairclough,
“[p]ower exists in various modalities, including the concrete and unmistakable modality of physical force” (Fairclough 1989: 3). This is not always so in the variety of conceptualizations of power found in the multitude of social theory (one overview of the various conceptualizations can be found in Lukes 1974). Fairclough himself works within a Marxist framework (see, for instance, Fairclough 1989 and 1995), which means relying on certain ways of social categorization (particularly class and structures of economic production) and, within the subfield of critical discourse analysis, focusing on the generation of consent that maintains the power status of the capitalist class.

For Fairclough, power is not “just a matter of language” (1989: 3; emphasis in original). In his view, exercise of power includes both the manufacture of coercion and consent; Fairclough’s linguistic model of discourse analysis seeks to analyze “social interactions in a way which focuses upon their linguistic elements, and which sets out to show up their generally hidden determinants in the system of social relationships, as well as hidden effects they may have upon the system” (ibid.: 5). Because of this focus on uncovering hidden power relations and domination, Fairclough has termed his approach to discourse analysis critical, used in this particular sense. Fairclough contrasts his view of power with that of Michel Foucault, for whom “[p]ower does not work negatively by forcefully dominating those who are subject to it; it incorporates them, and is ‘productive’ in the sense that it shapes and ‘retools’ them to fit in with its needs” (Fairclough 1992: 50).

Power, for Foucault (1975: 26-27), “is exercised rather than possessed; it is not the ‘privilege’, acquired or preserved, of the dominant class, but the overall effect of its strategic positions – an effect that is manifested and sometimes extended by the position of those who are dominated”. As such, Foucault’s framework lacks the focus on certain societal groups dominating others highlighted by Fairclough. Modern power, rather than imposed from above by powerful actors or elites, comes from below, from so-called microtechniques established in modern social institutions. Power is impersonal and ever-present, ingrained in social practices and discourses that (re)produce subjects who make use of these practices and discourses. Foucault’s conception of power is intimately connected to his conception of knowledge and discourse. Hall (1996:}
201) notes that while discourse produces knowledge – that is, meaning – discourse itself is produced by practice, which in turn entails the production of meaning, which… And so on. “On the one hand, the techniques of power are developed on the basis of knowledge which is generated, for example, in social sciences; on the other hand, the techniques are very much concerned with exercising power in the process of gathering knowledge” (Fairclough 1992: 50). Foucault refers to this modern form of power as ‘biopower’.

In his conceptualization of discourse, one of the perspectives borrowed from Foucault by Fairclough is that of discourse as a constitutive force, and the related question of resistance and self-reflection. Foucault’s view of power has been criticized as “one-sided, monolithic” (Lukes 1974: 93), leaving little room for resistance or self-reflection and positing that subjects were fully constituted by power relations. Fairclough (1992: 57) notes that in Foucault’s work, “the dominant impression is one of people helplessly subjected to immovable systems of power”, Foucault does, however, at least to some extent, also address the question of resistance and societal change. This is perhaps the most pivotal difference between Foucault and Fairclough: whether power is to be something that must be resisted, or simply viewed as a shaping force of human interaction that can be studied but not abolished.

As mentioned above, choosing a particular conceptualization of power will, to some extent, affect the analysis. Foucault and Fairclough share the view that discourse is, to some extent, constitutive, and that systems of discourse are intertwined with power. However, the aim here is not, like Fairclough, to uncover domination of one section of society over another, and as such Foucault’s view of a constructive force seems more attractive. Therefore, for the analysis here, the concept of the Foucauldian kind of power is used: a systemic but essentially contested “bias” that is built and maintained by ingrained practices and privileges certain ways of looking at the world over others. The office of President of the United States is a powerful position, that much is true, but the newly elected president is not being handed a blank slate to do as he pleases. The next section, on ideology, brings the concepts of discourse and power together and discusses the implication for the assignment of moral responsibility in more detail.
2.3. Ideology

“In using the term ‘discourse’ I am claiming language use to be imbricated in social relations and processes which systematically determine variations in its properties, including the linguistic forms which appear in text. One aspect of this imbrication in the social which is inherent to the notion of discourse is that language is a material form of ideology, and language is invested by ideology.” (Fairclough 1995: 73)

Ideology is where the concept of discourse and power come together, and as the theoretical framework has thus far revolved to a significant degree around Norman Fairclough’s approach, his views on ideology will be presented first. For Fairclough’s critical analysis of discourse, ideology is instrumental, as it provides certain representations and constructions of the world; however, what separates ideology from turning into a neutral “worldview” is its origin in a state of power asymmetry – of domination (Fairclough 1995: 92-93). Ideology, for Fairclough (1989: 4), is thus “the prime means of manufacturing consent”. Given his view of power as an ultimately oppressive force, this view of ideology is perhaps unsurprising. However, since power is treated in this analysis as a constructive force, rather than a dominating one, some caveats will again be necessary.

Certain aspects of Fairclough’s framework, particularly those derived from his approach on discourse, discursive practice and social practice, are certainly applicable for the theoretical framework laid out here. Ideology, like discourse, is constitutive. It contributes to the constant creation and recreation of subjects and relations between subjects, and thus works constitutively and has a material effect in reproducing and reshaping social, political and economic institutions (Fairclough 1992: 73). “Ideology is located, then, both in structures which constitute the outcome of the past events and the conditions for the current events, and in events themselves as they reproduce and transform their conditioning structures” (ibid.: 72). Thus, ideology can be viewed as a particular kind of discursive and constructive practice – one with a moral dimension, brought about by the presence of power.
Fairclough’s view of ideology has its critics. Some (e.g. Abercrombie, Hill & Turner 1980) have questioned the existence of unitary dominant ideologies, while others (e.g. Thompson 1990) treat ideologies as the particular worldviews of groups with differing interests and social positions. However, arguments that Fairclough (1995: 16) himself terms “[a] more fundamental attack on ideology” originate from post-structuralist and post-modernist camps. One position, in the tradition of Nietzsche (1886/1990) and carried on by Foucault (1975) is that ideological critique presupposes access to the true state of things, a claim that in reality is nothing but a “will to power” in disguise. Perhaps, then, it is safest to view ideology here as Jonathan Charteris-Black (2005: 21) does, as a “belief system through which a particular social group creates the meanings that justify its existence to itself” and is therefore “an exercise in self-legitimation”.

Here, the analysis focuses on words which are clearly attributed to a specific speaker and contain assertions and assessments which, while inspiring for some, may also seem objectionable to others. Though I have largely referred to Fairclough in discussing discourse and ideology, Foucault’s view of power seems more suited for the analysis here precisely because of its more morally relativist stance. Therefore, the way power is conceptualized here essentially posits that the president, despite his clear position of authority, is in some ways constrained in his rhetorical choices by truths that are held to be self-evident. At the same time, however, the inaugural address allows the president draw on certain discourses in favor of others, thus privileging certain ways of constructing the world, the audience, himself and other social objects. Martin (1995), referring to identity narratives, notes that such narratives can be useful in “redressing or reversing a balance of power considered detrimental to the interests of a ‘group’” and that it can have a central role in “mobilizing the ‘group’ by giving it conscience of itself and of the situation it endures”. This provides an appropriate transition to the specific group the analysis here is concerned with, the social entity and construct known as a nation.
2.4. Nation

“[T]he ‘end of the era of nationalism,’ so long prophesied, is not remotely in sight. Indeed, nation-ness is the most universally legitimate value in the political life of our time.” (Anderson 2006: 3)

In the investigation of American national identity, the concept of “nation” is, of course, quite explicitly brought into fray and needs to be addressed. Less explicit, but nonetheless lurking in the background, is the nation’s twin sister, the state. Paloheimo and Wiberg (2005: 96) differentiate the concepts of “state-building” and “nation-building” and (referring to Almond and Pye in Allardt 1983) place the two in a dualistic process in the creation of a nation-state, alongside the expansion of the legal structures of governance, such as courts, administration and infrastructure. This kind of a view delegates the legalistic structures under the concept of the state, and the establishment of a community to the nation.

There is no generally accepted definition of a “nation”, though many have tried, often referring to some kind of a “political will” possessed by individuals in the community or “objective criteria” such as a common language, territory or culture (Wodak et al. 1999: 18–19). Benedict Anderson (2006: 3) observes that for such a historically and culturally important phenomenon, plausible theory on the subject has been conspicuously meager. Anderson himself conceptualizes nations as “cultural artifacts of a particular kind” that emerged out of the correlation of certain historical forces at the end of the eighteenth century (ibid.: 4). He (2006: 37–42) identifies the joint enterprise of the printing press and capitalism as the starting point for national consciousness: the first version of popular culture emerged out of mass readership.

Initially, the literary market encompassed “a wide but thin stratum of Latin-readers” (Anderson 2006: 38) but later Latin fell gradually out of favor and the ideas of the Reformation, advocated by Martin Luther and circulated through his German translations, produced the first instance of mass readership. “In effect, Luther became the first best-selling author so known” (ibid.: 39; italics in original). Local vernaculars slowly replaced Latin as
administrative languages and were eventually transformed into standardized forms, giving rise to unified fields of communication and, consequently, a certain awareness of a limited community (ibid.: 41-45). “[I]t is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship” (ibid.: 7). Anderson (2006: 6) terms his conceptualization of a nation as an imagined community precisely “because the member of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the mind of each lives a communion”.

2.5. National Identity

“Yes there is scarcely a society without its major narratives, which are recounted, repeated and varied; formulae, texts, and ritualized sets of discourses which are recited in well-defined circumstances; things said once and preserved because it is suspected that behind them there is a secret or a treasure.” (Foucault 1984: 114)

The study of identity is much like the study of power: broad, varied and well beyond anything that could be summarized here. For the approach taken here, I refer to authors and theories used by Wodak et al. (1999) in their discursive study of Austrian identity. They, in turn, make use of Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis. “Formally and logically, ‘identity’ is a relational term. It defined the relationship between two or more related entities in a manner that asserts sameness or equality.” (Wodak et al. 1999: 11.) But, as both Wodak et al. and Denis-Constant Martin (1995) note, individuals change and their identities change with them; as such, identities are far from stable, and our conceptualization of identity must be able to accommodate that.

Wodak et al. (1999: 3-4) treat national identity as a form of social identity, which is produced and reproduced discursively, and contains “a complex of similar conceptions and perceptual schemata, of similar emotional dispositions and attitudes, and of similar behavioral conventions, which bearers of
this ‘national identity’ share collectively and which they have internalised through socialisation”. Like Fairclough, they assume that there is a dialectic relationship between discourse practice and societal structures. In the discursive formation of nations and national identities, their approach focuses on “national uniqueness and intra-national uniformity but largely ignore intra-national differences” (ibid.: 4); “In imagining national singularity and homogeneity, members of a national community simultaneously construct the distinctions between themselves and other nations”. As Martin (1995) puts it:

“From the start, it appears that part of the problem lies with the uses to which the word identity is put. As a tool for describing political clashes, it connotes homogeneity and permanence. In the process, the polysemy of identity is erased, and the complexity of the relationships needed in order to define the concept of identity is diluted. Identity implies both uniqueness and sameness.”

This kind of view of identity also makes it fragile, ambivalent and easily changed, and thus national identity is continually re-formulated (Wodak et al. 1999: 4).

For the analysis of national identity, what is needed is a concrete set of tools to elaborate exactly what to look for. Stuart Hall (1996: 613–614), for instance, lists five aspects of the narration of national culture:

1. *Narrative of the nation*, told in national histories, literature, media, popular culture, containing stories, events, symbols and rituals that represent shared experiences;
2. *Origin, tradition and timelessness*, “the essentials of national character” (ibid.: 614) that remain unchanged through history;
3. *Invention of tradition*, a certain set of practices that are, through repetition, aligned with the continuity of an appropriate historical past;
4. *Myth of origin*, a foundational story that “locates the origin of the nation, the people and their national character so early that they are lost in the mists of, not ‘real’ but ‘mythic’ time” (ibid.);
5. And the *idea of an original people*. 
Separating these five aspects into five distinct points is not entirely unproblematic, as many of them are mutually connected, and the fifth aspect is not always easily applicable, as Wodak et al. (1999: 24) discovered in their own study. Because of its history as an immigrant nation, the United States is likely a similarly difficult case. Because of the intertwined nature of these aspects, the analysis will approach them comprehensively rather than addressing each point separately. In order to analyze national identity in a methodologically sensible way, a systemic functional method will be used. A brief introduction to it is presented below.

3. In Practice: A Systemic-Functional Method

A functional approach to language is the study of language in context; study of how and why language is affected by specific situations and specific cultural settings. As Butt et al. (2000: 2) point out, adult speakers and writers navigate this minefield of context-dependant ways of using language subconsciously, both in producing texts themselves as well as classifying the contexts of texts they encounter. It is this awareness that allows us to both make a speech, or write a poem, a wedding invitation or a Master’s thesis, and to recognize a piece of text as such. It is this aspect of language use that a functional approach to language is concerned with. Systemic functional linguistics (SFL for short), a widely used resource of language analysis that can mostly be attributed to the work of M.A.K Halliday, provides concrete “techniques and appropriate vocabulary” (Butt et al. 2000: 2) for the functional study of language.

The first notable defining characteristic of systemic functional linguistics in comparison to other approaches is its view of the study of language: According to Martin (2010: 14) SFL views language as “a large network of interrelated choices” and thus has a “considerable emphasis on the idea of choice” – “what you say in relation to what you could have said”. This is different from what Martin calls a “syntagmatic perspective”, “on what you say in relation to what you said before and what you are going to say next” (ibid.). The second notable characteristic is a keen interest in the relationship between language and
context; “you cannot understand the meaning of what someone says or writes unless you know something about the context in which it is embedded” (ibid.).

The first part of the analysis will feature components of three aspects of systemic functional grammar: Theme, Mood and Transitivity. These three components provide tools for examining thematic progression within the speech (Theme, as its name suggests), the participants and entities taking part (Mood) and the events and processes taking place (Transitivity). The second part is oriented towards examining the so-called texture of the text, referring to ways in which certain themes are carried forward to build coherence within the text. These terms and the theory behind them will be explained in more detail below, and will be addressed again in the analysis itself.

3.1. The Text As a Unit of Analysis

The culmination of the analysis is always a text. Texts – “bits of language” as Suzanne Eggins (2004: 1) calls them – are specific instances of language in use. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 1) define a text as “any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole”. Generally, it is quite easy to recognize whether a sequence of sentences form a coherent whole; when uncertainties arise, as they inevitably sometimes do, the familiar reaction is usually to reread the passage until it makes sense or until it clearly does not. Rather than a grammatical unit, it is “a unit of language in use” and is perhaps best described as a “semantic unit: a unit not of form but of meaning” (ibid. 1-2). What separates a text from a non-text (a group of mutually unrelated sentences) is something called ‘texture’.

Texture – what Halliday and Hasan (ibid.: 2) call “the property of being a text” – is derived “from the fact that it functions as a unity with respect to its environment”. It is further divided into two subcomponents: “coherence, or the text’s relationship to it extra-textual context (the social and cultural context of its occurrence), and cohesion, the way the elements within a text bind it together as a ‘unified whole’” (Eggins 2004: 24). Cohesion is a more semantic concept, realized in lexicogrammatical choices such as reference and
ellipsis (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 5). The context, on the other hand, includes both the sense of a broader cultural setting and, within it, the situation itself, with certain participants and a certain mode of communication.

Context can thus be further divided into two sub-components: the context of situation, and the context of culture. In studying texts, ‘genre’ is the term used to refer to the cultural context, while ‘register’ refers to the situation. Genre matters because “negotiating texts depends in part on identifying ways in which a particular text is similar to, reminiscent of, other texts circulating in the culture” (Eggins 2004: 55). The term takes many meanings across many disciplines of study, but here it is used in a strictly systematic functional sense, as habitual ways of using language in specific social contexts: recognizable patterns and structures built into specific texts allow us to identify its “generic identity”, as Eggins call it (2004: 55-56). Register, on the other hand, represents the parts brought into the text by the context that “constrains the appropriacy of using a particular genre, and which gives to the abstract schematic structure the ‘details’ that allow us to accurately place a text in terms of dimensions such as who was involved in producing the text, what the text is about and what role language was playing in the event” (ibid.: 87-88).

The terms ‘context of culture’ and ‘context of situation’ were originally proposed by an anthropologist called Malinowski, who, while translating texts of a Melanesian people whom he was studying in Papua New Guinea, found that direct translations of the texts made little sense in English without knowledge of the contextual background. Malinowski’s ideas (cf. Malinowski 1923, 1935) eventually found their way into Halliday’s theory on language and context though the work of an English linguist called J. R. Firth. By that time Firth and his students had refined the concept of the context of situation and adopted the term ‘register’ to denote the study of language in relation to the context of situation, as well as developing three subcategories for describing register: field, tenor and mode. (Martin 2010: 14-16.)
3.2. Three Levels of Experience and Analysis

The three categories of register – field, tenor and mode – are particularly important because they relate to a significant claim made by Halliday on the way language functions. First, however, it is necessary to elaborate what these terms mean. ‘Field’ is the term used to refer to, as Martin (2010: 16) puts it, “what is going on, where what is going on is interpreted institutionally in terms of some culturally recognized activity”, ranging anything from tennis or poker to politics, auctions or farming. Field encompasses any kind of social activity in which language is involved. The second term, ‘tenor’, “refers to the way you relate to other people when doing what you do” (ibid.). Eggins (2004: 99-100), borrowing a classification by Cate Poynton (1985), further differentiates three dimensions of tenor that affect “role occupation in a given situation”: power, contact and affective involvement. The third term is ‘mode’, which refers to the selected channel of communication. The obvious choice, as Martin (2010: 16-17) notes, would be between written and spoken language, but modern channels such as SMS messages, blogs and films complicate the picture. (For a more thorough treatment of the three terms, see Eggins 2004: 90-109.)

Halliday later integrated these three categories into his work on the relation between language and context and took them one step further, discovering “striking parallels” between the three categories of register and “the structure of language itself” (Martin 2010: 17). This discovery led him to form the three levels of analysis and meaning: ideational meaning, containing both the experiential meaning represented within clauses and logical meaning between clauses (field); interpersonal meaning, the realization of interpersonal roles and relationships (tenor); and textual meaning, the organization of clauses through continuity and foregrounding (mode). The significant claim made by Halliday and systemic functional linguistics is that “lexico-grammatical organization of language is itself a realization of the semantic organization of language” (Eggins 2004: 110; bold in original):
“In identifying these three main types of meaning, Halliday is suggesting that of all the uses we make of language (which are limitless and changing), language is designed to fulfill three main functions: a function for relating experience, a function for creating interpersonal relationships, and a function for organizing information.” (Eggins 2004: 110-111)

In the actual analysis, each of these three main functions also have their own sets of grammatical tools and terminology. However, as Eggins (2004: 206) notes, while the three levels of analysis themselves are separate, they are usually realized by clause constituents that are playing more than one function at a time.

Ideational meaning encodes, simply put, “how we represent reality in language”, and is realized through two analytical sub-systems: inside the clause, and between clauses. Inside the clause, this refers to experiential meaning, meaning “the choice of process types and participant roles seen as realizing interactants’ encoding of their experiential reality: the world of actions, relations, participants and circumstances that give content to their talk.” The term for this type of ideational-level analysis is ‘Transitivity’. It revolves around the choice of Process Type, which implicates “associated participant roles and configurations.” (Ibid: 206.) Between clauses, logical meaning refers to the way individual clauses containing experiential meaning are linked to each other, creating what are known as ‘clause complexes’. There are two ways in which clauses can be logically linked: “that of taxis (or how two or more adjacent clauses are linked to each other through relations of dependency or interdependency) and logico-semantics (the types of meanings that allow adjacent clauses to project or expand on each other)” (Eggins 2004: 254; bold in original).

While ideational meaning refers to ways in which reality can be represented through language, interpersonal meaning – as its name suggests – contains tools for dissecting ways in which relationships and roles are built into clauses. Interpersonal meaning works through “variables like clause structure (interrogative, declarative), attitudinal words with positive or negative meaning, expressions referring to degrees of certainty of obligation (modality), and other markers” (Eggins 2004: 110). “Establishing social identities… is not done by holding up a sign with a role label on it. Instead, it is done through talk.” (ibid.:}
The core of interpersonal meaning is in what is called the ‘Mood’ element of the clause, which consists of a Subject (a nominal group) and a Finite (a verbal group). The Mood element contains an expression of polarity (yes or no) as well as temporal and modal anchors, which “bring it down to earth so we can argue about it” (Eggins 2004: 151).

The third type of meaning, textual meaning, “breathes relevance into the other two” (Halliday 1994: xiii). It is concerned with “the structural configurations by which the clause is organized as a message”, with the analysis revolving around “the two main functional components of a Theme (point of departure for the message) and a Rheme (new information about the point of departure)” (Eggins 2004: 296). “This is the level of organization of the clause which enables the clause to be packaged in ways which make it effective given its purpose and its context” (ibid.: 298). In English, textual choice is realized through what is placed first and last in a clause, while other languages might use different kinds of signals to identify particular constituents. Typically, Theme, which comes first, contains familiar or given information. “[T]he choice of what gets to be Theme in an English clause contributes very significantly to the communicative effect of the message.” (Ibid.) The boundary between Theme and Rheme is determined according to the roles the constituents have in terms of Transitivity and Mood functions; a succinct overview of this is provided by Eggins (2004: 300-308).

“The essential distinguishing characteristic of the SFL model is that it sets up a realizational relationship extending all the way from the most abstract levels of context (ideology) through to the very concrete words, structures, sounds and graphology of text.” (ibid.: 328) A systemic-functional view of language treats it as a three-level semiotic system, with the focal point of the analysis, the text, integrating three levels of meaning simultaneously: the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual. These three in turn are realized in lexico-grammatical choices through four systems of grammatical structure: Mood, Transitivity, Clause Complex and Theme. A text is a sequence of choices as well as “the realization of contextual dimensions, including specific situational configurations of field, mode and tenor (register), cultural conventions (genre) and ideological positions. Language is thus modeled not just as a resource
embedded in a social and cultural context, but as a resource through whose use we are continually constructing, maintaining and defining what constitutes appropriate meanings in possible contexts in our culture.” (Eggins 2004: 327.)

3.3. Systemic Functional Linguistics in Discourse Analysis

Systemic functional linguistics has found comfortable niches in a variety of areas of linguistic study. According to Suzanne Eggins (2004: 2; bold in original), SFL gains much of its analytical versatility from its “common focus on the analysis of authentic products of social interaction (texts), considered in relation to the cultural and social context in which they are negotiated”. According to Halliday (1994: xv), “[t]he aim has been to construct a grammar for purposes of text analysis: one that would make it possible to say sensible and useful things about any text, spoken or written, in modern English”. Unsurprisingly, SFL has found a comfortable place in Norman Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis. As Halliday himself notes (1994: xvi): “A discourse analysis that is not based on grammar is not an analysis at all, but simply a running commentary on a text.”

In Halliday’s (1994: xv) view, the analysis of a text is a two-step process: first, the initial and purely linguistic analysis of the text and its grammatical features; second, the interpretation of the text in its situational and cultural context, clearing up ambiguities left by the initial analysis. The grammatical analysis belongs in the first step, and is ideally “followed up by some further commentary or exegesis” (ibid.: xvi) in the second. Widowson, however, points out that an ordinary reader or listener does not proceed through this kind of two-level process to understand a text. Therefore he takes a different view, treating individual texts as existing in conjunction with context. “We do not read possible meanings off from the text; we read plausible meanings into a text, prompted by the purpose and conditioned by the context” (Widowson 2010: 165).

“The kinds of pragmatic meaning that are ascribed to particular uses of language must be related to the semantic meanings which are inscribed in the grammar. The externalized functions are realizations, under various contextual
and other conditions, of the internalized functions that constitute meaning potential.” (Widowson 2010: 177; italics in original.)

Widowson’s conclusion is therefore that a systemic functional analysis can provide “an extremely detailed set of descriptive devices which can be used in specifying the linguistic features of texts” (ibid.: 170), but its usefulness is limited in the semantic realm, therefore serving only as “a pointer” to significant pragmatic issues in the realm of discourse. However, since pragmatic and semantic meaning are so closely intertwined in the same text, there must be a close relationship between the two (ibid.).

In his own approach to discourse and its analysis, Norman Fairclough (1992: 64) identifies what he calls the “three aspects of constructive effects of discourse”: first, the construction of social identities and subjects; second, the construction of relationships between these identities and subjects; and third, the construction of systems representing knowledge and beliefs. The first two – termed as “‘identity’ and ‘relational’ functions of language – Fairclough links to the interpersonal function in Halliday’s framework (ibid.). The third, “ideational”, bears the same name in both approaches. Based on this dual-trinity of functions, Widowson (2010: 167) formulates that “the ideational function can be understood as the relationship between the ego, first-person self, to third-person reality out there, and the interpersonal function as the relationship between first-person self and second-person other”.

This, however, still leaves Halliday’s third function, the textual. Fairclough (1994: 65) mentions the textual function in an offhand manner, referring to the way “bits of information” are highlighted, assumed or linked to each other. Widowson (2010: 167-168) terms the textual function as serving “an enabling purpose”, but nonetheless considers it a problematic part of fitting SFL and CDA to each other. Expanding on this, Widowson (2010: 168) identifies the mutual separation of the three levels of grammar as a handicap: “When the semantic resources are actualized pragmatically as text, they act upon each other in various ways,” and “[t]he more such inter-systemic dependencies could be accounted for, the closer the grammar of the system would approximate
to the grammar of text in that it would obviously increase semantic constraints on pragmatic meaning, and narrow down interpretative possibilities”.

Widowson (2010: 174-176) warns of making the tempting equation between the discourse functions identified by Fairclough and the grammatical functions identified by Halliday. Providing an example of Fairclough’s own analysis, Widowson points out that relying overmuch on the systemic-functional toolkit for discourse analysis poses a limitation. “This is the assumption that semantic signification is directly projected as pragmatic significance in language use, that people make meaning by the simple expedient of activating the socially motivated linguistic encoding described in S/F linguistics” (ibid.: 176). This pitfall he calls the “functional fallacy”. When a text arrives in the hands of a researcher, it is already removed from its original context, and it is deceptively easy to latch onto specific interpretations in favor of others. Though the context has left its mark in the actual grammatical realizations, care must be taken when drawing conclusions from the material.

4. The Art of Political Rhetoric

Politicians spend a significant portion of their careers speaking. They address their constituency and the general public; they debate and draft legislation; they listen to opinions and arguments from various interest groups and in turn do their best to promote their own views. A cynic might view the art of political rhetoric as the skill of speaking much while saying very little. Nonetheless, the amount of time those with political power spend wielding it verbally suggests that talk does indeed matter. American presidents are no exception in this regard, and have been known to speak quite a bit. Ellis (1998: 1), for instance, refers to “[p]residential leadership of public opinion” – but that will be discussed in more detail in the section on the American presidency below. As such, it is prudent to address political rhetoric as an object of study, and place it in some context in regards to Critical Discourse Analysis.

If previous sections have relied heavily on Fairclough, Foucault and Halliday, this section revolves largely around the work of Paul Chilton. In
comparison to Fairclough’s societal viewpoint, Chilton’s more cognitively
oriented approach brings the concept of discourse closer to the level of the
individual, and while he views the applicability of Critical Discourse Analysis in
certain contexts with some wariness (see, for instance, Chilton 2005), he offers
valuable insight into ways in which links between discourse and the human mind
could be drawn. The following section uses Chilton’s particular framework,
which approaches discourse production and processing from the viewpoint of an
individual. Metaphors as cognitive concepts are of particular interest here, and
will be discussed in some detail. This, however, does not change the fact that the
analysis itself will not attempt to explain what kind of mental processes have led
to the addresses being formulated in the way they are, or how individual listeners
process the words. Thus, the second section concerns rhetorical persuasion, and
what implications it holds for the analysis itself.

4.1. A Discursive Art

The definition of political associations, according to Paul Chilton (2004: 5;
emphasis in the original), “is a shared perceptions of values”, echoing the concept
of imagined communities as laid out by Benedict Anderson (2006). It is this
human capacity for language – genetically based but socially activated – which
allows the communication of these perceptions to others in the group, on what is
deemed advantageous, or just, or useful (ibid.). Chilton explores this relationship
between the cognitive and social aspects of language in some detail, starting with
the basic building blocks of asking why people say what they do.

If one takes the view that language has developed as a consequence
and means of social interaction and not simply as by-product of genetic mutation,
Chilton (2004: 32) offers a machiavellian view of language use, with human
communication resting on what he calls “reciprocal altruism”: “The primary
expectation is that individuals will truthfully intend to communicate
representations of the environment, with the back-up that everyone also has the
ability to check for consistency and cheating.” The first key word for Chilton is
cooperation, which in his words “requires explication in terms of social
intelligence” (Chilton 2004: 42) and at the very least “the illusion of consensual (undistorted) understanding” (ibid.: 45; emphasis in original) between participants. Nonetheless, speakers use various strategies to manage their self-interest, in (mis)representing and legitimizing their actions, not always through truthful means (ibid.: 45-46). The second key word is representation.

Representation is partly about reference, links between linguistic symbols and things which exist somewhere in the world. Referential meaning, however, must necessarily be complimented by what Chilton (2004: 48-50) refers to as “sense”, mental representations which are continuously cross-checked, entertained and circulated by individuals in social interaction. Indeed, Chilton’s approach to political text and talk concerns largely the “examination of possible mental representations stimulated by such text and talk”, with two main venues: the competing constructions of the world which speakers promote; and the actors and processes in those worlds (ibid.: 50). Long-term knowledge is stored as so-called frames, “theoretical constructs, having some cognitive, ultimately, neural reality” that structure cultural experience – entities and their properties, times and places, and the relationships between them (ibid.: 51).

Another part of human conceptualization, and of particular interest here, is the metaphor. Rather than a mere literary device, the metaphor here is a way in which the mind maps “well understood source domains of experience onto more schematic ones” (Chilton 2004: 51-52). Such metaphorical tools allow the utilization of familiar frames in matters which are unfamiliar or complex – an undeniably valuable tool for any political speaker. Conceptual metaphors are not presented here in any great detail, but one thorough examination of them is provided by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Chilton (2004: 52) himself provides a chilling example of effective metaphor usage in Hitler’s Mein Kampf, which uses frames related to microbes or disease when referring to Jews. The totality of the projected actors and events Chilton terms a “discourse world”, discursive realities entertained or meta-represented by speakers, projections of who does what to whom in what circumstances, and the analysis of such discourses requires the “unpacking” of these discourse worlds and their representations (ibid.: 54-55). The systemic functional method could be a valuable tool in unpacking these components in a systematic manner, precisely because it structures text through
grammatical categories that can in turn be brought together and analyzed comprehensively.

4.2. A Persuasive Art

Though previous sections have already touched upon the matter of why language matters in politics, the specific issue of how rhetorical prowess translates into cognitive and societal change has yet to be addressed. One could, of course, simply view rhetorical argumentation as a clash of cold, rational facts, in which the soundest argument prevails. Or one could simply posit that speakers simply “persuade” their interlocutors of the correctness of their preferred course of action” (Krebs & Jackson 2007: 36; emphasis in the original). This view, however, is not the view endorsed here, for the simple reason that “such mechanisms rest on a strong specification of the subjective motivations of the individuals and thus are methodologically intractable” (ibid.). No researcher on earth has access to the interests and motives of the speakers and writers whose words they study. Krebs and Jackson (2007: 36) prefer to “avoid centering causal accounts on unanswerable questions about actor’s true motives and to focus instead on what actors say, in what contexts, and to what audiences”. They are not claiming that actors do not have motives and interests, or that they do not shape actors’ behavior in significant ways; they are, however, claiming that motives and interests are severely limited as an explanatory analytical tool (ibid.: 41). The focus, therefore, has to be on “observable rhetorical contests, on narrative and language games” (ibid.).

Krebs and Jackson offer their own approach, which they call a model of ‘rhetorical coercion’. The model seeks to explain “how and why skillful rhetorical maneuvering can underpin a successful political campaign – not by persuading one’s opponents of the rectitude of one’s stance, but by denying them the rhetorical materials out of which to craft a socially sustainable rebuttal” (Krebs & Jackson 2007: 42). Their model allows – or rather presupposes – “that norms are inherently subject to challenge and that the rhetorical arrangements sustaining norms are never fully stabilized and are at best relatively stable” (ibid.:
41; italics in the original). It also relies on purely linguistic material for its analysis, and does not presume that words reflect the actors’ true beliefs. The specific conflict can concern the terms of the debate – what Krebs and Jackson call a “framing contest” – or, if the terms have been set, the concrete measures needed – a so-called “implication contest”. The parties are “attempting to outmaneuver each other onto more favorable rhetorical terrain and thereby to close off routes of acceptable rebuttal”. (Krebs & Jackson 2007: 44-45.)

Though Krebs and Jackson do not use the concept of frames in any cognitive sense, it is not an insurmountable leap of logic to apply a framework of cognitive frames and metaphors to the model of rhetorical coercion. On political debate, of course, there is usually an audience; political debaters are rarely actually attempting to persuade each other. Rhetorical persuasion, as Jonathan Charteris-Black (2005: 9) points out, has two sides. One is the rhetoric itself, “the act of communication from the hearer’s perspective”, while persuasion “refers both to speaker intentions and to successful outcomes”. Charteris-Black has focused specifically on metaphors as a tool of political rhetoric, treating the metaphor as “first and foremost a linguistic phenomenon – though it does have pragmatic and cognitive characteristics” (Charteris-Black 2005: 14; emphasis on original). When used appropriately, metaphors can be an effective tool, both in the realm of conscious, rational argumentation and unconsciously processed emotions: “Metaphor is an important characteristic of persuasive discourse because it mediates between these conscious and unconscious means of persuasion – between cognition and emotion – to create a moral perspective on life” by activating emotional associations, both positive and negative (ibid.: 13).

Successful persuasion needs both of these aspects, the rational and the emotional, the conscious and the unconscious (Charteris-Black 2005: 13). Skilled speakers – and, in modern times, their speechwriters – have to make use of a wide variety of rhetorical tools to gain and maintain the attention of their audience – tools such as Biblical allusions, rhetorical questions or recounted anecdotes – as well as to ensure that their message fits their political image (ibid.: 8) The inaugural address comes at the end of a long and arduous political campaign, and while one side has prevailed and the other has lost, the country as a whole has gained a leader. To some extent, the election of a president is always a
moment of transition for the entire country, even when the incumbent is re-elected. At the inauguration, the president is expected to show the way forward, and to reflect on the distance that has already been traveled.

5. Studies in Americanism

“It has been our fate as a nation not to have ideologies, but to be one.” (Historian Richard Hofstadter, cited in Lipsen 1996: 18)

Given its position as a (if not the) dominating force in the current global society of nations, Americanism and American identity have been quite understandably studied widely by the academic community. The central stage here is given to Robert N. Bellah (1976) with his concept of an American “civil religion”, and Vanessa B. Beasly (2004), who has studied American identity in presidential inauguration and state-of-the-union addresses. The aim is not to re-invent the wheel: to discover broad patterns of specific discourse already established to be prevalent in presidential or political rhetoric. With only two speeches to analyze, such generalizations would, in any case, be questionable. It is to be expected that the speeches will share a great deal in common – they are, after all, examples of a highly specified sub-genre within the wide and varied field of political language – but also personal touches among the broad strokes. This section presents the broad strokes referred to in the analysis: the exceptional origins of American identity and its particular nature as a kind of a civil religion.

Ricento (ibid.: 5) points out that while any number of texts could influence narratives on national identity, studying all of them is simply out of the question, and therefore particular attention should be paid to those that “intersect with and influence the greatest number of people” – more often than not, those of important social institutions or members of political and social elites. Similarly, Fairclough (1995: 37) views a focus on social institutions as the best possible “pivot” point between social structures and concrete events, and favors focusing on such instances instead of casual conversation, “as has been the fashion.” Any individual’s sense of national identity is formed in a crossfire of
conflicting or mutually enforcing discourses. The inaugural address, while certainly prominent, is still but a single flash in a continuous barrage.

This is also one of the hurdles faced by modern American presidents. “Presidential leadership of public opinion, though nowhere mentioned in the Constitution, is one of the defining roles of the contemporary presidency”, Richard J. Ellis (1998: 1) notes, and continues: “We take it for granted that the president should speak to the people and for the people.” This has not always been so in American history; “Many nineteenth-century Americans would have found such notions decidedly odd” (ibid.). Changes in the role the president plays in national politics have naturally also affected the way they are elected. Referring to the work done by James Ceaser on changes in the development of presidential selection system, Ellis notes:

“In the nineteenth century, styles of campaigns were constrained by norms requiring that candidates conduct themselves in a manner as dignified as that appropriate for the office to which they aspired. That is, ‘campaigning’ took its tone from traditional modes of governance. In our century, governing has become a continuation of the processes that led to election. That is, ‘governing’ takes its tone from modern modes of campaigning.” (Ellis 1998: 217.)

Before such changes in governance could take place, however, the United States of America was founded. The following segments cover three topics connected to American political life: firstly, a very, very brief overview of the cultural origins of the United States; secondly, the work of Robert N. Bellah on the American civil religion is explored; and thirdly, the role of the President and the inaugural address are considered in the context of American political life. These set the stage for the brief biographies of Presidents Kennedy and Obama in the following chapter. Both of these men are products of a nation created on July 4, 1776. The American Revolution and the subsequent establishment of new nation in the New World have left their own traces in the American national identity.
5.1. The Roots of American Identity

“The American self-image,” Michael Jay Friedman (2008) writes, “has harnessed its creative tension between pluralism and assimilation”. On the one hand, new arrivals have been expected to immerse themselves in the so-called melting pot of American culture; on the other hand, the American identity has embraced, at least in theory, the diversity of races, religions and creeds, and is “grounded in actions and attitudes” rather than on “‘accidents of birth’”. After all, in a nation composed almost entirely of immigrants, certain aspects of national identity – such as the idea of an original people – would have to be constructed somewhat differently.

In Western context, as Ricento (2003: 4) notes, the origins of the United States are quite unique. Initially, America was a nation of European colonizers, many of them fleeing religious persecution to a “New World” populated by people with alien appearance, customs and languages; the colonizers thus wanted to make a distinction not only between them and the Native American inhabitants, but also the lives and histories they had left behind in the “old world”. Therefore, in a relatively short time, the national identity had to be discursively constructed around “collective symbols” – these included a federal democratic republic, a new national language and, on a more general level, the idea of American exceptionalism. Many of these had roots in Anglo-Saxon culture, and though the British were by no means the only nationality represented in the new nation, the influence of British political thought dominated the emerging discourses of nationality.

5.2. The American Civil Religion

Robert N. Bellah (1976) starts his presentation of the American civil religion with excerpts (the very beginning and the very end) from Kennedy’s inaugural address and notes that God is mentioned a total of three times. In general, Bellah notes, that despite the constitutional separation of state and church, similar references to God are almost invariably to be found in the pronouncements of American
presidents on solemn occasions: not references to a Christian God, or Jesus, or a church, but only “to the concept of God, a word that almost all Americans can accept but that means so many different things to so many different people that it is almost an empty sign” (ibid.). Clearly, there is something going on with the relationship between the United States of America and God.

Bellah discerns an elaborate myth which seems to be pervasive in presidential rhetoric: the myth of the United States as God’s chosen nation on earth. On one hand, this means that the United States is conceptualized as being an American Israel, a chosen nation legitimized by its adherence to a “‘higher law’ that is itself based on both classical natural law and biblical religion” (Bellah 1967). On the other hand, because of its status as the biblical ‘city upon a hill’, the United States also has a moral obligation to the world to do its best to uphold these laws not only in its own country but abroad as well. Bellah notes that in the past, this belief has led the nation to embark on some questionable escapades, and sometimes to the mistreatment of domestic groups which did not adhere to the holy trinity of “God, country, and flag” (ibid.).

5.3. The Presidency and Its Inauguration

At the center of American political system stands the office of the president. It is a contradictory force in American politics. In the Constitution, the presidency is defined in ambiguous terms – its drafters were naturally wary of establishing such a powerful office shortly after fighting off a monarchy, but nonetheless felt that strong leadership would be needed in the future (Cronin & Genovese 1998: 2-3). The modern presidency has evolved from the form it originally took in 1787, and is now larger, more powerful and more “closely connected to popular passions” (ibid.: 5): “the president is, in essence, the one truly national voice and representative of the American people”. Cronin and Genovese (1998: 3) also note that “[t]oday the informal and symbolic powers of the presidency account for as much as the formal, stated ones. Presidential powers expand and contract in response to varying situational and technological changes.”
Thus, the president speaks to and on behalf of the American people. Bellah (1967), for instance, used various speeches by American presidents from Lincoln to Johnson in his own analysis. In studying national identity, one option, used by Wodak et al. (1999), is to use a variety of material, including literature and personal interviews, to build a comprehensive picture of how national identity is used. However, focusing solely on presidential rhetoric provides a different but no less useful perspective:

“Any presidential address delivered to the nation is a well-crafted piece of rhetoric, carefully designed to advance specific themes as well as the speaker. Rather than seeing the contrived nature of these speeches as a detriment to what they can reveal about the culture, one might view them instead as especially meaningful precisely because they provide information about the ideal.” (Beasley 2004: 12; emphasis in original.)

As a genre, inaugural addresses – used here in the American context – have been, as Dillon et al. (1990: 189) calls “hard nuts for academic and intellectual cracking”: they seem to be a genre of their own, with no clear argumentative or reflective function, though they obviously have symbolic significance. Rather, the inaugural address restores “ideological normality, which is to say invisibility,” which has been disturbed during the elections: “The partisan strife of a presidential campaign heightens public awareness of the relation of discourse to power; the surface of the hegemonic consensus is ruffled, and it must be made smooth in order to return to the normal functions of government.” (Ibid.) At the inauguration, the new President rises above that partisan strife and re-establishes the common American identity (Dillon et al. 1990: 189–190).

That is not to say that all of them will be permanently inscribed in the country’s national consciousness. “One of the memorable characteristics of inaugural addresses is how forgettable most of them are,” an article in Fox News (2009b) noted before the inauguration of Barack Obama, speculating whether the new president, known for his skills as an orator, would reach the rhetorical heights of masters like John F. Kennedy or Franklin Roosevelt – not to mention
Lincoln and Jefferson. The article quotes Leo Ribuffo, history professor at George Washington University, who counts the number of memorable inaugural addresses as “‘eight-nine if you’re a historian, maybe three or four if we just have a vague sense of the past’”, while “‘[t]he number of plodding speeches is almost countless.’” Ribuffo also notes that, in his opinion, ”’Americans understand really that an inauguration is like a graduation or a wedding. There's a kind of rhetoric of great optimism and then afterward, well maybe the graduate doesn't get the greatest job in the world. Maybe the marriage is a little rocky. But today, at least, let's look on the bright side.’”

6. The Tale of Two Presidents

The election of Barack Obama as the 44th President of the United States sparked many comparisons to an earlier time when a relatively young and charismatic man was elected to lead the country. Although the two tales share a number of similarities, John F. Kennedy and Barack Obama came from vastly different backgrounds. As such, the choice of these two particular presidents was not coincidental; neither do they offer a representative selection of the forty-four men who have thus far occupied the office. They are both Democrats, charismatic speakers and relatively young (some might claim, and indeed have, that this translates into relative inexperience) in comparison to their peers. Of course, their paths also diverge in significant ways.

Here, short biographies of Presidents Kennedy and Obama are provided. Particular attention is paid to the wider societal and political conditions at the time of their election as president – given the fact that we are dealing with the United States, this requires not only a look at national but international politics as well. Additionally, particular attention is paid to their political campaigns and the themes which were featured prominently in them. It is not unreasonable to expect that topics which are prominently featured in the campaign, as well as specific characterizations of the world and the nation, are likely carried over into the inaugural address itself. Though this provides a certain amount of context for the two speeches, they are nonetheless already removed from the circumstances in
which they originally took place, and it is now impossible to re-capture that moment.

6.1. John F. Kennedy

“Some would say that those struggles are all over, that all the horizons have been explored, that all the battles have been won, that there is no longer an American frontier. But I trust that no one in this assemblage would agree with that sentiment; for the problems are not all solved and the battles are not all won; and we stand today on the edge of a New Frontier – the frontier of the 1960's, the frontier of unknown opportunities and perils, the frontier of unfilled hopes and unfilled threat.” (John F. Kennedy, accepting the Democratic Presidential Nomination on 15 July, 1960)

The life and presidency of John F. Kennedy has gained an almost mythical quality. It has inspired a vast amount of literature, some of it building and maintaining the legend and legacy of a great man, while others are keen to question whether Kennedy truly earned his mythic stature (Victor Lasky, one of the writers quoted below, belongs to the latter group) (Paper 1975: 3-4). John Fitzgerald Kennedy was born in Boston on May 29, 1917 to a wealthy Irish Catholic Family. Forty-three and a half years later, sworn in as the 35th President of the United States, he had become a war hero, won a Pulitzer, served three terms and a total of thirteen years in Congress and overcome (mostly in secret) a number of dangerous illnesses. He was the first President of the United States born in the twentieth century, the first Catholic president and, as Giglio (1991: xii) notes in the light of his recently published medical records, perhaps the most medicated president in American history.

In 1961, the United States was a nation “in transition” (Giglio 1991: 25): though it remained the world’s most prosperous nation and enjoyed relatively steady growth, Japan and West Germany had begun their economic advancement, while the Soviet Union was gaining ground in technological development; a number of new nations were emerging in Asia and Africa,
drawing the cold war rivalry into the third world; and at home, the civil rights movement was gaining momentum and publicity. After the Congressional Elections of 1958, the Democratic Party had gained significant victories in both houses and strengthened its liberal wing. Dallek (2003: 235-236) identifies the reasons for this transformation as “[a] recession producing higher unemployment nationwide and farm failures in the Midwest, Republican support of integration in the South and anti-union right-to-work laws in industrial states, and the ‘missile gap’ – fears that America was losing the arms race to Russia”.

When, after a successful career in Congress, Kennedy turned his attention to the presidency, his Catholicism – which had been an advantage in Massachusetts – turned into a weakness. “In some respects, religion became Kennedy’s greatest obstacle because of the long-standing public sentiment against Catholic presidential aspirants.” (Giglio 1991: 7.) He began an aggressive nationwide campaign in 1957, advocating the welfare-state and “attuned to civil liberties” (ibid.: 13), though his voting record on issues related to civil rights was mixed (ibid.: 14). In foreign policy he, “[l]ike most senators, believed in the domino theory and viewed communism as a monolith”; however, he also opposed European colonialism, a view not shared by his Democrat colleagues (ibid.: 15).

Having achieved the Democratic presidential candidacy, he faced Richard Nixon as his opponent. The current Republican president, Eisenhower, was still popular, and so Kennedy “needed two things. He needed poetry, and he needed a country with some desire, however vague, for change.” (Rich 2008.) Though the United States was by all accounts going strong, Kennedy discovered his avenue of attack in what liberal pundit Arthur Schlesinger Jr. called “‘the discrepancy between our national potential and our national performance’” (Lasky 1963: 209). He could offer a new direction while attacking Eisenhower – and, through him, the current Vice-President Nixon, who was forced into the position of arguing that “the old product is still good” (ibid.: 476) – for failing to keep up with Soviet development in education and technology, and domestically for sluggish economic growth and the neglect of disenfranchised people, including (eventually) racial minorities. During his campaign, “Kennedy came through as a somewhat paradoxical figure who radiated extreme confidence while talking of grave troubles ahead” (Lasky 1963: 21).
During the presidential campaign, the major issues were “America’s defense posture, her prestige and rate of economic growth,” and the issue referred to as “Quemoy and Matsu” – a phrase referring to American protection of Taiwan against Communist China, which Nixon supported. “These were Democratic issues. In other words, the campaign was waged on Democratic terms.” (Lasky 1963: 476.) Nixon attacked Kennedy’s youth and perceived inexperience, an issue that Kennedy had grappled with also in his race to the Democrat nomination against Harry Truman. (Giglio: 18-19.) Incidentally, the 1960 presidential election was the first with televised debates. The so-called Great Debates were a deciding factor in the election, invigorating the Kennedy campaign after a period of waning enthusiasm, while Nixon was put on the defensive; on television, Kennedy looked “pert and clean-cut” while Nixon seemed “haggard and heavy-bearded” (ibid.: 475). Though Nixon improved in later debates, the damage was done.

Both Lasky (1963: 481) and Giglio (1991: 19) agree that John F. Kennedy’s Catholicism was a major factor in the election, bringing in voters from certain areas while alienating others. Though Nixon did his best to avoid the religious issue, he was in a predicament: “Republican Catholics were being urged to vote for Kennedy because he was of their religion; and Republican Protestants were being urged to vote for him to prove they were not biased against Catholics” (Lasky 1963: 482). In the end, Kennedy prevailed over Nixon by a mere 119,450 votes, resulting in 303 electoral votes for Kennedy and 219 for Nixon. Margins in certain key states were close to negligible, instantly sparking stubborn suspicions of vote fraud, particularly in Texas and Illinois, two key states of the Kennedy victory (ibid.: 494-496).

Kennedy benefited particularly from a swing of Catholic votes as well as urban minorities, African-Americans among them; Democrats had been particularly active in African-American areas, and Kennedy had scored additional points in the last days of the campaign by interceding on behalf of Martin Luther King Jr., who had been recently jailed (ibid.: 492-493). In his inaugural address, however, civil rights were conspicuously absent, much to the relief of Southern newspapers, but to the disappointment of black leaders (ibid.: 21-13). “The inaugural address left plenty to the imagination. The language sounded forthright.
The delivery was vigorous. But the speech had its share of those banal antitheses which ghost writers have been composing ever since F.D.R.’s memorable line that we have nothing to fear except fear itself.” (Lasky 1963: 21.) Nonetheless, the speech was loved nearly universally by both Democrats and Republicans, while criticism was mostly mild.

6.2. Barack Obama

“Africa, our work will not be easy. The challenges we face require tough choices. And Democrats, as well as Republicans, will need to cast off the worn-out ideas and politics of the past, for part of what has been lost these past eight years can't just be measured by lost wages or bigger trade deficits. What has also been lost is our sense of common purpose, and that's what we have to restore.” (Barack Obama on August 28, 2008, accepting the Democratic Presidential Nomination)

Barack Hussein Obama was born to a Kenyan father and an American mother (from Kansas) in Hawaii on August 4th, 1961 – incidentally, the year of John F. Kennedy’s inauguration. He spent most of his childhood in Hawaii, except for a few years in Indonesia, and later moved to New York to attend Columbia University. He worked for some time as a community organizer in Chicago and then went on to earn his Law degree from Harvard, becoming the first African-American president of the Harvard Law Review in the process, before returning to Chicago to work as a civil rights lawyer and teaching constitutional law. He served in the Illinois State Senate for eight years before running for, and getting elected to, the U.S. Senate. (Organizing for America.)

As the presidential elections entered its most intense phase in late 2008, the United States itself faced an uncertain future. After the end of the Cold War, the nation had been left as the sole superpower on the global level, yet now found itself challenged, both by economic rivals and outright enemies. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, had left their mark. According to David E. Sanger (2009: xi), the operations in Afghanistan and Iraq had turned into
costly diversions that drained resources, damaged American legitimacy and
distracted the administration from other potent threats to national security. China
was rising, both in economically and militarily; Iran was making progress with its
nuclear program; Pakistan, a nuclear state, was wavering under the pressure from
militant groups working within its borders. The 2008 presidential election could
have very well been about foreign policy.

Instead, events took over. The dramatic collapse of the
Lehman Brothers in September and the subsequent financial panic very quickly
took over the election, and the debate began circling around bailout packages and
other measures meant to fix the crumpling economy (ibid.: xix). During the final
months of the race, the presidential election “seemed to play second fiddle to the
events of the moment” and the face of Bush’s treasure secretary Hank Paulson
was as prominent on the media as those of the presidential candidates’ (Todd &
Gawiser 2009: 24). Shortly after the Lehman collapse, McCain infamously uttered
those unfortunate words that destroyed his credibility on economic issues, and
therefore his chances for the residency, claiming that “the fundamentals of our
economy are strong” (ibid.: 25-26).

In many ways, the election of Barack Obama as the president
of the United States is still fresh in American (and foreign) minds. History has yet
to step back and consider the wider implications of Obama the President-Elect,
ever mind Obama the President. In comparison to John F. Kennedy, however,
Obama had one clear advantage in his presidential campaign: this time around,
“[t]here’s nothing vague about the public’s desire for national renewal” (Rich
2008), with the highly unpopular administration of George W. Bush still in office,
a global financial crisis wrecking havoc on the economy and a controversial,
bloody war still raging in Iraq. These three issues meant that “the stars were
aligned for the Democrats” (Kenski, Hardy & Jamieson 2010: 13) in the 2008
election. Initially, the battle for the Democratic nomination was supposed to be
between Hillary Clinton and any alternative candidate willing to challenge her –
and that candidate turned out to be Barack Obama, a young senator from Illinois.

Throughout 2008, President Bush’s approval ratings were, to
quote Kenski, Hardy and Jamieson’s (2010: 13) phrase, “subterranean”, and
therefore a significant hindrance to the Republican candidate. In fact, according to
Todd and Gawiser (2009: 10), those approval ratings meant that more than anything else, the voters were looking for change. In the battle for the Democratic nomination, Obama effectively positioned himself as the agent of change, while Clinton – and later McCain – made the mistake of focusing less on contrasting themselves with Bush and more with Obama (ibid.). The electoral battle itself, if the opposing campaigns were to be believed, was waged between a Republican “McSame” and a Democrat “tax-and-spend liberal”: “Specifically, where Obama defined himself as the agent of needed change and equated McCain both with Bush and the failed politics and policies of Washington, McCain cast himself as a maverick and contended that the liberal changes Obama proposed would worsen the economy and harm the middle class.” (Kenski, Hardy and Jamieson 2010: 17.) Obama’s race, though never an explicit theme, hovered in the background as a wild card on undecided voters, but McCain himself never used it (Todd & Gawiser 2009: 24-25) – much like Nixon never attacked Kennedy’s Catholicism. Obama, unlike Kennedy, won by a clear majority, with 365 electoral votes against McCain’s 173. He benefited particularly from the huge turnout of black and Hispanic voters, and his election, as the New York Times called it, was both “a national catharsis” from recent unpopular policies and “a strikingly symbolic moment in the evolution of the nation’s fraught racial history” (Nagourney 2008). However, Obama’s victory, and the expectations of change it accompanied, might prove too high to overcome amidst the crises the United States was facing: “Slogans that are enormously powerful motivators in campaigns can become liabilities once the realities of governing intrude” (Sanger 2009: 446). The newly elected president had shown his rhetorical skills during his campaign, and expectations for his inaugural address were naturally high. Obama’s expected themes of responsibility and accountability echoed “John F. Kennedy’s call for personal sacrifice in his 1960 inauguration address,” another article (Fox News 2009a) said. As an article in Fox News (2009b) put it: “Americans want something for the dispiriting times they live in. They have their first extraordinary speaker in decades taking the oath of office. They know how good he's been. Time for great.”
7. The Analysis

Now it is time to move to the practical application of what has been presented so far. The analysis is presented in two major sections. The first section is concerned with comparing a set of particular grammatical features of the two addresses. Some of these features show commonalities between the two speeches, hinting at – though, with only a set of two examples out of a pool of forty-four speeches, naturally not establishing – characteristics of the inaugural address as a genre. Other features reveal points of divergence, and will also be discussed. To a certain extent the first section models itself on the section on the practical application of systemic text analysis presented by Suzanne Eggins (2004: 328-352), though the analysis here is not quite as exhaustive, highlighting only certain elements of the three-level analysis.

These particular elements of systemic-functional analysis have been chosen because they allow the examination of general tendencies – broad strokes, figuratively speaking – between the two speeches. The chosen elements also concern certain key aspects of national identity: whose voice the president uses in the address; which entities and actors are most prominent, and what they are doing; where and how the national past, present and future are discussed. The aim is not to entertain an exhaustive discussion of each individual clause. Rather, the chosen elements are of central importance in studying the ‘discourse worlds’ established by Kennedy and Obama. Who participate? What do they do, and where are they situated, both in terms of time and space? In the second section, the focus shifts from grammatical features to a more straightforwardly thematic approach, revolving around so-called lexical strings. These sections collect instances revolving around three major themes – religion, past Americans, and war and work – and examine the ways in which they are woven into the speeches. To some extent these themes are already present in the first half of the analysis, but they will be examined in particular detail in the second. As a rough generalization, it could be said that while the first section is about actors and events, processes in other words, the second section concentrates on specific frames, bringing findings together for a more in-depth analysis.
The particular setting of the inauguration itself imposes certain restraints on the relationship between the speaker and the audience, and therefore also constrains the way information is presented. Goffman (1981) differentiates the role of the audience according to whether the speaker is physically present (on a podium, for instance) or removed (on TV or radio). The inauguration features both of these audience types. For the audience present at the ceremony itself, “the role of the audience is to appreciate remarks made, not to reply in any direct way. They are to conjure up what a reply might be, but not to utter it; ‘back-channel’ response alone is what is meant to be available to them.” (Goffman 1981: 138.) There is no dialogue, and as such certain elements – turn-taking and immediate feedback, for instance – are absent in this instance of political rhetoric. The audience as a whole is addressed as “imagined recipients” (ibid.; emphasis in original). Since the speech is addressed to a variety of removed audiences (present and removed, domestic and foreign), it has to take all of these aspects into account in its structuring. While the analysis and its material is presented here in written format, the initial address was, ironically, written to be spoken, and then reproduced in written form later.

First, as a point of departure, a statistical comparison shows a brief overview of the clause structure in the two texts (Table 7.A):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7.A.) Clause Structure</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>Obama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of words</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>2428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of sentences</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words per sentence</td>
<td>27.07</td>
<td>21.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clause simplexes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clause complexes = 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clause complexes = 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clause complexes &gt; 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of clauses</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words per clause</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>12.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obama’s address is significantly longer than Kennedy’s, but also features a comparatively greater number of sentences which are, on average, shorter. The
same applies also to individual clauses. Over half of all sentences in both addresses are clause simplexes (sentences consisting of only one clause), and as the number of clauses in clause complexes increases, the number of sentences in both addresses conversely decreases, so that only a handful of sentences contain more than three clauses (a few of these contain as many as eight clauses). These differences in length and clause structure will translate into lower or higher number of instances in certain grammatical elements, and because of this tables will also include percentages for easier comparison.

In terms of word density within sentences, Kennedy’s speech is comparatively denser than Obama’s. Nonetheless, both rank as dense in comparison to Eggins’ analysis of three texts (2004: 337), in which the academic excerpt, the most “written” of the three, averaged a sentence length of 22.8 words. Perhaps the relative shortness of sentences in Obama’s address is meant to counterbalance its length, which is almost twice that of Kennedy’s. Though here the material is provided in written form, it is useful to keep in mind that the inaugural address is a curious blend of spoken and written language. It is technically presented in spoken form, but prepared in advance in writing; the transcripts reproduce, for instance, President Obama’s momentary lapse in (63).

7.1. Snapshots of Discursive Worlds

The analysis presented here has three focal points: an analysis of Themes in the addresses; an analysis of Subjects found in the speech; and an analysis of Process Types. Taken together, these three categories form the basis for examining the discourse worlds laid out by Kennedy and Obama. Themes often contain presumed knowledge about the world, such as actors or institutional and geopolitical entities. Subjects focus on the entities which exist and take part within the discourse world, while Process Types concern the events taking place within that world. The material analyzed here is very particularized in its style, and certain aspects of the analysis, such as determining clause boundaries and Process Types, proved somewhat challenging. I have relied largely on examples provided by M.A.K. Halliday’s (1994) and Suzanne Eggins’ (2004) in their
introductions to functional grammar to resolve these difficulties. The first segment concerns the first grammatical element of the clause: the Theme.

7.1.A. World Themes

As the departure point of the clause, Theme is also a natural way to begin the analysis. In English, Theme is always the first element in the clause; other languages have different ways of marking a clause element as Theme, but the function itself is presumed to be universally applicable to all languages. It typically contains information that is presumed to be already familiar, either from the context or the preceding text. Theme is complimented by Rheme, which contains everything not covered by the Theme and typically includes the new information in the clause. (Eggins 2004: 299-300.) The exact boundary between Theme and Rheme is dependent on clause elements that have a function in either Transitivity or Mood analysis. Suzanne Eggins (2004: 300-320) provides a thorough summary of the exact constituents which can be included within the Theme. For the analysis here, it bears mentioning that minor clauses placed at the beginning of a clause complex are treated as single, marked Themes (the second option would be to mark the Themes on two levels, both between and within the clauses), and are also counted among the total number of marked Themes. Also, Theme as a grammatical category will be capitalized in the entire analysis to keep it separate from its topic-related namesake.

Elements within the Theme can bear various labels – textual, interpersonal or topical Themes – depending on the various functions individual components can serve in experiential meaning, but all can occur both in marked and unmarked Themes. Only one of these Theme types – textual Theme – is featured as a separate category. Textual Themes serve as cohesive links within the text, typically at the beginning of the clause; words such as because, and, although and but, which carry the narrative forward but do not serve an experiential function (Butt et al. 2000: 137-138). Marked and unmarked Themes, on the other hand, refer to patterns that are either expected, and therefore unremarkable, or unusual, and therefore noteworthy (ibid.: 139). For instance, a
clause in declarative mood typically features a Subject as its first elements. This Subject would be treated also as the Theme and as an unmarked Theme. If, on the other hand, there was an adverbial element placed before the Subject, the Theme would consist of this adverbial element and would be marked. The total number of Themes here is somewhat lower than the total number of clauses, since the element serving as the Theme in certain clause complexes has occasionally been omitted. Table 7.B. shows the distribution of unmarked and marked Thematic elements in the addresses, as well as the number of textual elements in Themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7.B.) Thematic Elements</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>Obama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual Themes</td>
<td>31 (41%)</td>
<td>61 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked Themes</td>
<td>52 (69%)</td>
<td>129 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked Themes</td>
<td>23 (31%)</td>
<td>50 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>179 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first four of these five Thematic elements – marked and unmarked Themes, marked Themes consisting of a minor clause and textual Themes – have been included because they allow for an examination of the way the speeches progress, and how that progression is signaled by the speaker. Textual Themes, of course, are specific signals meant to carry the narrative forward. However, marked Themes can also be used to draw the listener’s or reader’s attention to an element that builds coherence better than an unmarked pattern would (Butt et al. 2000: 139). On the other hand, these Thematic elements – this time excluding Textual Themes – are a convenient starting point in uncovering what the two speeches are really about, and since the analysis here focuses particularly on identity, Themes which contain the word “we”, “us” or “our” will receive special attention.

In texts largely comprised of clause simplexes, it is perhaps unsurprising that Textual Themes are in such a prominent role. Many of the ones at the beginning of those clause simplexes are words which are typically found within clause complexes, like and and but, creating continuity while still retaining a structure that primarily favors short clauses that are easier for a listener to
follow in a lengthy address. As a whole, marked Themes represent a little over a third of the total in both speeches, but minor clauses rarely serve as marked Themes. They serve as counterpoints to the unmarked Themes that dominate, often highlighting new topics or sections of particular importance. The interplay of marked and unmarked Themes builds a rhythm within the speech that carries it forward. Table 7.C. shows the number of instances related to some of the most prominent topics within the addresses, both marked and unmarked:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7.C.) Prominent Topics in Themes</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>Obama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Themes Referring to…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We/Us/Our</td>
<td>25 (33%)</td>
<td>78 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geopolitical Entities</td>
<td>16 (21%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Economy and Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges and Adversity</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Values</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firstly, it is interesting to note that the portion of Themes which contain the words “we”, “us” or “our” (as well as a few instances of deictic reference to elements that contain these words) add up to a third of all Themes in Kennedy’s address and nearly a half in Obama’s. Thus, it is safe to say that to a significant degree both addresses are about “us”, though this is only a first step in establishing how the speeches are oriented towards the world at large. Examples in this first category range from several instances of plain, unmarked “We” to lengthy noun phrases such as Kennedy’s clause number (6), “the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought” and Obama’s (94) “those values upon which our success depends” (throughout the analysis, clause number will be included in parentheses when specific instances are quoted).

In Kennedy’s address, another prominent category revolves around dividing geopolitical lines, particularly with those connected with the Cold War. Some of these Themes refer generically to “nations”, while others are localized geographically. A group of marked Themes, concentrated particularly in the early parts of the speech, divide the globe in various zones and groupings: there are nations with spiritual and cultural ties to the United States (11); former
colonial states stepping into “the ranks of the free” (14); “sister republics south of the border” (19); even the United Nations itself (23); and nations “who would make themselves our adversaries” (24i). The United States itself is boldly referred to as “this hemisphere” (22ii). After this, the focus shifts to “sides”, with references to two opposing groups organized around two superpowers in, among others, (27), (30), (31i) and (34). In contrast, Obama has only one instance of geopolitical groupings, in which he refers to “the Muslim world” (79). There are references to adversaries, of course, but unlike Kennedy, Obama identifies them as individuals – terrorists in (74iii) and oppressive leaders in (80) – rather than as specific nations or groupings of nations. There is, however, a slight echo of the Cold War in “old friends and former foes” (73).

The only group of nations Obama mentions is defined in economic, rather than geopolitical terms: “nations like ours who enjoy the relative plenty” (83i). In contrast with Kennedy’s cultural allies, Obama identifies with a certain level of economic development. Otherwise Obama lacks Kennedy’s focus on foreign entities, but Kennedy’s address in turn lacks a number of Themes connected with the American economy and institutional entities that are present in Obama’s. These national entities are particularly concentrated in the early half of Obama’s speech, starting with “[o]ur economy” (12) and continuing with “[h]omes” (13i), “[o]ur health care” (14) and, later, “[o]ur workers (37) and “our goods and services” (38ii). In comparison, there are no corresponding Themes to be found in Kennedy’s address. This disparity is evident in the category concerning challenges and adversaries as well. Kennedy focuses almost entirely on enemies (the various references to “both sides” have been included here as well), with the single exception of the danger posed by certain scientific advances in (24iii). Obama, on the other hand, identifies a specific “crisis” (10i) and speaks of “America’s decline” (16ii) and, later, “challenges” (92) in addition to the hostile individuals in (80) and (74iii).

Notably, these hostile individuals and nations are referred to in ways that classify them as enemies, not necessarily because the United States opposes them, but because they are opposed to the United States itself or unwilling to respect the values it represents. Some of them are terrorists opposed to the American way of life (Obama in 74ii) or identified as oppressive leaders
(Obama in 80 and 81i). Others simply choose to pit themselves against the United States, as Kennedy (24i) phrases it: “those nations who would make themselves our adversary”. The American values which others are so determined to oppose are alluded to in several Themes as well, sometimes directly, other times more implicitly. Kennedy (6) speaks of “revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought”; Obama (71) speaks of “principles” that serve to guide the nation. The exact content of these values may differ to a certain extent, but both they and their opponents are nonetheless included as Thematic categories. The next segment, concerning the analysis of Subject, turns to the question of inclusion and exclusion, and to the ways in which unity is imposed upon the audience.

7.1.B. We the Subject

This part of the analysis turns to the realm of interpersonal meaning and, more specifically, to a structure called the Mood. As a term, Mood refers both to the overall clause structure of the clause and to a specific element of the clause (Eggins 2004: 149). In this segment the focus is on Mood in the latter sense, as a clause element composed of a Subject and a finite verb element. The analysis itself revolves around the Subject, defined by Eggins (ibid.: 151) as the entity upon which the success or failure of the proposition rests. There is only one Subject per clause, and it can consist of a single word, a lengthy noun phrase, or even an embedded clause (ibid.: 151-152). Here, since the focus is on national identity, the analysis is oriented towards examining what kind of relationships are established between the speaker and the audience in the two addresses – by bringing them together through the use of first person plural, by centering on the speaker through first person singular, or by addressing the audience (or some part of it) separately through second person, singular or plural.

Subjects tend to be active participants, and the establishment of certain actors as responsible for (in active voice) or being subjected to (in passive voice) to actions and events places them in a prominent position within the text. Secondly, they are often also involved in some level of a Thematic analysis, as unmarked Themes often contain a Subject in declarative and
interrogative clauses – the vast majority of clauses in both speeches are declarative. In fact, many of the Subjects included in the analysis here are also Themes, and the two categories overlap to some extent. Thus, the focus here is on the establishment of interpersonal relationships, rather than on terms that contain economic or geopolitical elements. In terms of examining discourse worlds, Subjects as a category offer a way to examine what kind of entities are involved; the segment after this will address the other side of the coin, the finite verb element, through the analysis of process types.

Below, Table 7.D presents the distribution of Subjects that contain elements of first person plural, first person singular, or second person, singular and plural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7.D.) Subjects</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>Obama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Subjects</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: we/us/our</td>
<td>31 (39%)</td>
<td>86 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: I</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: you/your</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even a purely mechanical count of Subjects containing the words “we”, “our” or “us” (as well as a handful of instances of deictic “it” or “them” in Obama’s address which refer to Subjects containing these words, such as “our journey”) results in astonishingly high numbers: nearly 40% of all Subjects in Kennedy’s speech and 50% in Obama’s, even higher than the corresponding numbers in the Theme analysis. Clearly, “we” is a prominent (or, arguably, the prominent) participant on both addresses, particularly in comparison to “you” and “I”, both of which have only a handful of instances. The numbers for “we” would be even higher if instances such as “America”, “this hemisphere” and “this nation” were included. However, a straightforward equation of “us” to “Americans” would be both uninformative and deceptive, as the previous section already demonstrated, with Kennedy focusing largely on the outside world and Obama on national entities. Some Subjects with “us” expand beyond “we the nation” to encompass actors and identities beyond the country, while other Subjects zooms in, so to
speak, to ‘something of ours’. However, in most of the cases involving first person plural, the Subject is still simply, plainly “we”, and its reach is defined implicitly by its context.

Many of the patterns found in Theme analysis apply here as well, with economic and societal topics well represented in Obama’s speech and geopolitical ones in Kennedy’s. In Kennedy’s speech, there are familiar clusters of “we” and “us”, revolving around the division line of the Cold War, explicitly placing the United States as one half of this dichotomy. Obviously the president of the United States cannot speak on behalf of the Soviet bloc, but the Subjects in these instances are perhaps best treated as appeals for unity rather than presumptions of it, with the repeated structures of “let us” and “let both sides” calling for action rather than demanding it. When referring to other (presumably) Western nations with common “cultural and spiritual origins” in (11), “we” expands similarly to encompass those other nations in (12) and (13). Obama makes a similar reference in (83), though in his case on the basis of economic development. Beyond (83), the “we” in Obama’s address does not step beyond the boundaries of the nation’s borders. In (54i), “the question we ask today”, the “we” asking the question could conceivably be understood as those not questioning “the scale of our ambitions” (50), thus excluding some part of the domestic public as well. This group is referred to through third person plural in (51) and (52i); they are excluded from the audience entirely, dismissed, delegated to a role that leaves their presence unacknowledged.

Of course, establishing interpersonal relationships is not simply a matter of inclusion – it is also about exclusion, and juxtaposition. Identity is as much about exclusion as it is about inclusion, uniformity demanded for both sides. The rhetorical construction of national identity requires not only an imposed unity on the nation itself, but also differentiation from all other nations. This means that “we” should not be regarded as the sole focus of the analysis here, and this is why the instances in the first person singular and second person are included in the analysis as well, rare as they may be in comparison to first person plural. Usage of the first person singular signals that the president is momentarily stepping away from the rhetorically constructed unity that “we” imposes and into the role of a leader, establishing a rhetorical hierarchy in order
to address the audience as a separate entity from himself. On the other hand, using second person isolates the speaker from the audience, or places some part of the audience in a position to be addressed separately.

Comparatively speaking, though Kennedy has a lower number of Subjects with first person plural, he uses the first person singular and second person more frequently. Both Kennedy and Obama use first person singular at the beginning of their speech, situating themselves in the center of the proceedings, a new leader facing his nation. The other instances, one for Obama and two for Kennedy, come later. In Obama’s case it is still in the early part of the address, a curious example of meta-speak as he says that he says that “the challenges we face are real” (17) but that “[t]hey will be met” (20ii). This is a promise made by a leader to his people, both an acknowledgement of the graveness of the situation and an assurance that these challenges will be overcome. Otherwise, in the address as a whole, “we” the nation dominates heavily, with two small but notable exceptions. Obama sends a variety of messages to the rest of the world on behalf of the nation that he now leads, but there are only three instances in which he addresses a foreign entity directly as “you”, in clauses (75i), (81i) and (81iii), and they are all directed at adversaries. One is an extended olive branch (81), the other a vow to ensure that terrorists will not prevail. Adversaries were previously addressed in the segment concerning Theme, and the individuals Obama addresses his words to are those same terrorists and the dictators with grudges against the United States.

Kennedy, however, refers to “you” quite differently. The instances of second person are concentrated towards the end of his address, and they are not meant for enemies – quite the opposite. In fact, after the single instance of first person singular at the beginning of his speech, “I” and “you” intersect at the end of the address. Kennedy is not addressing an adversary; far from it, in fact. He is addressing his audience, at home and abroad, asking them to “join in that historic effort” (44) to “assure a more fruitful life for all mankind” (43ii). Then there are the iconic words Kennedy is known for, “ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country” (50), followed by a similar question posed to the world as a whole in (51). Like Obama, he is
explicitly stepping into the role of a leader, setting the course, asking for the support of his people – and of the world.

If the inaugural address is to be viewed as a normalization of national identity after the ideological strife stirred up by the election, it is perhaps surprising that “we” as a Subject dominates to such an extent. Though the share of first person plural is lower in Kennedy’s address, the inclusion of “both sides” (e.g. 24ii) would significantly even the percentages. Using “we” imposes a sense of unity over the audience, though its reach is always implicated by the context – we the nation, we the two superpowers, we who are free and affluent, we who are willing to take up the challenge and believe that the crisis will be resolved. Occasionally, the president inserts himself into the speech, asserting leadership and momentarily separating himself from the public. Occasionally, some part of the audience is addressed directly, as an entity separate from the unity, or referred to in a way that excludes them from the audience entirely. These instances reveal who is worthy of being included, and who must be excluded. The next section, however, turns the focus from the participants to the events, and to process types.

7.1.C. Events in Process

In Halliday’s systemic functional terminology, reality is represented in language by experiential meaning. Within the clause, experiential meaning is represented through Transitivity, which revolves around process types, which in turn determine the roles for other clause constituents. (Eggins 2004: 206.) Process types range from the material (undertaking an action, often in a tangible, physical sense) to the relational (establishing the existence of entities, or assigning attributes or identities to them) and to the quite self-explanatory verbal. Again, Eggins (2004: 215-249) provides brief overviews of each process type. Naturally, the analysis here will revolve around process types. Thus, while previous sections have concentrated largely on entities, this part revolves around events. The establishment of a national identity requires a variety of narratives concerning the present, past and future of the nation. These narratives will be examined in more detail through Material processes.
First, however, a brief general overview of finite verb elements within the speeches is provided. The Transitivity analysis contains all finite verbs within the addresses, except for those contained within other clause elements, such as Verbiage. Table 7.E. summarizes the use of polarity (the use of negation) and modality, “which has to do with the different ways in which a language user can intrude on her message, expressing attitudes and judgements of various kinds” (Eggins 2004: 172). Assessments of probability and frequency (such as possibly, probably, usually, rarely) are referred to as modalization, while the term for obligations and inclination (should, must, be determined to, be willing to) is modulation. Modality is discussed briefly, but it is nonetheless a useful addition, as it signals speakers’ measurements between the two extremes allowed by polarity. Table 7.F. compares the temporal distribution of finite verb forms, also known as tense, and lays the groundwork for a more detailed Process analysis which will be explored below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7.E.) Distribution of Finite Verbs: Polarity and Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7.F.) Distribution of Finite Verbs: Temporal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paradox of modalization, as Suzanne Eggins (2004: 175) notes, is that while one of its functions is to act as a judgment of certainty, using it always creates a shade of uncertainty. Thus, even saying “I am very sure that we will defeat our enemies” will still not have the definitive tone of “We will defeat our enemies”. Perhaps this is also why modalization – and modality as a whole –
seems to be so markedly underutilized in both speeches. After all, the newly elected president is standing before the American people and the world, ready to take charge and lead both into a bold new future; any expression even hinting uncertainty would not fit the occasion. Obama’s speech contains a slightly higher number of modulation, with words expressing obligation being featured most prominently (mostly through “must”, though Kennedy also uses “cannot” as an expression of necessity rather than ability). In regards to polarity, negation is utilized more frequently, with Kennedy’s speech showing a relatively higher number of instances. Thus, the claims made in both addresses are not typically measured through (or tempered by) assessments of modality, though negation is somewhat more frequent.

The distribution of temporal finite verbs shows more variety between the two addresses. Unsurprisingly, present tense is the most common in both, but while nearly ninety per cent of finite verbs in Kennedy’s speech are in present tense, Obama presents a more moderate number of sixty-two. The percentages of future tense are close to each other, though in Kennedy’s case the inclusion of the many variations of “let us”, which are currently counted in the present tense, would raise the total quite significantly. The most notable difference is in the use of past tense. In fact, the difference is twenty percentage points, with over a quarter of finite verbs in Obama’s speech being in past tense, while the corresponding number in Kennedy’s does not even reach ten. One can naturally expect an inaugural address to contain a certain amount of reflection on the past, present and future of the nation, as all three are also important components of constructing a national identity, but the new president can choose to reflect on each portion in varying amounts. Thus, while Kennedy seems to concentrate on the present-future, Obama is more oriented towards the past-present. This difference in orientation will be examined in more detail below, in connection with material process types.

Before that, however, it is necessary to first address process types on a more general level. This provides an overview of the types of events taking place within the discursively constructed worlds, whether they are tangible actions, representations of mental states or messages. Thus, in the two addresses, representations of process types are distributed as follows in Table 7.G:
(7.G.) Distribution of Process Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process type</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>Obama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>37 (49%)</td>
<td>74 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>11 (15%)</td>
<td>50 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>17 (23%)</td>
<td>12 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>19 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>157 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, however, a few words on the categorization. The model of process types laid out by Halliday proved somewhat challenging to apply to the kind of intricate, metaphor-laden language used in the speeches here. As a rule of thumb, I have attempted to reduce an expression such as “let the word go forth” to a more mundane or simpler form, which in this case and in my opinion would be ‘let’s tell everyone’, and determine the process type on that basis. This instance would therefore be treated as a verbal process.

There are several instances in both speeches which require some deliberation, not only relating to verbal processes. Not all of these lines are entirely unproblematic, and as such it is best that the reasoning behind some of them is explained. In Kennedy’s address, expressions such as the aforementioned “let the word go forth” (8), “let every nation know” (9) and “offer a special pledge” (19) have all been labeled as verbal processes, as they are instances of a repeated structure of “to [group of nations] we pledge [Verbiage]”. In some instances the Verbiage element consists of an extended noun phrase, as in (11) and (17), or an entire clause, as in (21) and (22). For the sake of uniformity any finite verb elements contained within the Verbiage have not been analyzed, regardless of whether it contains a single noun phrase, a whole clause or, in rare instances, even an entire clause complex. In Obama’s address, to “choose hope over fear” (21) has been interpreted as a mental process; “the state of our economy calls for action” (43) has been categorized as relational; “they have something tell us” (86) has also been labeled as a relational process, as “them” having the attribute of “having something to tell us”.

There seem to be patterns of distribution in both speeches.
Existential and behavioral processes are the most underrepresented in both. Neither speech is therefore concerned with the establishment of new participants, as demonstrated by the very low frequency of existential processes, and when the inner workings of actors are explored, mental rather than behavioral processes are used; the speaker situates himself in the actors’ minds rather than simply describing the outer behavior. As evidenced above in the section concerning Subjects, “we” is a common participant in these processes, strongly suggesting that the two presidents seem to be both simultaneously addressing their audience and speaking on behalf of it. Material processes are the most prominent single category in both speeches, and they will be addressed in more detail below. In Obama’s speech, relational processes are a strong second, demonstrating a secondary focus on the state or attributes of actors presented in the speech. In Kennedy’s address, the second most frequent process type is, interestingly, the verbal, which seems to dominate much of the early half of the speech. In general, instances of the most prominent process types are often grouped in clusters.

In fact, there is a long section in which Kennedy addresses the outside world with varying versions of “to [group of nations] we pledge [X]”. The same repeated structure is present in Obama’s address as well, though in a much less prominent role, and in many cases the verbal process itself has been omitted – perhaps explaining the comparatively lower number of verbal processes. In the majority of cases, though not always, the Recipient is some kind of a foreign entity. In Kennedy’s speech, this section is lengthy; in Obama’s speech, its relative invisibility suggests that other themes dominate. Instead, relational and mental processes are the second and third most frequent categories, respectively. Therefore Obama seems more concerned with descriptions of actors and their thoughts and mental states. Kennedy is focused on foreign entities and oriented towards the future: his address portrays a nation assuming a role on a global stage, ready to play its part, articulating its vision both to national and international audiences. Obama, on the other hand, concentrates on national issues: his nation, faced with a crisis, is reflecting on the way things are and the way things once were, and how they relate to the way the country plans to move forward.

The very beginning and end of both speeches are fairly mixed in terms of the process types, but beyond that, certain process types seem to have
a tendency to cluster. Within Kennedy’s address, verbal processes seem to be mostly concentrated in the early part of the speech, while focus shifts to material processes in the latter part; relational processes are scattered in between, fairly evenly throughout the whole speech. In Obama’s speech, on the other hand, the major tendency is the alternation of relational and material processes; other process types are, again, scattered in between. There is a section similar to Kennedy’s that addresses foreign actors about halfway through, but the verbal process is largely omitted, except for the decidedly Kennedy-esque (82).

As noted in the general review of the process types above, the most prominent process type within the addresses is the material. Material processes are a category of actions, of doing, often in a concrete or tangible way. Table 7.H. presents the temporal distribution of material processes, with a more in-depth discussion of certain discernable tendencies, as well as constructions of the past, present and future to follow. Constructions of the past will be discussed in more detail in the second half of the analysis as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>Obama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>28 (76%)</td>
<td>32 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>28 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
<td>15 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 (100%)</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material processes show a temporal distribution that bears clear similarity to the distribution in all process types, except for a slightly higher number of future tense in Obama’s case. Again, many of Kennedy’s “let us” variations are included in the present tense, and though their grammatical form is in the present, they are at the very least looking ahead in spirit.

In the early half of his address, Kennedy addresses the world as the new leader of the United States and of the free world. In the latter half there is a string of material processes, from clause (30) onwards and mostly fitted into the “let us” structure, that set an almost adventurous scene. There instances such as “explore” (twice, in 30 and 33i), “conquer the deserts” (33ii), “tap the ocean
depths” (33iv) and “join in creating a new endeavor” (35ii). The tale continues with “[a]ll this will not be finished” (36) but “let us begin” (38) and “join in that historic effort” (44). In fact, this endeavor metaphor takes over almost the entire latter half of Kennedy’s speech, and is laid out in ambitious terms: “the trumpet summons” (42i) the nation “to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle” and to “forge… a grand and global alliance” (43i). Kennedy himself will not “shrink from this responsibility” (46i). The Theme analysis showed that Kennedy is particularly focused primarily on the global level, and this endeavor is laid out in terms that reach out to the world rather than being confined to the national borders. It is a “historic effort” (44) and “will light our country” (48) and “the world” (49). Thus Kennedy appeals both to Americans (50i) and to “citizens of the world” (51i) to undertake this bold task with him.

There is a similar segment in the middle of Obama’s address, a concentration of future tense outlaying the nation’s course: the United States “will build” (44), “wield technology’s wonders” (45ii) and “harness the sun and the winds and the soil” (46). Before this, in the early half of Obama’s address there is a concentration of material processes in past tense that paint a very different picture, one of hardship and struggle. Describing what he calls “[o]ur journey” (27), Obama uses processes that establish a concrete narrative of physical actions. American ancestors, “men and women obscure in their labor, who carried us up the long, rugged path towards prosperity and freedom” (29), “packed up their few worldly possessions” (30i) and, among other things, “settled the West” (31ii), “endured the lash of the whip” (31iii), “plowed the hard earth” (31iv) and “fought and died” in battle (32) to ensure a better life for future generations. This is the inspiration and the example the United States must now follow, to “begin the work of remaking America” (41iii).

7.2. Weaving a National Fabric

In this section of the analysis, the focus shifts from specific functional elements to a tool of cohesive analysis called lexical strings. Lexical Strings – a term used by Suzanne Eggins (2004: 42-47), while Butt et al. (2000: 148-149) use ‘lexical
chains’ – offer a way of studying lexical cohesion in order “to relate the text consistently in its area of focus or its field” (Egging 2004: 42). In practice, lexical strings allow the tracking of certain specific themes, the way they develop within the text and the way they weave the texture (cohesion) into the text. Lexical cohesion works mainly through the so-called open-class items such as nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs, as opposed to closed-class items like prepositions and pronouns (ibid.). Lexical strings add texture to a text through various sequentially related lexical items, and the same lexical item can be included in multiple strings, thus serving several semantic associations (ibid.: 44) Lexical cohesion—realized semantic relations and repetition, for instance—is a device of textual meaning, along with grammatical cohesion created through reference, substitution and ellipsis (Butt et al. 2000: 147).

The purpose of this segment is to explore certain “strings” that seem prevalent or otherwise particularly relevant to the two addresses. The first of these strings concerns religion and God, whose special relationship with the United States has been studied by Bellah (1967). The second is focused on the national past and, more specifically, on past Americans, expounding upon the Transitivity analysis presented above. The third and final segment collects instances around two somewhat opposing frames, one of conflict and warfare, the other of physical labor and work. These frames have not been chosen at random: both the Theme and Subject analysis showed a notable number of entities revolving around the Cold War and geopolitical divisions in Kennedy’s address, while Obama’s featured many related to the economy. The collected instances do not contain only instances directly related to war or work, but also metaphorical expressions used in other contexts. Again, the various ways in which national identity is constructed shall be considered with each theme.

7.2.A. God Bless America

According to Paul Chilton (2004: xii), religious discourse has been neglected as an area of research, often overshadowed by politics. Religion is present in American political rhetoric, though usually reserved for certain parts in public
speeches and phrased in a way which avoids offending any religious sensibilities (ibid.: 174-175). The analysis here is focused on texts which combine the religious and the political. Bellah (1967) is an important name here, with his ideas of the American civil religion and the religiously ambivalent but ever-present God that can also be found in both John F. Kennedy’s and Barack Obama’s inaugural addresses. As Table 7.H. shows, religious references are not restricted to variations of the iconic phrase “God Bless America” at the end of each address. Both speeches, for instance, feature quotations from the Bible, with one instance of explicit quotation each – Kennedy in (34), Obama in (23ii) – as well as one quotation from the Roman used by Kennedy in (42i). Below, Table 7.I. shows the collected instances of the religious theme in the speeches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7.I.) Lexical Strings Referring to Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 revered clergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 before… Almighty God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 from the hand of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 spiritual origins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 the command of Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42i &quot;rejoicing in hope: patient in tribulation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 the faith… which we bring to this endeavor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 His blessing and His help… God’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some marked differences in the ways Kennedy and Obama address faith and religion. While Kennedy speaks of God, faith and spirituality only in a very vague sense – he does address the “revered clergy” in (1), and the reference to others with similar spiritual origins in (11) could be and very possibly is meant for the (Western?) Christian world, but it is nonetheless never specified – Obama explicitly describes the American spiritual heritage as containing a multitude of faiths in (77). Even atheists are mentioned! References to Islam are unsurprising in the aftermath of 9/11, but one wonders whether similar explicit references to non-Christian faith within the nation could be found in previous inaugural addresses. It is also worth noting that the reference to God-
given rights is the closest Kennedy comes to addressing the issue of civil rights and the related movements that were very much active at the time in the United States, even though he had (ultimately) identified himself as a proponent of the civil rights movement during his campaign. Obama addresses the theme more openly: there are references to racial oppression in (31iii) and (78ii) as well as his own African heritage in (101iii). On the other hand, Kennedy does in no way refer to his Catholicism beyond the vague references to Christianity.

Most telling of all, however, is the way God and the fate of the United States as a nation are implicitly – and, in Kennedy’s case, also explicitly – intertwined. The faith and destiny of the American people as a unit rests in the hands of God, whose work the nation is destined to carry out, as is states by Obama in (89ii) and (100) and by Kennedy in (42i), (48) and in (53). The values which the nation represents are similarly of divine origin, as both Kennedy in (6) and Obama in (24) say: the God-given right bestowed upon mankind to be free and equal and for all to have “a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness”, as Obama phrases it. Interestingly, despite the presumed separation of state and organized religion, a deity is also present to observe the proceedings of the inauguration, as Kennedy takes his presidential oath before God in (3) and Obama imbues the oath in question with clear spiritual significance, calling it “sacred” in (101ii). Though able to accommodate a multitude of faiths, and even those with no faith in a higher authority, the concerns and rituals of the state are imbued with religious significance.

With word counts reaching one and a half to two and a half thousand words, these religious instances do not, as far as percentages go, feature in any prominent role in either of the addresses, but they nonetheless reveal significant implications for the way the earthly matters of the state are conceptualized in relation to more divine concerns. One aspect of establishing a national identity is an appropriate myth of origin, and here God is quite openly tied to the very foundations of the United States. The “God-given promise”, as Obama (24) terms it, underlies the American values of freedom and hard work upon which the nation has been built, and is still being built. This unfinished project is elevated above and beyond the concerns of mere human beings and
nations; Kennedy (48) calls it an “endeavor” and Obama (100) a “destiny”. The human aspect of this heritage is the focus of the next section.

7.2.B. Builders of the American Past

Heritage provides a convenient transition to the theme in this section, which concerns the American past – and, more precisely, past Americans. The Transitivity analysis showed that in terms of process types the past is underrepresented in Kennedy’s speech in comparison to Obama’s, but this does not necessarily indicate that the establishment of a common past as an aspect of national identity is ignored. Perhaps the past is simply represented through means other than the explicit temporal placement of events. This section is concerned with uncovering those other means. Below, Table 7.J. shows the collected instances of past American individuals and groups which are mentioned in the two addresses, in the context in which they are placed. The list also contains instances of deictic references to these persons or groups in subsequent clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7.J.) Lexical Strings Referring to Past Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three-quarters ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40II each generation of Americans has been summoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 they fought and died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Our Founding Fathers…drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 earlier generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80II the fallen heroes who lie in Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107II the father of our nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals from the American past can be demonstrative of several things in regards to national identity: they can represent some kind of myth of origin,
iconize significant events or embody the process through which the nation as it is now known was created. In fact, Table 7.J. contains instances of all three, though here, too, there are notable differences between Kennedy and Obama.

On a general level, Kennedy evokes symbols that are connected with earlier generations, while Obama refers to individuals who act in tangible and concrete ways. There are mentions of forebearers and their beliefs very early in both speeches, with military-flavored wordings; sacrifices, by Obama, and fighting, by Kennedy (6). However, Kennedy connects references to past generations with impersonal symbols: the presidential oath (3), American values (6), and the graves of fallen soldiers (41). Even the one direct reference to past generations, in (40ii), is placed in a passive construction. By contrast, in Obama’s address, soldiers are active participants. They “fought and died” (32) and currently “lie in Arlington” (80ii). In general, both presidents utilize a military narrative, complete with heroic soldiers who have died for the cause, encompassing the time the United States gained its independence and afterwards.

While the instances of the American past in Kennedy’s speech revolve almost entirely around the theme of conflict and war, Obama provides a second, complementary narrative of others taking part alongside the soldiers. They are the workers: “the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things” (29) who “traveled” (30) and “toiled” (31) – and “endured the whip” (31), a subtle reference to slavery and to an alternative narrative to the story of free men and women working towards a better tomorrow. It is a vivid, down-to-earth tale of perseverance, meant to establish a tradition that will carry the nation through the difficult times ahead. In contrast, Kennedy’s tale is one of grand ideas and brave deeds, and of a nation with the duty and the will to live up to its destiny. Both establish a tradition that draws a trajectory between the past and the future.

Comparatively speaking, the number of instances in Kennedy’s address is somewhat lower than in Obama’s, but the difference is far less pronounced than the one in the temporal comparison of process types. Kennedy does not neglect the national past: he does refer to earlier generations, and to symbols of past events, but does so in a manner that for the most part hides the human agency behind them, thus constructing a national past without explicitly reflecting upon it. It is a “long twilight struggle” (42i); descriptions of
individuals taking part in that struggle are not needed because the narrative invites
the audience to reach beyond the mundane, day-to-day events through which
history is ultimately constructed. Obama, on the other hands, provides vivid
descriptions and portrayals of individuals, of the past in action. The United States
he portrays is faced with a daunting, urgent crisis, but it has faced and overcome
difficulties before, through the actions of brave and hard-working individuals.
This crisis can be overcome as well – if the American people get to work.

7.2.C. The Sword and the Shovel

This is the final part of the analysis, and the point at which the previous segments
come together. Previously, the focus has been restricted either to a specific
functional element, or to lexical strings concerned with a clearly defined topic.
Each segment has sought to explore some facet of the discourse worlds built by
the two presidents while investigating the various aspects of national identity. In
this final segment, the focus shift from a specified focus to an approach that,
rather than restricting itself to either entities or events, views the addresses
through metaphorical frames. Two frames have been chosen, based on findings
from the previous segments: the first focusing on expressions that relate to
warfare and conflict, the second on physical labor and work.

As noted previously by Dillon et al. (1990: 189), the inaugural
address is about the restoration of ideological normality after the months upon
months of political strife, expressing an idealized version of national identity. At
the same time, Kennedy’s and Obama’s addresses also have a second common
purpose: a call to embark in a grand project of some kind to avoid or pull through
a crisis. The previous section showed both Kennedy and Obama establishing a
tradition rooted in the national past. These traditions are then in turn drawn upon
to establish the future course of the nation. However, while Kennedy’s project is
heavily invested in the international realm, and in the geopolitical lines drawn by
the Cold War, Obama’s is primarily intranational, grounded in the economic and
societal situation of the nation. Essentially there are two main narratives: the first,
used by Kennedy and to a lesser extent by Obama, of the United States as a nation
which has fought for its freedom and for the freedom of others; and the second, used only by Obama, of a nation built through hard work and perseverance.

The following instances reflect these two different strands of narrative found in the speeches. It is important to note that they do not contain only instances that are directly relating to warfare and conflict, or alternatively to work and physical labor, but rather also instances in which related words are used metaphorically in other contexts. First, Table 7.K presents military-themed items in the texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7.K.) Lexical Strings Referring to Warfare and Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kennedy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 our forebears fought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71i we are the heirs of that first revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8ii tempered by war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9vi oppose any foe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 a far more iron tyranny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 this peaceful revolution of hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21ii oppose aggression or subversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24i those nations who would make themselves our adversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24iii the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26i our arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 modern weapons... deadly atom... uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 (belaboring those problems which divide us)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31i inspection and control of arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33ii conquer the deserts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35i a beachhead of cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40ii the graves of young Americans who answered the call to service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42ii bear arms... arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43i against these enemies... a grand and global alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*inclusion dependant on how "belaboring" is understood
Clearly, Kennedy’s address contains many more lexical items relating to warfare or fighting in comparison to Obama’s – the difference is even more pronounced when one takes into account the comparative lengths of the two speeches, with the word count in Obama’s address almost twice that of Kennedy’s. Now, Table 7.K. can be contrasted with Table 7.L., which shows the instances related to physical labor and work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7.L.) Lexical Strings Referring to Work and Physical labor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kennedy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35ii a new endeavor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33i these men and women struggled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33iiii worked till their hands were raw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Our workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41iii the work of remaking America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 there is work to be done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43ii lay a new foundation for growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 We will build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72ii forge a hard-earned peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73i work tirelessly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 what you can build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 work alongside you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90i selflessness of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 hard work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110i brave... the icy currents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In Kennedy’s case, even these examples are debatable, but they are the best available.

The previous segment showed Kennedy and Obama establishing two somewhat different narratives of the national past. If Kennedy’s speech clearly favors conflict or militaristic phrases, then the dominance of work and labor-related phrases is even more pronounced in Obama’s. This fits with the findings from the previous segment. Where Obama uses a militaristic narrative of the past in addition to his dominating theme of a nation built through hard work, Kennedy’s address is almost entirely devoid of labor-related terms – even the ones included here are debatable. Since the military theme is the one the speeches have in common, it will be addressed first.
Firstly, of course, there are the obvious and explicit references to actual battles. One notable similarity is the fact that both invoke ancestors very early in the speech, Kennedy in (6) and Obama in (2), and also refer to a conflict in which they were involved, to “our” revolution – Kennedy in the following clause (7), Obama at the very end of his speech in (107i). The birth of the nation is located in this struggle, and the people involved in it, and its life afterwards has not been peaceful. The American past seems to be one of conflict and sacrifice, initially at home and later abroad, recorded in iconized battles or symbols that remind the listener of a narrative of military history. Kennedy, for instance, does not refer to specific wars or battles beyond the American Revolution: instead, the conflict between the free world and the Communists is ingrained and ever-present, woven into the very world view of his address. In Obama’s address, the terrorists are not granted a similarly central role. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are referred to in (72i) and (72ii), but they are only the latest in a long list of battles. United States has thus far defeated “fascism and communism” (35), with American soldiers now patrolling “far-off deserts and distant mountains” (85).

In (32), Obama identifies some famous battles by location, and while three of them have either taken place abroad (Normandy in World War II, Khe Sahn in Vietnam) or on American soil during the Revolutionary War against the British (Concord), there is also a reference to Gettysburg, an iconic battle of the American Civil War. The wording in the clause is no doubt carefully selected (“they fought and died in places like…”), as Vietnam was no great victory for the United States, and claiming victory in a civil war, even in one long past, could prove to be politically problematic. Still, the implication is there: that those fighting for a better tomorrow for future generations were the ones defending freedom for all Americans, regardless of race or religious orientation. It is a topic Obama brings up in other parts of his speech as well, such as in (24) and (78). On the other hand, given the societal upheaval at the time of Kennedy’s election, it is curious that he does not address the issue of equality – racial or gender – within the United States beyond a mention of God-given rights in (6). His focus is, again, on freedom in the outside world: on nations casting off the chains of colonial control (14), or struggling to overcome poverty in (17) and (19), in danger of falling “prey to hostile powers” (20).
However, even ventures that Kennedy describes as peaceful in intent – a “peaceful revolution of hope” in (20), “a beachhead of cooperation” in (35i) – are phrased in ways that call forth images of confrontations and military operations. There are many of these instances: deserts to be conquered (33ii), disease to be eradicated (33iii), and the mission itself, a struggle against “the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself” (42i). In a time when “man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life” (5), Kennedy urges the world to step back from the brink and seek peace, but does so in a way that nonetheless invokes associations of a military confrontation, even if the enemy is not the kind one can face on a battlefield.

Up to a point, Obama uses similar themes – the invocations of the revolution, for instance, and the vivid tale of the advancing enemy around (105). However, the most prominent narrative is the one of the United States as a nation of hard-working individuals building a better tomorrow, of previous generations farming and building and struggling, and this extends into the metaphorical imagery he uses in his address. When urging his nation to take action to address the problem, he represents the undertaking in very concrete terms: “Starting today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin the work of remaking America” (41). This metaphor of making and building is repeated again and again in his address: in his plan to “lay a new foundation for growth” (43ii) in the United States; in urging dictators to “build” rather than “destroy” (80); in promising to “work alongside” impoverished nations (82). An economic crisis in itself is an abstract thing with tangible consequences, but Obama frames it in terms of a structure in need of repair, of a nation picking up the hammer and getting to work. “For everywhere we look,” he (42) says, “‘there is work to be done’.

8. Conclusion

The objective here has been to explore American identity in the inaugural addresses of Presidents Kennedy and Obama. Though forty years apart, Barack
Obama’s election sparked many a comparison to another young charismatic star who beat the odds, triumphed over prejudice and made history by being elected President. They lived in vastly different times and came from vastly different backgrounds, but in assuming the highest political office in the country both took part in a ritual that has great importance in regards to national identity. Though the inaugural address cannot be considered representative in terms of public opinion or perceptions, it is pivotal in offering an idealized version of national identity. Here national identity is conceptualized and treated as a discursive construct, and the assumption is that the president giving the address is, in assuming office, influenced by discursive traditions at least as much as they themselves can influence them.

Utilizing tools provided by the systemic functional linguistics, the analysis has sought to explore national identity by examining the two addresses through a variety of perspectives, each focusing on a certain aspect of systemic functional meaning or, in the second half, on cohesive elements related to certain specific topics. The first half of the analysis has explored the establishment of discourse worlds, of entities and events organized in meaningful ways, while the second half has focused on so-called lexical strings with three thematic focuses, tying findings from the first half together and attempting to take them a step further within their context. These findings showed a number of similarities as well as differences, but most importantly of all, they portrayed a set of features that could be built into a coherent picture.

There is no doubt that both addresses are about “us”: the Theme analysis showed a high frequency of we-related entities, and in the Subject analysis “we” is by far the most represented participant in the two addresses. In some rare instances the presidents insert themselves into the speeches, asserting leadership, and occasionally step back from the rhetorically imposed unity to address the audience or some part of it separately. Though they both narrate both a national past and a national future, they stress the two in varying amounts, with Kennedy gazing forward while Obama reflects on the past. Kennedy, and to a lesser extent Obama, invoke a military narrative of a history of duty and sacrifice in service of a higher cause. Obama’s speech also features a second important tradition, that of hard work: it is the foundation upon which the United States has
been built, and is now the way to lead the nation out of the economic crisis. However, in both cases the national endeavor has a meaning beyond the mortal realm. The words of the presidential oath are addressed not only to the nation but also to God, the promotion of American values linked to rights ordained by divine authority. Though vaguely Christian in origin, this God accepts members of all religions under the American flag. As a whole, these findings represent only two speeches, and drawing any generalized conclusions on the inaugural address as a genre would be problematic. However, perhaps certain aspects of the analysis – the narrations focused on war and work, for instance – could serve as a starting point for a broader study of the genre.

To a certain extent, both addresses represent choices. Kennedy could have focused more on the civil rights movement, or the somewhat sluggish national economy. Instead, he left national issues almost entirely unexplored and focused on the global stage, on the fault lines of the Cold War, on nuclear weapons, on the retreat of colonialism, on world poverty. He constructs a world of discord and confrontation in which problems are to be conquered and defeated. Obama, assuming office, faces not only an economic crisis, but two large-scale operations overseas, the ever-present threat of terrorism, global warming and a host of hostile foreign leaders. He does address these issues to some extent, but his attention is nonetheless primarily on the economic situation. His address portrays a nation built on hard work, now faltering, but capable of regaining its feet. But one does wonder: To what extent are they free to choose their challenges and their narratives? How constrained is Obama by the looming economic crisis, or Kennedy by the geopolitical realities of the Cold War, or either by the conventions set by their predecessors? When Kennedy took office, thirty-four other men had already delivered their inaugural address. Obama was the forty-fourth. They were not given a clean slate, but they delivered, and at least for one day the nation stood as one.
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Appendice

Notations:

{ Theme, TEXTUAL THEME }

(S)ubject

Transitivity:
Actor, Material Process & [Goal/Range]
Sayer, Verbal Process & [Verbiage]
Senser, Mental Process & [Phenom(enon)]
Token/Carrier, Relational Process & [Value (in Identifying)/Attr(ribute) (in Attributive)]
Existant, Existential Process
Behaver, Behavioral Process & [Behaviour]

Additional element: [Circ(umstance)]

Appendix 1: Inaugural Address of John F. Kennedy, January 20, 1961

Transcript from <www.americanrhetoric.com>

1 Vice President Johnson, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, President Truman, reverend clergy, fellow citizens:

2 { We (S) } observe (Pr:Mat) [today] not [a victory of party]Range but a [celebration of freedom]Range – symbolizing (Pr:Relat) [an end]Attr, as well as [a beginning]Attr – signifying (Pr:Relat) [renewal]Attr, as well [as change]Attr.

3 { FOR I (S) } have sworn (Pr:Verb) [before you]Circ and [Almighty God]Circ [the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three-quarters ago]Verb.

4 { The world (S) } is (Pr:Relat) [very different]Attr [now]Circ.

5 { FOR man (S) } holds (Pr:Mat) [in his mortal hands]Circ [the power to abolish all forms of human poverty]Goal and [all forms of human life]Goal.

6 { AND YET the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought (S) } are (Pr:Relat) [still]Circ [at issue]Attr [around the globe]Circ – [the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God]Goal.

7i { We (S) } dare not forget (Pr:Ment) [today]Circ
that we are the heirs of that first revolution

Let [the word] go forth (Pr:Verb) [from this time and place], [to friend and foe alike]

[THAT the torch] has been passed to a new generation of Americans -- born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage, and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

Let [every nation] know (Pr:Verb), whether it wishes us well or ill,

THAT we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

This much we pledge -- and more.

To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends.

United there is little we cannot do, in a host of cooperative ventures.

Divided there is little we can do -- for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

To those new states whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny.

We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view.

But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom -- and to remember
that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside.

[To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves for whatever period is required.]

Not because the Communists may be doing it, but because it is right.

If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge: to convert our good words into good deeds, in a new alliance for progress, to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty.

This peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers.

Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas.

And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support — to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective, to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak, and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.
25 { We (S) } dare not tempt (Pr:Behav) [them]\text{Range} [with weakness]\text{Circ}. 

26i { For only when our arms (S) are (Pr:Relat) [sufficient beyond doubt]\text{Attr} } 

26ii can we (S) be certain (Pr:Ment) [beyond doubt]\text{Circ} [that they (S) will never be employed]\text{Phenom}. 

27 { BUT neither can two great and powerful groups of nations (S) } take comfort (Pr: Behav) [from our present course]\text{Phenom}? – [both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons]\text{Circ}, [both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom]\text{Circ}, yet [both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war]\text{Circ}. 

28i { So let us (S) } begin anew (Pr:Mat) – [remembering on both sides 

28ii { THAT civility (S) } is not a sign of weakness, 

28iii { AND sincerity (S) } is always subject to proof]\text{Circ}. 

29i { Let us (S) } [never]\text{Circ} negotiate (Pr:Verb) [out of fear]\text{Circ}, 

29ii { but let us (S) } [never]\text{Circ} fear (Pr:Ment) [to negotiate]\text{Phenom}. 

30 { Let both sides (S) } explore (Pr:Mat) [what problems unite us]\text{Range} instead of [belaboring those problems which divide us]\text{Circ}. 

31i { Let both sides (S) }, [for the first time]\text{Circ}, formulate (Pr:Mat) [serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms]\text{Goal}, 

31ii { AND } bring (Pr:Mat) [the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations]\text{Range}. 

32 { Let both sides (S) } seek to invoke (Pr:Mat) [the wonders of science]\text{Range} instead of [its terrors]\text{Range}. 

33i { [Together]\text{Circ} } let us (S) explore (Pr:Mat) [the stars]\text{Range}, 

33ii conquer (Pr:Mat) [the deserts]\text{Range}, 

33iii eradicate (Pr:Mat) [disease]\text{Goal}, 

33iv tap (Pr:Mat) [the ocean depths]\text{Range}, 

33v and encourage (Pr:Mat) [the arts and commerce]\text{Range}. 

34 { Let both sides (S) } unite to heed (Pr:Mat), [in all corners of the earth]\text{Circ}, [the command of Isaiah -- to "undo the heavy burdens, and [to] let the oppressed go free"]\text{Range} \textsuperscript{1}. 

¹ Isaiah 58:6
35i { AND, if a beachhead of cooperation (S) may push back (Pr:Mat) [the jungle of suspicion] }.

35ii let both sides (S) join in (Pr:Mat) [creating a new endeavour] – [not a new balance of power, but a new world of law –

35iii where the strong (S) are just, and the weak (S) secure, and the peace (S) preserved].

36 { All this (S) } will not be finished (Pr:Mat) [in the first one hundred days].

37 { Nor will it (S) be finished (Pr:Mat) [in the first one thousand days]; nor [in the life of this Administration]; nor [even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet].

38 { BUT let us (S) } begin (Pr:Mat).

39 { In your hands, my fellow citizens, [more than mine], will rest (Pr:Mat) the final success or failure of our course (S).}

40i { Since this country (S) was founded (Pr:Mat) },

40ii { [each generation of Americans] has been summoned (Pr:Mat) [to give testimony to its national loyalty].

41 { The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service (S) } surround (Pr:Relat) [the globe].

42i... { Now } the trumpet (S) summons (Pr:Mat) [us] again –

42ii { not as [a call to bear arms], though [arms] we (S) need (Pr:Relat) –

42iii { not [as a call to battle], though [embattled] we (S) are (Pr:Relat) –

...but [a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation," a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself].

43i { Can we (S) forge (Pr:Mat) [against these enemies] [a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West] ,

43ii { that can assure (Pr:Mat) } [a more fruitful life for all mankind]?
45 [In the long history of the world]^{Circ}_{Range} (S) have been granted (Pr:Mat) [the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger]^{Range}_{Range}.

46i {I (S)} do not shrink (Pr:Ment) [from this responsibility]^{Circ}_{Circ} –  

46ii {I (S)} welcome (Pr:Ment) [it]^{Phenom}_{Phenom}.

47i {I (S)} do not believe (Pr:Ment)

47ii {THAT any of us (S)} would exchange places with any other people or any other generation]^{Phenom}_{Phenom}.

48 {The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor (S)} will light (Pr:Mat) [our country]^{Goal}_{Goal} and [all who serve it]^{Goal}_{Goal}.

49 {AND the glow from that fire (S)} can [truly]^{Circ}_{Circ} light (Pr:Mat) [the world]^{Goal}_{Goal}.

50i {AND SO, my fellow Americans, ask not (Pr:Verb)} [what your country (S) can do for you]^{Verbiage}_{Verbiage},

50ii {ask (Pr:Verb)} [what you (S) can do for your country]^{Verbiage}_{Verbiage}.

51i {My fellow citizens of the world, ask not} (Pr:Verb) [what America (S) will do for you]^{Verbiage}_{Verbiage},

51ii {BUT [what] together we (S) can do for the freedom of man]^{Verbiage}_{Verbiage}.

52i {Finally, whether you} are (Pr:Relat) [citizens of America]^{Value}_{Value} or [citizens of the world]^{Value}_{Value},

52ii {ask (Pr:Verb)} [of us here]^{Recipient}_{Recipient} [the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you]^{Verbiage}_{Verbiage}.

53 {With a good conscience our only sure reward}^{Circ}_{Circ}, [with history the final judge of our deeds]^{Circ}_{Circ}, let (Pr:Mat) us (S) go forth to lead [the land we love]^{Range}_{Range}, [asking His blessing and His help]^{Circ}_{Circ}, but [knowing that here on earth God's work (S) must truly be our own]^{Circ}_{Circ}. 
Appendix 2: Inaugural Address of Barack Obama, January 20, 2009

Transcript from <www.americanrhetoric.com>

1 My fellow citizens:

2 { I (S) } stand (Pr:Mat) [here]Circ [today]Circ [humbled by the task before us]Circ, [grateful for the trust you've bestowed]Circ, [mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors]Circ.

3 { I (S) } thank (Pr:Verb) [President Bush]Recipient [for his service to our nation]Verbiage, as well as [the generosity and cooperation he has shown throughout this transition]Verbiage.

4 { Forty-four Americans (S) } have [now]Circ taken (Pr:Verb) [the presidential Oath]Verbiage.

5 { The words }Goal (S) } have been spoken (Pr:Verb) [during rising tides of prosperity and the still waters of peace]Circ.

6 { Yet, every so often }Circ [the Oath Range (S) is taken]Circ [amidst gathering clouds and raging storms]Circ.

7i { At these moments }Circ America (S) has carried on (Pr:Mat) not [simply because of the skill or vision of those in high office]Circ, but also [our collective failure to make hard choices and prepare the nation for a new age]Circ.

7ii { BUT BECAUSE We the People (S) } have remained (Pr:Relat) [faithful to the ideals of our forbearers]Attr. and [true to our founding documents]Attr.

8 { So }Attr it (S) } has been (Pr:Relat).

9 { So } it (S) } must be (Pr:Relat) [with this generation of Americans]Circ.

10i { That we are in the midst of crisis (S) } is (Pr:Ment) [now]Circ [well understood]Phenom.

11 { Our nation (S) } is (Pr:Relat) [at war]Attr. [against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred]Circ.

12 { Our economy (S) } is (Pr:Relat) [badly weakened]Attr. [a consequence of greed and irresponsibility on the part of some]Circ, but also [our collective failure to make hard choices and prepare the nation for a new age]Circ.

13i { Homes }Range (S) } have been (Pr:Mat) lost;

13ii { Jobs }Range (S) } shed;
13iii { [businesses]Range (S) } shuttered.

14i { Our health care (S) } is (Pr:Relat) [too costly]Attr;

14ii { our schools (S) } fail (Pr:Mat) [too many]Goal;

14iii { AND each day (S) } brings (Pr:Mat) [further evidence]Goal

14iv { THAT the ways we use energy (S) } strengthen (Pr:Mat) [our adversaries]Range and

14v threaten (Pr:Mat) [our planet]Range.

15 { These (S) } are (Pr:Relat) [the indicators of crisis]Attr, [subject to data and statistics]Circ.

16i { Less measurable }Attr, but [no less profound]Attr, is (Pr:Relat) a sapping of confidence across our land (S) – [a nagging fear

16ii { THAT America's decline } is inevitable,

16iii { THAT the next generation } must lower its sights].

17 { [Today]Circ } I (S) say (Pr:Verb) [to you]Recipient [THAT the challenges we face (S) are real]Verbiage.

18i { They (S) } are (Pr:Relat) [serious]Attr

18ii { AND they (S) } are (Pr:Relat) [many]Attr.

19 { They (S) } will not be met (Pr:Mat) [easily]Circ or [in a short span of time]Circ.

20i But know (Pr:Ment) } [this]Phenom, America:

20ii { They (S) } will be met (Pr:Mat).

21 { On this day}Circ, we (S) gather (Pr:Mat) because we (S) have chosen (Pr:Ment) [hope over fear]Phenom, [unity of purpose over conflict and discord]Phenom.

22i { On this day}Circ, we (S) come to proclaim (Pr:Verb) [an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations and worn out dogmas,

22ii { THAT for far too long } have strangled our politics]Verbiage.

23i { We (S) } remain (Pr:Relat) [a young nation]Attr,
BUT [in the words of Scripture], the time has come to "set aside [childish things]."

The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit, to choose our better history, to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea, passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness.

In reaffirming the greatness of our nation, we understand that greatness is never a given; it must be earned.

Our journey has never been one of short-cuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the faint-hearted -- for those who prefer leisure over work, or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame. Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things -- some celebrated but more often men and women obscure in their labor, who have carried us up the long, rugged path towards prosperity and freedom.

For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and traveled across oceans in search of a new life.

They toiled in sweatshops and settled the West; endured the lash of the whip and plowed the hard earth.

For us, they fought and died, in places like Concord and Gettysburg; Normandy and Khe Sahn.

Time and again these men and women struggled and sacrificed so that we might live a better life.
They (S) saw (Pr:Ment) [America as bigger than the sum of our individual ambitions]Phenom, [greater than all the differences of birth or wealth or faction]Phenom.

This (S) is (Pr:Relat) [the journey we continue today]Value.

We (S) remain (Pr:Relat) [the most prosperous, powerful nation on Earth]Attr.

Our workers (S) are (Pr:Relat) [no less productive than when this crisis began]Attr.

Our minds (S) are (Pr:Relat) [no less inventive]Attr,

Our goods and services (S) [no less needed than they were last week or last month or last year]Attr.

Our capacity (S) remains (Pr:Relat) [undiminished]Attr.

But our time of standing pat, of protecting narrow interests and putting off unpleasant decisions - that time (S) has [surely]Circ passed (Pr:Mat).

[Starting today]Circ), we (S) must pick [ourselves]Goal up (Pr:Mat),

dust [ourselves]Goal off (Pr:Mat),

AND we (S) will act (Pr:Mat) -- not [only to create new jobs]Circ, but [to lay a new foundation for growth]Circ.

[We (S) will build (Pr:Mat) [the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our commerce and bind us together]Goal.

We (S) will restore (Pr:Mat) [science]Range [to its rightful place]Circ,

AND we (S) will harness (Pr:Mat) [the sun and the winds and the soil]Goal [to fuel our cars]Circ and [run our factories]Circ.
47 { **AND we** (S) } **will transform** (Pr:Mat) [our schools and colleges and universities]^{Goal} [to meet the demands of a new age]^{Circ}.

48 { [All this]^{Goal} we } (S) **can do** (Pr:Mat).

49 { [All this]^{Goal} we } (S) **will do** (Pr:Mat).

50 { **Now, there** (S) } **are** (Pr:Exist) [some who question the scale of our ambitions]^[Existent] – [who suggest that our system cannot tolerate too many big plans]^[Existent].

51 { **Their memories** (S) } **are** (Pr:Relat) [short]^Attr.

52i { For **they** (S) } **have forgotten** (Pr:Ment) [what this country (S) has already done];

52ii { what } free men and women (S) can achieve

52iii { when } imagination (S) is joined to common purpose, and necessity (S) to courage]^Phenom.

53i { **What the cynics fail to understand** (S) } **is** (Pr:Relat)

53ii { { THAT the ground (S) } has shifted beneath them –

53ii { THAT the stale political arguments that have consumed us for so long (S) } no longer apply]^Value.

54i { **The question we ask today** (S) } **is** (Pr:Relat) not [whether our government is too big or too small]^Verbiage, but [whether it works]^Verbiage –

54ii { { whether it } helps families find jobs at a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified]^Verbiage.

55i { [Where]^[Circ the answer (S) } **is** (Pr:Relat) [yes]^Value },

55ii we (S) **intend** (Pr:Ment) [to move forward]^Phenom.

56i { [Where]^[Circ the answer (S) } **is** (Pr:Relat) [no]^Value },

56ii programs (S) **will end** (Pr:Mat).

57i { **AND** [those of us who manage the public's dollars]^[Range (S) } will be held (Pr:Mat) [to account]^[Circ – [to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day]^[Circ –

57ii { **BECAUSE** [only then]^[Circ } can we (S) **restore** (Pr:Mat) [the vital trust between a people and their government]^Range.
58 { Nor is (Pr:Relat) the question before us (S) } [whether the market is a force for good or ill] \textsuperscript{Value}.

59i { Its power to generate wealth and expand freedom (S) } is (Pr:Relat) [unmatched] \textsuperscript{Attr}.

59ii { BUT this crisis (S) } has reminded (Pr:Ment) [us]

59iii [{ THAT without a watchful eye }, the market (S) can spin out of control] \textsuperscript{Phenom}.

60i { The nation (S) } cannot prosper (Pr:Mat) [long] \textsuperscript{Circ}

60ii { when it (S) favors (Pr:Mat) [only the prosperous] \textsuperscript{Range}.

61i { The success of our economy (S) } has [always] \textsuperscript{Circ} depended (Pr:Relat) not [just on the size of our Gross Domestic Product] \textsuperscript{Attr}, but [on the reach of our prosperity; on the ability to extend opportunity to every willing heart] \textsuperscript{Attr} – [not out of charity] \textsuperscript{Circ}, but

61ii { BECAUSE it (S) } is (Pr:Relat) [the surest route to our common good] \textsuperscript{Attr}.

62 { [As for our common defense] \textsuperscript{Circ}, we (S) reject (Pr:Mat) [as false] \textsuperscript{Circ} [the choice between our safety and our ideals] \textsuperscript{Range}.

63 { Our Founding Fathers -- Our Founding Fathers (S) }, [faced with perils that we can scarcely imagine] \textsuperscript{Circ}, drafted (Pr:Mat) [a charter to assure the rule of law and the rights of man] \textsuperscript{Range}, [a charter expanded by the blood of generations] \textsuperscript{Range}.

64i { Those ideals (S) } [still] \textsuperscript{Circ} light (Pr:Mat) [the world] \textsuperscript{Range},

64ii { AND we (S) } will not give [them] \textsuperscript{Goal} up [for expedience] (s sake) \textsuperscript{Circ}.

65i { AND SO [to all the other peoples and governments who are watching today] \textsuperscript{Recipient}, [from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born] \textsuperscript{Circ}:

65ii { [Know] (Pr:Ment) } that [America (S) is a friend of each nation and every man, woman, and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity] \textsuperscript{Phenom}.

66 { AND we (S) } are (Pr:Relat) [ready to lead once more] \textsuperscript{Attr}.

67 { Recall (Pr:Ment) } that [earlier generations (S) faced down fascism and communism not just with missiles and tanks, but with the sturdy alliances and enduring convictions] \textsuperscript{Phenom}.
68i { They (S) } understood (Pr:Ment)

68ii { THAT [our power alone (S) } cannot protect us,

68iii { nor does it (S) } entitle us to do as we please]\Phenom.

69i { Instead, they (S) } knew (Pr:Ment)

69ii { THAT [our power (S) } grows through its prudent use;

69iii { our security (S) } emanates from the justness of our cause, the force of our example, the tempering qualities of humility and restraint].

70 { We (S) } are (Pr:Relat) [the keepers of this legacy]\Attr.

71 { [Guided by these principles once more] }, we (S) can meet (Pr:Mat) [those new threats that demand even greater effort -- even greater cooperation and understanding between nations]\Range.

72i { We (S) } will begin (Pr:Mat) [to responsibly leave Iraq to its people]\Range,

72ii { AND } [forge a hard-earned peace in Afghanistan]\Range.

73i { [With old friends and former foes]\Circ, we (S) will work (Pr:Mat) [tirelessly]\Circ [to lessen the nuclear threat]\Range,

73ii { AND } [roll back the specter of a warming planet]\Range.

74i { We (S) } will not apologize (Pr:Verb) [for our way of life]\Verbiage,

74ii { NOR will we (S) } waver (Pr:Mat) [in its defense]\Circ,

74iii { AND [for those who seek to advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents] }, we (S) say (Pr:Verb) [to you]\Recipient [now]\Circ

74iv { THAT [our spirit (S) } is stronger and

74v cannot be broken]\Verbiage.

75i { You (S) } cannot outlast (Pr:Mat) [us]\Range,

75ii { AND we (S) } will defeat (Pr:Mat) [you]\Range!

76 { For we (S) } know (Pr:Ment) that [our patchwork heritage (S) is a strength, not a weakness]\Phenom.

77 { We (S) } are (Pr:Relat) [a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus -- and non-believers]\Attr.
We (S) are (Pr:Relat) [shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth]\textsuperscript{Attr},

AND BECAUSE we (S) have tasted (Pr:Mat) [the bitter swill of civil war and segregation]\textsuperscript{Goal}.

AND ] emerged (Pr:Mat) [from that dark chapter stronger and more united]\textsuperscript{Circ},

we (S) cannot help but believe (Pr:Ment)

THAT [the old hatreds (S) shall someday pass]\textsuperscript{Phenom};

THAT [the lines of tribe (S) shall soon dissolve]\textsuperscript{Phenom};

AND THAT [America (S) must play its role in ushering in a new era of peace]\textsuperscript{Phenom}.

[To the Muslim world]\textsuperscript{Recipient}, we (S) seek (Pr:Mat) [a new way forward, based on mutual interest and mutual respect]\textsuperscript{Range}.

[To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict, or blame their society's ills on the West]\textsuperscript{Recipient} – know (Pr:Ment) that [your people (S) will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy]\textsuperscript{Phenom}.

To those – [To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent] }, know (Pr:Ment) that [you (S) are on the wrong side of history]\textsuperscript{Phenom};

BUT THAT [we (S) will extend a hand

IF you (S) are willing to unclench your fist]\textsuperscript{Phenom}.

[To the people of poor nations]\textsuperscript{Recipient}, we (S) pledge (Pr:Verb) [to work alongside you to make your farms flourish and let clean waters flow; to nourish starved bodies and feed hungry minds]\textsuperscript{Verbiage}.

[AND to those nations like ours that enjoy relative plenty]\textsuperscript{Recipient}, we (S) say (Pr:Verb)

[we (S) can no longer afford indifference to the suffering outside our borders]\textsuperscript{Verbiage};

[NOR can we (S) consume the world's resources without regard to effect]\textsuperscript{Verbiage}.
For the world (S) has changed (Pr:Mat),

AND we (S) must change (Pr:Mat) [with it] Circ.

As we (S) consider (Pr: Ment) [the road that unfolds before us] Phenom,

we (S) remember (Pr: Ment) [with humble gratitude] Circ [those brave Americans who, at this very hour, patrol far-off deserts and distant mountains] Phenom.

They (S) have (Pr: Relat) [something to tell us] Attr,

just as the fallen heroes who lie in Arlington (S) whisper (Pr: Verb) [through the ages] Circ.

We (S) honor (Pr: Mat) [them] Range

NOT ONLY BECAUSE they (S) are (Pr: Relat) [the guardians of our liberty] Attr,

BUT because they (S) embody (Pr: Relat) [the spirit of service] Attr; [a willingness to find meaning in something greater than themselves] Attr.

AND yet, [at this moment] Circ -- [a moment that will define a generation] Circ -- it (S) is (Pr: Relat) [precisely this spirit that must inhabit us all] Attr.

FOR [as much as] Goal government (S) can do (Pr: Mat) and

must do (Pr: Mat),

it (S) is (Pr: Relat) [ultimately the faith and determination of the American people upon which this nation relies] Attr.

It is the kindness to take in a stranger when the levees break (S), the selflessness of workers who would rather cut their hours than see a friend lose their job (S) which sees (Pr: Mat) [us] Range [through our darkest hours] Circ.

It is the firefighter's courage to storm a stairway filled with smoke (S), but also a parent's willingness to nurture a child (S), that finally decides (Pr: Mat) [our fate] Range.

Our challenges (S) may be (Pr: Relat) [new] Attr.

The instruments with which we meet them (S) may be (Pr: Relat) [new] Attr.

But those values upon which our success depends (S) -- honesty and hard work, courage and fair play, tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism (S) -- these things (S) are (Pr: Relat) [old] Attr.
95 { These things (S) } are (Pr:Relat) [true]Attr.

96 { They (S) } have been (Pr:Relat) [the quiet force of progress throughout our history]Attr.

97 { What is demanded (S) } [then]Circ is (Pr:Relat) [a return to these truths]Attr.

98i { What is required of us (S) } [now]Circ is (Pr:Relat) [a new era of responsibility]Attr – [a recognition, on the part of every American,

98ii { THAT we (S) } have duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world, duties that we do not grudgingly accept but rather seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than giving our all to a difficult task]Attr.

99 { This (S) } is (Pr:Relat) [the price and the promise of citizenship]Value.

100 { This (S) } is (Pr:Relat) [the source of our confidence]Value – [the knowledge that God (S) calls on us to shape an uncertain destiny]Value.

101i { This (S) } is (Pr:Relat) [the meaning of our liberty and our creed]Value –

101ii { why } men and women and children of every race and every faith (S) can join in celebration across this magnificent mall,

101iii { AND why } a man whose father less than sixty years ago might not have been served at a local restaurant (S) can now stand before you to take a most sacred Oath]Value.

102 { So let us (S) } mark (Pr:Mat) [this day]Range [with remembrance, of who we are and how far we have traveled]Circ.

103 { [In the year of America's birth]Circ, [in the coldest of months]Circ, a small band of patriots (S) huddled (Pr:Mat) [by dying campfires]Circ [on the shores of an icy river]Circ.

104 { The Capitol (S) } was (Pr:Relat) [abandoned]Attr.

105 { The enemy (S) } was advancing (Pr:Mat).

106 { The snow (S) } was stained (Pr:Relat) [with blood]Attr.

107i { [At a moment when the outcome of our revolution was most in doubt]Circ,}

107ii the father of our nation (S) ordered (Pr:Verb) [these words]Verbiage be read [to the people]Recipient.

108i { Let it (S) } be told (Pr:Verb) [to the future world]Recipient...
THAT [in the depth of winter], when nothing but hope and virtue (S) could survive...

THAT the city and the country (S), alarmed at one common danger, came forth to meet [it] Verbiage.

America: [In the face of our common dangers]\textsuperscript{Circ}, [in this winter of our hardship]\textsuperscript{Circ}, let us (S) remember (Pr:Ment) [these timeless words]\textsuperscript{Phenom}.

[With hope and virtue]\textsuperscript{Phenom}, let us (S) brave (Pr:Mat) [once more]\textsuperscript{Circ} the icy currents\textsuperscript{Range},

and endure (Pr:Mat) [what storms may come]\textsuperscript{Range}.

Let it (S) be said (Pr:Verb) by our children's children (Ac)

THAT when we (S) were tested (Pr:Mat)

THAT we (S) refused to let [this journey]\textsuperscript{Range} end (Pr:Mat),

THAT we (S) did not turn back (Pr:Mat)

NOR did we (S) falter (Pr:Mat);

AND [with eyes fixed on the horizon]\textsuperscript{Circ} and [God's grace upon us]\textsuperscript{Circ}, we (S) carried forth (Pr:Mat) [that great gift of freedom]\textsuperscript{Goal} and

delivered (Pr:Mat) [it]\textsuperscript{Goal} [safely]\textsuperscript{Circ} [to future generations]\textsuperscript{Circ}.

Thank you }, God (S) bless (Pr:Mat) [you]\textsuperscript{Range},

AND God (S) } bless (Pr:Mat) [the United States of America]\textsuperscript{Range}. 