
DONALD TRUMP AND BARRACK OBAMA'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS: STYLISTIC ANALYSIS

Agung Suhadi and Kiagus Baluqiah
Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu
agungketupat@yahoo.com

Abstract

The two Presidents of U.S., Barack Obama (former) and Donald Trump displayed outstanding rhetorical craftsmanship to drive the power of persuasion that gave them a victory. This study explores by taking up the 2009 Inaugural Speech of President Barack Obama and Donald Trump in 2016 as the target of stylistic analysis. To achieve this objective, this study analyzes the oral communication by concerning on the content of speeches and how it was carried out as well. In order to identify the “what” and “how” questions will be formulated through research questions; what promise and requests are made, how does intertextuality strengthen the speech, what are the lexical features and what are the reference of politically loaded pronouns in the speech. The result of this study showed that Obama’s inaugural speech style is more communicative, evocative and its message conveyed orderly. While, Trump’s style is more conversationally, but it was able to awaken audiences through huge topics are delivered, for instance American first, transferring power, nation etc.

Keywords: *Inaugural, promise and request, stylistic, intertextuality, and pronoun usage*

1. INTRODUCTION

The two figures of United States, Donald Trump and Barack Obama display a characteristic and personality when convey their speech. Trump is unloved figure by majority of American (cited in Yourish, 2016), and is regarded controversial and less of political norm (Devis W, 2016). In *Washington Post*, Millbank (2016) gives a strickly critic of Trump’s provocative way through social networks without any real consideration of the media. Ingoing every norm of the American politics and hoping to reflect the silent majority, Donald Trump says what he thinks, and thus appears sincere and authentic. For him, any exposure in and all comments from the media are considered good. Trump believes that the repetition of a simple message, even a wrong one (Boyd, 2016), is enough to persuade the citizens that it is true. His image is centered around his verbosity, egocentricity, and pomposity. But Trump was able to beat all his opponents, won the nomination for the Republican party (July 21st 2016), and won the general election (Nov. 8th, 2016).

Barack Obama demonstrated personalized anecdote, educated and underscored political platform more reasonable and logic (Hesford, 2007). He has mastered in rhetorical devices that project power and confidence in communication. Yu. B (2008) comments Trump’s speech displayed the personalized message with full aspirational language, great magnanimity and humility as a leader and fondly embraced his political rivals. But, people have generally noticed that there is noticeable different in the pronunciation which has been interpreted as the indexical of African American Vernacular English.

Based on speeches delivered during the inaugural speech, detect their communication styles and discover the rhetoric features that can explain success or, at least, their differences. To provide a partial answer to these questions and define rhetoric as the art of effective and persuasive speaking, the way to motivate an audience, while language style is presented as pervasive and frequent forms used by an author (Biber & Conrad 2009). Therefore, this study examines the style features in the speech of Donald Trump and

Barack Obama from the target through stylistic analysis. These will be identified by addressing research questions; what promises and requests are made, how does intertextuality, lexical features, and referent of politically loaded pronouns strengthen their speeches.

2. CONCEPTUAL THEORY

The word of stylistic is derived from Latin word "elocution" which means style. It has several meanings in and outside of the literary. A particular procedure by which something is done, a manner or a way is style. Broadly, it can be transposed in many ways for example appearance of everything, the way of doing something, the way of living as well can be considered as style. Style is also related to the language use or language of politics is used by individuals in speech as a persuasive one, hence politicians are expected to be conversant with this characteristic of language. The usage of language of politics to perform the task of persuading and emphasizing goes a long way in making the language of politics a beautiful language. One of the beautiful features of human language is the fact that it is used for social interaction. Bloch and Trager (1942) define human language as—a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group cooperates. In social lives of humans, language is used to establish and maintain social relationships. It is by—virtue of our membership of social groups that we are able to interact with others and in doing so, to establish our individual identity and personality (Lyons 1977:51). The act of speaking is one way by which human beings communicate feelings and emotions as well as ideas to other members of a social group.

The concept of stylistics is often referred to as "literary linguistics" which is concerned with the linguistic choices that distinguished genres such as poetry, prose, drama, and novels. It studies the language use by individuals or groups in specific contexts (Richard, 1997). But, in broader term, the stylistic is not only concerned on literary analysis, it is a discipline that has been approached from many perspectives for serving various meanings, purposes ranging from communication to command and persuasion. Ayeomoni (2004:177) argues that linguistic stylistics as—an analytical approach that helps readers to objectively study both literary pieces and non literary materials. In *"Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students"*, Simpson (2004) states stylistics is concerned with the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of texts of all categories, whether literary or non-literary, constructed with the verbal apparatus of language, from the perspective of linguistics.

Stylistic is an aspect of linguistic study that emphasizes the appropriateness of a language to its audience. It tries to understand how suitable a language is to a particular audience. Stylistics is the study and interpretation of texts from a linguistic perspective. As a discipline, it links literary criticism and linguistics, but has no autonomous domain of its own, Widdowson (1975). It is on this premise that this study seeks to use stylistics as a foundation for the analysis of presidential speeches which is a domain of politics. Stylistics also attempts to establish principles capable of explaining the particular choices made by individuals and social groups in their use of language as cited in (Brown, 2005; Finch, 1998 and Wisniewski, 2007).

Stylistic investigations were initially concerned with literary text, that is why it is sometimes called literary linguistics or literary stylistics. Nowadays however, the domain of stylistics has expanded into the analysis of various kinds of texts such as manuals, recipes as well as novels and advertisements. In addition, media discourses' such as films, news reports, song lyrics and political speeches have all come to be under the umbrella of stylistic analysis. (Brown, 2005; Finch, 1998 and Wisniewski, 2007).

3. THE CONCEPT OF STYLE

The term 'style' is used in linguistics to describe the choices which language makes available to a user, above and beyond the choices necessary for the simple expression of a meaning. Linguistic form can be interpreted as a set of possibilities for the production of

texts, and thereby linguistic form makes possible linguistic style. The understanding of the term style influences the characteristics given to stylistics as one of several linguistic disciplines. There are several broad areas in which it is used: (1) At its simplest, style refers to the manner of expression in writing and speaking, just as there is a manner of doing things, like playing squash or painting. It is possible to talk of someone writing in an ornate style, or speaking in a comic style. For some people, style has evaluative connotations: style can be good or bad. (2) One obvious implication of (1) is that there are different styles in different situations (e.g. comic vs. turgid); also that the same activity can produce stylistic variation (no two people will have the same style in playing squash or writing an essay). So style can be seen as variation in language use, whether literary or non-literary.

The effects these features convey can be understood only by intuitively sensing the choices that have been made... and it is usually enough simply to respond to the effect in this way. But, there are often occasions when we have to develop a more analytical approach...here...our intuition needs to be supplemented by a more objective account of style. It is this approach which is known as stylistics. Crystal and Davy (1969:9,10) cited in Murana (2011) identify four definitions of style as: a) referring to the language habit of a person; b) meaning some or all of the language habits shared by a group of people at one time or over a period of time; c) referring to the effectiveness of mode of expression; and d) tant amount to literary language. Style therefore, can be seen as the different kinds of options a narrator exercises from the linguistic system, and also from the social semiotic from which, according to Halliday, the linguistic system ultimately derives. Style, looked at in this way, is the complex of different paths through different social and linguistic systems, which generate the text.

4. RESEARCH METHODS

The approach used in this paper was qualitative analysis method of inquiry that deals with linguistic units such as words, intertextuality, lexical features and pronoun use (Donyei, 2007: 38), (Cresswell, 2003: 182), by means of which this research paper attempted to identify and intepret Donald Trump's speech and Obama's rhetoric in his Iowa Causeses Speech entitled "Our Time for Change has Come". The data for this study were derived from the written text of *Obama's Iowa Victory Speech* (Obama, B. 2009, January 3) and Donald Trump's inauguration speech, in 2016. The target from Trump and Obama's speech, firstly, employing content analysis, which enable us to clarify the promise and request of the speech. Secondly, I focus on intertextuality as reference to U.S. history 'speaking to ages'—is one of the requirements of U.S. inaugural addresses. Third, I employ lexical features and lastly, I observe usage of pronouns that are common used by two figures.

5. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

This part delineates the language use or styles as conveyed in Barack Obama and Donald Trump's inaugural. Both have addressed in terms of crucial topics about U.S. through four styles such as promise and request, intertextuality, lexical features and pronous usage. Their rhetorical craftsmanship have proved to drive irresistibly power of persuasion and evokes emotional appeals toward their audiences.

Promises and request—these are the speech behavior pattern that often found in English language. Riyadh Tariq (2012) argues these are communicative behavior of speakers in maintaining social relationships between the individuals in any society. These can be performed in different aspects of life such as social, political, pedagogical and religious relationships. The use of these, whether explicitly or implicitly, differs from culture to culture and from society to another. As described in Barack Obama's inaugural, he firstly uses "anaphora" and "apostrophe" styles to manage and ensure his promise and request messages. These rhetorical tools can manage his thought about American promise, dream and future. It is vividly conducted when he begins his sentences with some couple of words,

for instances “You’ll hear [...]”, “We want [...]” or “That’s [...]”, indicates positive ideas about U.S., Americans or what the future will bring. This anaphora, thus is followed by the same lines over and over again. The usage of it as a great way of Obama to ensure his promise and request stand out and easier to be remembered by audiences. Obama further talks about the spirit of American and provides some realistic examples that evoke how U.S. will have ended the economic crisis and war in a very near future. He gently uses “apostrophe” to ensure his address message go through. As cited in lines of his inaugural, “It’s not always a straight line. It’s not always a smooth path, it moves forward because of you. It moves forward because [...]”, he conveys about the union and the future like they (audiences) were capable of understanding what was said about them, or if they were alive, and once again the anaphora is used so all these optimistic ideas will stick. All in all, this entire speech is made up, using Tautology at its best: when reading or listening his speech, the sense is just repeating himself of how well he and his country have been doing lately and how bright the future is for everything and everyone.

Obama talks about how great, wealthy and powerful the U.S. to give American spirit, not the military or the universities. It mentions American dream and how every American should follow up to his promise and how the U.S. has made to the a point of no return where moving forward is the only option. Then his speech seems automatically become neutral, he addresses everyone; “And whether I earned your vote or not, I have listened to you...”, he is talking to every American, Democratic, Republican - even third parties. He manages to put some of his political work into it. This quote is taken directly from the speech, when Barack Obama is talking about a girl, who was about to die from leukemia: “[...] had it not been for health care reform passing just a few months before the insurance company was about to stop paying for her care.” This is a very sensitive area for everybody, and Obama uses that to his advantage by using pathos which makes most of the listeners feel pity for the little poor girl, and at the same time happiness because of what Barack Obama has done for the U.S. This actually leads the Americans to ask themselves a rhetorical question: If it wasn’t for Barack Obama’s health care, would this little girl have died then?

The speech itself is just what you’d expect from any reasonable leader in the U.S. It is a speech where the American Dream is the biggest topic, when being optimistic about the future and then work a little harder is all there is to save the nation. It is a speech that will promise a greater country, and contains a lot of empty promises, just like in the campaigns. Personally, I believe that if Mitt Romney had won the election, the speech he would have given would have been almost identical to this. Of course, there’re some parts where their political views would be different, but all in all I think the essence and rhetorical layout of a victory speech would be pretty much the same. It was back in 1776 when all of this began. Using some aspects of his character, Obama asserted his power of persuasion; a character imbued with optimism to do great things, he resonated the strength of his spirit of optimism to do great things. He was adoring the great achievement of his supporters to do great things in Iowa.

In his request, he uses the construction pattern, “will do such and such to do something”, with personalized and language style to describe his purposes with the infinitive “to do”, he mentions, “*We will act not only to create new jobs, but to lay a new foundation for growth, We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our commerce and bind us together, We will restore science to its rightful place, and wield technology’s wonders to raise health care’s quality and lower its cost, We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age.*” Obama described his requests are made in what is required of us now is a new era of responsibility—a recognition, on the part of every American, that we have duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world, duties that we do not grudgingly accept but rather seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than giving our all to a difficult task. This is the promise of

citizenship. This is the source of our confidence—the knowledge that God calls on us to shape an uncertain destiny.” The core message is to ask the citizens to be aware of their duties and responsibilities and get over the difficult time.

Meanwhile, the rhetorical styles of Donald Trump was not orderly as Obama done, but he was able to address important issues of U.S. for empowering his promise and request. As cited in Johnson’s view of Trump’s inaugural that Trump’s speech is more conversational, the interesting point of his address are language slogan that he made such as great America, one American. It is mentioned, as follows, *“We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and restore its promise for all of our people. Together we will determine the course of America and the world for many, many years to come”*. Here, Trump ran on a nostalgic slogan of “make America Great Again.” But it was never clear what, precisely, that meant. By many basic measures and statistics, the country is better off than eight years ago. The country was on the precipice of a potential Great Depression and more than 100,000 troops were overseas, entangled in two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Now, the economy has improved; the unemployment rate is below 5 percent. And the number of troops in conflict is drastically reduced. There has, however, been some permanent damage to some after the recession — some have had to take jobs for less money and struggled to retrain for new careers. Many retirement plans were decimated. And the red tape and cost to some for Obamacare caused a backlash against President Obama and his party. For more on the country Trump is inheriting, Trump mentions, *“We will face challenges. We will confront hardships. But we will get the job done. Every four years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power.”* It’s remarkable that Trump is following Barack Obama as president, a man whom Trump repeatedly and falsely questioned about his birthplace. It’s what launched him onto the scene during this run for the White House. But despite that, Obama made a point of being gracious and welcoming during the transition. In fact, in the Oval Office when Trump met with Obama after his election, Trump noted that he had never met Obama and was impressed. Since then, they have talked multiple times by phone. It’s an example that Obama learned from his predecessor, George W. Bush. Despite Obama’s having run against Bush’s economic and foreign policy, Bush was gracious. It’s unclear, however, that Obama will completely follow Bush’s example POST-presidency. W., who left office with rock-bottom approval ratings, remained silent for much of Obama’s presidency. Obama, on the other hand, is leaving with high approval ratings. He said he will be focused on family for a year, but he has pledged to speak out when what he sees as American “core values” are threatened.

Donald Trump says ‘We are transferring power from Washington D.C. and giving it back to you, the people. Trump’s inaugural speech strongly echoes the themes that were central to his campaign: a populist, anti-establishment message combined with a promise to transfer power to “the people.” Trump tapped into a feeling among many voters that the political system was broken and the Washington establishment was not serving them; that feeling led many voters—especially in the nation’s Rust Belt —to reject traditional politicians and instead elect a real estate developer and entertainment mogul with no political experience to the nation’s highest office. Trump’s use of “Believe me!” that he wants his audience to believe. Why does he use such expressions and how do they work in discourse? To understand this, one needs to look at the concept of lying. Most people will say that a lie is a false statement. But a study by linguists Linda Coleman and Paul Kay pointed out more than 30 years ago that the situation is more complex. but you sincerely believe that it is true, you are not lying in stating it. Lying involves a hierarchy of conditions defining worse and worse lies. Here is the hierarchy, *“You don’t believe it, you are trying to deceive, you are trying to gain advantage for yourself, you are trying to harm”*. Trump said time and time again that politicians are all talk and no action, he uses believe that he is up to bat and he needs to demonstrate that he’s all action. He brings some issues economic,

terrorism, health and foreign policy. In health, his main goal for health care policy is to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Intertextuality

Intertextuality in a speech usually reflected the use of quotations and reference of speakers. It draws upon the concept, rhetoric or ideology a reference to empower the speech address. In Obama's inaugural, most of his intertextuality are quoted from famous public figures, swing time (singers) and scripture. Obama quoted Robert Kennedy's words, "*it is revolutionary world that we live in*", a civil rights who was also assassinated before becoming a probable President of the United States. He was a leader for the young people in America in a decade in which students were active protesters. He also borrows the words of Thomas Paine (the first president George Washington), or the father of nation who lift up the spirit during the Independence. His main intention by using Kennedy and Paine's words to evoke and believe young generation of American that Kennedy was a young victim of a conspiracy when killed and Paine as a father of nation which lift up the spirit during the Independence. Here, Obama is also young and is being addressed to young people in delicate historical moment and follows predecessors' (former president) to stand out or attain his originality by letting the nuance of 'lifting up spirit' link historically to significant moment of American nation. In *Swing Time*, Obama takes reference from Dorothy Fields and Jerome Kern's musical lyrics. He mentions, "*We must pick ourselves up and dust ourselves off and begin again the task of remaking America and it was played to lift up the U.S. citizens' spirit during the Great Depression era, nothing's impossible, I have found, for when my chin is on the ground, I pick myself up, dust myself off, start all over again*". The word "nothing impossible" from *Swing Time* indicates that Obama wants to address his great motivation toward young people and American society. This expression can motivate for American people must be confidence, don't lose confidence if they slip. Then this quote is further corroborated with his scripture's words, "be grateful for a pleasant trip and pick yourselves up; dust yourselves off; start all over again". This can build insight for creating a spirit of life, the word "nothing impossible" means never give up and new hope will come.

In Trump's inauguration portrays two highly interesting examples of exophoric references in regards to intertextuality. The first one is the references to the movie actor, Batman Villain Bane and the second is the iconic of "Bee movie". The meaning of these intertextuality regard very appropriate for Trump's address; his political mission and strictly contain a critic on the reign of Obama. Trump repeats many times the phrase, "American first" which indicates that he describes himself as having seized power, he continues from this day forward, a new vision will govern our land to be only American first. Then his rhetorical is supported by Bane's words "'We are one nation, and their pain is our pain. Their dreams are our dreams. And their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny.'" This expression is able to make his audiences eerily echoed. The most gutting intertextuality reference; 'grab them by pussy', Trump's words

Lexical features

During conveying his inaugural speech, there are some words are mentioned by Obama indicating his characteristics terms such as "nation, America, people, generation, now, today, time, spirit, crisis, peace, Americans and journeys". On the basis of the frequency counts, it turned out that 880 different words were used in the speech with 2400 token words. Out of these 880 words, basic words (verbs) such as 'carry', 'remain' and 'meet' were repeatedly used to make his speech lucid. 'America' and 'Americans' are among the 'buzz words' frequently used in U.S. presidential inaugural speeches. 'Buzz words' mean "the terms which arouse U.S. citizens' patriotism" (Matsuo 2002). Other examples of such expressions are 'peace', 'hero', 'unity', 'believe' and so on. Obama uses a larger number of buzz words usually in his speeches (notably, the 2008 election campaign slogan was 'change

we can believe in'). But in this inaugural address, he used few buzz words. Instead, he managed to arouse patriotic feelings in context and with the strategic usage of pronouns.

In Trump's rhetorical characteristics address in broad sense that refer to particular groups of people. These are immigrants/illegals, muslim, hispanis/latinos and friends. In the context of 'immigrant/illegal' group into four words, namely 'immigrants', immigrant', 'illegals' and 'illegal', because depending on the context they have different referent. Trump only uses the terms 'hispanis, as studied by Linda Martin Alcoff it links between ethnic names and political movements "would-be political leader have long known that one's choice between these terms can signal one's political views about assimilation, cultural nationalism and relative importance of race as well. It seems to correlate with the notion that the term is strongly tied to specific political ideologies.

Pronoun Usage

The first-person pronoun "I" refers to a particular individual as the speaker producing an utterance, and second-person "you" refers to another individual to whom the speaker directs the utterance. This well-accepted idea of personal pronouns, however, does not contribute to the explication of their functions in discourse although only first- and second-person pronouns refer to "discourse instances" (instances de discourse) (Benveniste 1966). This paper aims to establish the contention that the first-person pronoun "I" refers to the speaker as the addresser of an illocutionary act, and the second-person pronoun "you" refers to the hearer as the addressee of the illocutionary act. This clarifies the discursive function of the personal pronouns: they indicate participants of the illocutionary act performed in the discourse. Identifying the indicating function of personal pronouns makes it possible to analyze Japanese personal pronouns and the formality level of the discourse, which are generally assumed to be a problem case, in a consistent manner.

During conducting campaign trail, in particular moment, both Presidents have the same way or style in pronoun usage with different intentions. As has been done by Trump, he employed pronoun words such as 'we', 'I', 'me', 'myself', 'you', 'us', 'they'. The word 'we' as the leading element in a rhetorica device is known as anaphora, where the repetition of a word means rhetorical power of "we", on the campaign make him infamous for declaring himself as the solution to America's ill, most notably declaring that "I alone can fix it" when accepting the GOP nomination. "We" is commonly employed to establish shared identity (in opposition with 'they', for example, which creates exlusion), and suggests co-operation and common goals. Therefore, it is unsurprising that 'we' is frequently observed in both Presidents' speeches. He opted for "we" over his usual "I" as agent of action. In addition, Trump used "we will" as theme to tie together a number of hopeful goals, "We will embark upon a project of national and growth and renewal. We will double our growth and have the strongest economy anywhere in the world. We will have great relationship."

This repeated use if "we will" accomplishes two important goals, first, it's departure from Trump's usual tone, moving from the sel-focused "I" of the campaign trail to the broader idea of "we" the nation. Second, it changes the tone of the speech from candidate Trump's negative claims of an American under threat toward a tone that is aspirational, even hope. It focuses on the work that is to be done, and the benefits of working together. He also uses "me", "myself" and "I" in order to self-focus among Presidential Frontunners. The usage of "I" has been linked to honesty, depression, status, and psychological dimensions. The exploring of singular pronouns such as me, my, and mine lead to personalities and mental states.

Trump also does this through personal pronouns. Trump's use of "you" in particular (its variation, such as "your"), records over double the frequently observed in Obama's speech. Trump's use of you and much frequently, however, further encourages the listeners' personal, individual involvement, and establishes Trump as someone who care for his fellow citizens, in opposition to 'they', those-especially politicians. 'They' in Trum's

rhetorical refers to other countries, their governments, their citizens, while 'us' means Americans.

Meanwhile, in his speech, Obama uses "I", "you", "we" and "they". His targets by using "you and I" indicated to share correspondence relationship dialogically, while "we and they" is another type of correspondence relationship that reflects between himself and audiences. The word "I" refers to him/herself. "They" as way to suggest human, people in general, but other pronouns are "I", "you" and "we" are used only to suggest human. It can be seen from the following quotation, as follows; "For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and traveled across oceans in search of a new life. For us, they toiled in sweatshops and settled the West; endured the lash of the whip and plowed the hard earth. For us, they fought and died, in places like Concord and Gettysburg; Normandy and Khe Sahn". As underlined above, there are three times of appearance of 'they'. The first use of 'they' reminds us of Puritans (Whites) who immigrated to America by the Mayflower. However, the second 'they' evokes slaves (Blacks) from Africa. The third 'they' superficially hints at all Americans, yet if we take a closer look, there can be a deeper interpretation. Concord suggests the War of Independence, Normandy suggests World War II and Khe Sahn suggests the Vietnam War. Thus 'they' refers to Americans. But Gettysburg is the Civil War, meaning this was the battle among Americans. Gettysburg is the symbolic place for President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation (1862) and the Gettysburg Address (1863), which lead us to the idea that 'they' implicates more of Blacks. Historical facts show there were more black war victims at that time. In this paragraph, Obama repeatedly used the expression, "For us, they...". The next section is dedicated to an analysis of the use of this 'us'.

Meanwhile, "we & I" means the president himself in the inaugural address. Impression changes by frequency, placing, and usage. 'We' has a function to 'arouse sense of unity by grouping up individuals and bind as a whole' (Ito 2010). When observing the pronoun 'we', there are two essential points: First, is 'we' inclusive or exclusive? Second, is there 'a basis of sense sharing' or not. First 'we' evidently refers to Americans, or people suffered from Segregation are Blacks, not Whites that this 'we' implicates Blacks.

Therefore, this is superficially an exclusive 'we' usage (against White people). Yet the third 'we' suggests 'we the Americans' or 'one people', meaning an inclusive 'we'. Was the second 'we' originally intended to be an exclusive usage and interpretation, addressing only from Blacks' viewpoints? Obama is the first president that used both 'they' and 'we' to mention racial issues. Former white presidents avoided the use of 'we' for the topics of segregation and slavery—they quoted or hinted at Lincoln and Martin Luther King Jr. instead, whereas half-Black Obama had the right to use 'we'. Yet, Obama has been appealing himself as 'American' (not Black) since his first election campaign and had the ideal of 'One America'. This usage of 'they' and 'we' was his way of meeting high expectations from U.S. citizens and the world on his epoch-making inauguration –to complete a historic turn. Rather, by fusing exclusive 'we' and inclusive 'we' together and by making the best of the functions of 'we' and 'they', Obama stylistically accomplished to encode the concept of 'One America', the fundamental philosophy of U.S., 'E pluribus unum' in his first symbolic inaugural address.

6. CONCLUSION

This study was motivated by the question 'what was talked about and how it was delivered in Donald Trump and President Barack H. Obama's Inaugural Address 2009. In order to clarify the stylistic characteristics of this speech, I employed a method of stylistic analysis that combined content analysis and linguistic (lexical and pronoun) analysis. With the notions of "what" and "how" being inseparable, I placed a high priority on how; linguistic analysis. As of intertextuality, I clarified Obama's both direct and indirect quotations from the Bible, a musical *Swing Time*, and Thomas Pain's work. Content analysis

made in this study revealed that Obama's promises were made in the form of "we will do such and such to do something".

The result of analysis showed that Obama employed some deliberate acts of persuasion toward audience's emotion, reason and logic. He brought the facts, or reality and notion of famous figures like Robert Kenney, scripture, swing time and Thomas Pain. And Obama frequently used pronoun "you and I", "they"; 'you and I' means to share correspondence relationship dialogically, while 'they' refers to white, the puritans who immigrated to America by the Mayflower and 'they' evokes slave from America. While, Trump's rhetorical speech was not good as Obama, but rather conversationally. Most of his pronoun in speech by using 'me', 'myself' and 'I' refer to self-focus in term of honesty, depression, status, and 'mine' leads to personalities and mental states.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bitzer, L. The Rhetorical Situation. Paper presented as a public lecture at CornellMUniversity in November, 1966.
- Brown, R. and Gilman, The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. Sebeok (ed.) Style in Language. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960.
- Crystal, D & Davy, D. *Investigating English style*. Longman Group Ltd, 1969.
- Erickson, DF. Presidential Inaugural Addresses and American Political Culture. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 27. pp. 23-56, 1997.
- Hebel, U. Intertextuality, Alusion and Quotation. New York: Greewords Press, 1989.
- Millbank, D. 2016. Trump's Fake-News Presidency. *Washington Post*, November 18th.
- Schiffrin, D. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Simpson, P. *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge, 2004.
- Schlesinger, A. The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society. New York. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc, 1992.
- Simpson, P. *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge.
- Sean, Jasso. Measuring the president's inaugural mission. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Science Association. Hilton, Chicago, Sep. 3., 2004.
- Simpson, P. *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge, (2004).
- Ito, R. Stylistic Analysis of U.S. Presidential Inaugural Address: with the Focus on Obama. Keio University, 2010.
- Yourish, K. 2016. Clinton and Trump Have a Terrible Approval Rating. Does it Matter? *New York Times*, June 3rd.
- Yu, B. 2008. Classifying Party Affiliation from Political Speech. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 5(1), 33-48.
- MYu, B. 2013. Language and Gender in Congressional
Boyd, D. 2016. Reality Check: I Blame the Media. *Points*, November 9th. URL: [https://points.datasociety.net/reality-check-de447f2131a3#.cosi2pmkr,](https://points.datasociety.net/reality-check-de447f2131a3#.cosi2pmkr)