

Реторика и политическа комуникация
Rhetoric and Political Communication

**Rhetorical analysis: The example of Obama's speech
at Stavros Niarchos Foundation [SNFCC]**

Magdalini Lamprogeorgou

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
Educator, Med 'Rhetorics, Human Studies and Education'
magdalini_lmpr@hotmail.com

Abstract: The topic of the current paper is the rhetorical analysis/evaluation of president Obama's speech, through the lens of the neo-Aristotelian method of analysis. The methodological analysis is structured according to the five principles of Rhetoric speech, as mentioned in the work of Cicero, titled *De Inventione*. A comparative analysis of the persuasion techniques used by the speaker in relation to the Aristotelian rhetoric (textual and contextual rhetoric analysis) an examination of the principles and customs of fragments of the speech in question and a deeper critical insight of the primary message in order to highlight the ways this specific politic figure uses verbal and non-verbal elements to persuade in the field of presidential rhetoric.

Keywords: Barack Obama, neo-Aristotle analysis method, presidential rhetoric, political rhetoric, canons of classical rhetoric.

Introduction

Rhetoric, as Aristotle defined it, is the method of finding substantive means of persuasion in every rhetoric occasion. [1] Over the past years, though, except from a method to produce effective communicative patterns, rhetoric functions interpretatively in an attempt to understand how people inside specific social situations try to affect others through language. [2] The argumentation of speech is studied from the aspect of *New Rhetoric* where persuasion, an integrant part of argumentation, is enforced not only with elements of Classic Logic, but with elements of Non Typical Logic as well. [3]

Rhetoric is among the most important and least understood elements of presidential leadership. As a result, presidential/political rhetoric has emerged as a political communication theory that describes the communication and government style of U.S. presidents in the twentieth century. [4] The discipline of presidential rhetoric is concerned with the study of presidential public persuasion as it affects the ability of a President to exercise the powers of the office. It is a study of "how Presidents gain, maintain, or lose public support". [5] A president,

apart from his constitutional and statutory power granted by the constitution or conferred by law and his political power as head of the party, also has power with public opinion. [6] “Presidential power is the power the persuade”, as Neustadt states [7]. With this definition, Neustadt places the locus of presidential power in the president as persuader, instead of it residing solely in the formal legal or political powers. It is true that presidents have always wielded rhetoric as a strong tool of governance, related with political ends, such as image building, persuasion of the mass public, and inter-branch government persuasion. Presidential rhetoric is not only one of the powers available to a president, but in a democracy, it may well be the fundamental power, strengthening the need to improve our abilities as communicators through Rhetorical criticism.

Methodological framework

The topic of this study is President Barack Obama’s speech, based on the *Neo-aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis/Criticism*. It pursues a comparison of the persuasion means that are used by the speaker in relation with Aristotelian Rhetoric and an evaluation of the degree that it manages to parlay all these tools and techniques in order to achieve its goals. It is noteworthy that between textual and contextual analysis no distinction has been pursued, taking into consideration that both coexist naturally, function complementarily and are able to give a clearer picture of speech, through the continuous interaction of text-context. [8]

According to Foss [9], a neo-Aristotelian approach is a standard methodology designed for examining rhetorical processes. Neo-Aristotelian method can be summed up in three basic steps: reconstructing the context, in which the artifact occurred, application of proofs and the five canons, assessing the impact on audience. The important features, including the speaker’s personality and character, the audience’s identity, speaker’s ideas, the means of persuasion, the messages, the speaker’s arrangement, the speaker’s expression, the speaker’s delivery and style, and the effect on a certain audience are required to be investigated. [10]

The methodological analysis occurs based on the five canons of rhetoric speech, as referred to in *De Inventione: Inventio, Dispositio, Elocutio, Memoria, Pronuntiatio*. [11]

Invention (*Inventio*) is the location and creation of ideas and materials for the speech. It is related with the external proofs, materials the rhetor does not construct, as well as with the artistic proofs, which means aspects constructed by the rhetor (*ethos, pathos, logos*). The canon of Organization (*Dispositio*) refers to the construction or arrangement of the speech, and Style (*Elocutio*) to the language of the speech. Furthermore, Memory (*Memoria*) is the mastery of

the subject matter, which may include actual memorizing of the speech and Delivery (*Pronuntiatio*) is defined as the management the voice and gestures in the presentation of the speech. [12]

The notions “*ethos, pathos, logos*” are examined once as *probationes artificiales* and belong to *Inventio*, while ‘style and utterance’ fall into *Elocutio*. Ethos, pathos, and logos are the three included types of artistic proofs. Logos aims at the rational, the way of persuading the audiences through logical steps. Its critical analysis is based on assessing evidence and reasoning, considering if it is relevant to thesis, if there is consistent evidence, is the evidence is sufficient to make the point and if reasoning, the use of logical arguments, is related to inductive or deductive way of thinking. [13] Ethos refers to a speaker’s credibility. Aristotle regarded ethos as the most persuasive means of persuasion. [14] Its critical analysis is based on accessing how the rhetor’s perceived character affects the acceptance of the message. The speakers can enhance their credibility through representing moral character, intelligence, and goodwill to the audiences. [15] Pathos is an emotional appeal or the way of putting the audiences into a particular state of mind. [16] It appeals to emotion and its analysis pinpoints evoked emotions and concludes how that changed the audience’s frame of mind.

At a certain point, the method of rhetoric criticism “*Fantasy Theme Analysis*” is used, which is defined as “The creative and imaginative interpretation of events that fulfills a rhetoric need” delimiting completely differently the notion of Imagination. [17] Essentially, a fantasy theme research is a “playful” way of interpreting an experience, based on the analysis of words or phrases that characterize the shared vision of a group/state, in order to explain how characterizes or understands events. [18] As material for processing, the videotaped speech from the Stavros Niarchos Foundation website was used, as well as the written form of the speech as it was published on the official website “Barack White House”.

Speech Context/Rhetorical circumstances

The speech of the President of the United States, Barack Obama, was considered historic by communicators and political analysts. The 44th President of the United States, in the context of his official visit in Athens, gave a speech on the 16th of November 2016 at the Stavros Niarchos Foundation Cultural Centre. This visit was the first contact of the president of the United States with Greece as well as the last official visit regarding his governance. It was a speech that not only Greece and its government were looking forward to, but the whole world, as the first official speech after the election results of 8th November in the USA.

The speech was followed by his visit to the Acropolis and the Museum of

Acropolis, departing after a while for his visit in Berlin for scheduled meetings with European politics and state leaders. His speech in front of the Greek audience was considered preparatory by political analysts in relation to this travel, which was confirmed due to the fact that in a personal dinner with German Angela Merkel in Berlin, he discussed the same topics.

This was a clearly symbolic gesture from his side and choosing to present his speech in Athens two months before being succeeded by Donald Trump regarding his governance was not random. The fact that he wanted to present the speech from 'Pnika' with the Acropolis as the background is also noteworthy, even though in the end the speech was preferred at KPSIN for security reasons. As Lacopoulos mentions [19] *“Obama directed the end of his political career masterfully, crossing the Atlantic to connect his term with the Athens-Berlin axis, with the symbolisms of the land that gave birth to Democracy and the fall of the Berlin wall”*.

Speaker – Audience – Message/Target

Speaker

Barack Hussein Obama II (04/08/1961) served as the 44th President of the United States of America, while being the first African-American that was elected in this position. The first time he was elected president of the USA was at the 4th of November 2008 elections and he governed for the second time in a row after being reelected. His studies include Political Science (Occidental College of L.A.; Columbia University of NYC) and Law (Harvard Law School) and he has also published two books known worldwide. [20]

Audience

A fundamental principle of the Neo-aristotelian Analysis Method is the principal role of the audience. Excluding the bystanders in the Opera hall, the various latent audiences of the speech deserve to be noted. First, the speech addresses every Greek citizen that watches the speech live via a newscast. Characteristics of these citizens are living under economic crisis circumstances, the trial of handling a large refugee/humanitarian crisis, the feeling of lack of parliamentary representation and a wider deconstruction of the sociopolitical status quo. Taking all of the above into consideration, a sub-team of the young Greek generation emerges, which faces the unemployment effect, the need for migration to foreign countries in search of jobs as well as a deep disappointment with the ethical fall of the new world order. Let us also point out that the face-to-face audience did not represent the majority of the Greek people (middle class), as it consisted of

politicians, business people, artists, members of the ex-royal family and more. The Greek government being represented by the Greek Prime Minister's presence at the speech, is one more sub-team of the audience, which expects apparent support on part of the American President, in order to intensify its views and win the commendatory poise of the speaker. Lastly, Obama's concern regarding a possible deconstruction of the postwar world order and the underlining of the outlook via democracy, targets two latent audiences, that of the American people and that of the European leaders that are overwhelmed by insecurity after the election results in the USA.

The rhetoric purpose of the message

The purpose of this speech needs to be viewed based on the tripartite categorization of rhetoric speeches: deliberative, judicial, epideictic. [21] Taking a first look, the speech naturally fits the features of the deliberative speech, as the content is related with public politics and looks towards the future through recommendations/political enforcements to the Greek people in order to have economic followed by sociopolitical restructuring. However, the speech tends to become epideictic, as it seems to aim more towards forming worldwide humanitarian values, rather than persuading about a certain political recommendation. [22] We also note that the speech was presented mainly in order to seal and secure the contribution of the former President of the USA in the American and worldwide legacy, but also to reassure indirectly the concerns of the European leaders after the subversive election results. The whole communicative channel is leaning towards reconstructing the self image of America in the international politics through narratives and persuasion procedures.

The Five Principles of Rhetoric (Officia Oratoris)

Inventio: Ethos – Pathos – Logos

Ethos

Catherine Steel notes that B. Obama's rhetoric is formed with the tripartite Aristotelian ideal: Pathos, Logos, Ethos, meaning "emotion, argument and character". [23] Ethos, aside from textual selections, has been established in the audience's eyes abinitio due to his reputation and his status as "world-leader". The naturalness, the sensitive humor, the spontaneous interaction with the audience forms an affinity ambiance towards his person. The presented philhellenic feeling plays a crucial role towards this direction, not only on a national American level, but on a personal level as well, which determines the textual choices – thematic axis. Also, in order to manage the distance, physical and social, between

transmitter and receiver he sets in motion grammatical choices, such as “*us, our*” while he constantly uses the first-person plural “*we*”. [24]

He maintains an exemplary stance towards the election results of the USA, as it would be really easy to make an open attack against Donald Trump, but he restricts himself to lateral implications. He seems, in the beginning, not to use any argumentation against the American election results, and to make an objective reference to the universal ideals and the naturally disruptive that might supervene in the political affairs of a democratic country. Keeping his distance, without evidently targeting the newly elected President, he effectively forms his morals. He represents himself as a calm, fair and level-headed politician.

With his list of his accomplishments on a national but mainly international level during his governance, he tries to build a reliable profile. However, the level of achieving the specific communicative target is questionable: undeniably he didn't proceed to give hypocritical excuses for the cold-war situation of Ukraine, Yemen and Syria, but he also didn't refer to the truth that presents America as a partaker to this arena. The intervention of the USA in other nations' affairs is presented as a sensible necessity of defense. Here sorts to George Bush's known rhetoric motif “war on terror” – the American operation in Afghanistan and Iraq so he can justify the army intervention in the Middle East and Ukraine. [25]

Pathos

Pathopoiia [> páθος+ποιῶ(=make)] is a means of persuasion based on the human feeling. In order for the sentimental adjuration to be successful, the rhetorician is required to have in depth knowledge of the sentimental condition of the audience as well as the reasons that cause this sentimental condition. [26]

Pathopoiia is mainly used in the prefatory and perorational parts of a speech, something that Obama also does in the case in point.

Indeed, the American president, focuses greatly on “*pathos*”, on the sentimental participation of the audience (Greek people) and that's why the majority of the argumentation is psychological and not rational. He praises the Greek History and identifies the Greek setting with the place where democratic institutions and the development of Arts were established. He expresses compassion and support towards the solidary actions of Greek people, encourages them and constantly reminds them of their contribution to the refugee effect.

He refers to the nowadays' politic discontent groundswell, while he resorts to another familiar strategy; the imaginary pattern of “Ordinary People as Real Americans” [27], adjusted to match the existent audience; “Ordinary People as Real Greeks”. More specifically, he uses examples of great persons (Greek expa-

triates in the American war, the rising basketball player Yiannis Antetokoumpo, the solidary feminine figure of the island-hotspot with refugee inflow) in order to awaken prideful feelings and ethical obligation towards Democracy.

How does he accomplish suppressing the image of America as a capitalistic society and capitalization power? Barak Obama narrates a story - the birth of Democracy - derived from the Greek people's experience and strives to shape that experience into social reality. The conclusion he ends up it that democracy resides in the experience of Greeks, so even today, they live in Democracy. He uses this imaginary pattern – the experience of Democracy - in order to form a collective conscience in the audience [28] so that it can react sentimentally every time that this pattern reappears through keywords: “*democracy, hope, future*”. However, the paradox is that in the whole speech extent, the Greek and American people are deliberately mixed up behind the personal pronoun “*we*”. As a result, he manages to connect the experience of Democracy with the American society, as Greece and America relate to each other, constructing a worldwide “*image*” of uniqueness of the American Nation as a place of peaceful reformation, constitutional democracy and equal treatment towards the other nations.

Logos

All of the speaker's argumentation is based on the Rhetoric of Hope. This political tactic is expressed in the electoral campaigns of 2008 and 2012. According to Wiliamsson [29] it is about “the deliberately constructed political speech that visualizes social improvement through the power of shared values and the promise of a better nation in the future”.

His arguments in their majority are dominance arguments (*to dominate*). The logic of dominance arguments is analyzed using two different kinds of conditionals: indicative (epistemic) and subjunctive (counter-factual). On the indicative interpretation an assumption of independence is needed for a dominance argument to go through. [30] He uses an *a fortiori* argument, which tries to empower an appeal to authority (Winston Churchill); “*Democracy is by definition an incomplete political system; however, all of the other political systems are worse or more incomplete than it*”. So, Democracy is the best alternative. Democracy is also evaluated quantitatively in another point “*more democracy*” than qualitatively. This thematic pattern that flows through the speech, can be analyzed based on the Roman pattern of Argumentation, as present by Cicero (1954) in the *Ad Herrenium* opus [31]:

- **Assumptio:** Democracy is the superior political system.
- **Approbatio Assumptionis:** In the democratic political system the au-

thority comes from “*demos*”, and justice, social equality and respect are preserved.

- **Propositio:** In every developed nation –example of America and Greece– the democratic political system is exercised.
- **ApprobatioAssumptionis:** Every nation, in which the democratic political system is exercised, tends to; (i) be more fair, stable and successful, (ii) carry out less wars between them.
- **Complexio:** Democracy is the political system which needs to be exercised in all nations.

Hypothetical Reasoning “If”: “*If you could choose the time you were given birth, you would choose “now”, because the world has never been more healthy, more educated, more prosperous and less violent*”. The whole justification of this view is contradicted by the hard facts, weakening the persuasiveness of the argument. The speaker also tries to anticipate the audience, saying “*I know, it’s hard to believe but it’s the truth*”.

The speaker makes good use of the collective memory and the setting of History as a source of discovery, but resorts as well to the use of specific rhetorical *topoi* (*loci communis*), resulting in the recommendation content of his arguments to be derived from the total of the commonly accepted recommendations [32]:

Common topos of Definition: The word democracy is defined typically with the use of etymology (*kratos* + *demos*) and the historic example (ancient Greece). Example: “*Kratos–the power, the right to rule–comes from demos–the people*”, “*Politicians weren’t always happy because sometimes the stones could be used to ostracize, banish those who did not behave themselves.*”

Common topos of Comparison / Subcategory of Difference: Democracy in contrast with the totalitarian regimes (homogenous meanings). Example: “*There’s been the belief that some are superior by virtue of race or faith or ethnicity, and those beliefs so often have been used to justify conquest and exploitation and war.*”

Common topos of Comparison / Subcategory of Similarity: It’s about an inductive reasoning that begins from the view that “*The political rights didn’t develop in a steady course/ Democracy in Greece didn’t develop in a steady course / The vision of united Europe didn’t develop in a steady course*” and **so**, even our time is rational to be undergoing changes.

Common topos of Relationship / Subcategory of Cause and Effect: Causative character is attributed between globalized economy and challenges of the

contemporary time. Example: “*The same forces of globalization and technology and integration that have delivered so much progress, have created so much wealth, have also revealed deep fault lines*”.

Common *topos* of Testimony / Citing experts or authorities: “*this small, great world*” ≥ Odysseas Elitis, “*our constitution favors the many instead of the few...this is why it is called a democracy*” ≥ Pericles, “*democracy is the worst form of government [...] except for all the others*” ≥ Winston Churchill, “*The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.*” ≥ Dr. King.

Specific *topos* of Epideictic/Ceremonial Speech / The virtues: The speaker enumerates and praises the achievements during his governance, constructing his own Encomium. Example: “*That’s how, with diplomacy, we were able to shut down Iran’s nuclear weapons program without firing a shot. With diplomacy, the United States opened relations with Cuba. With diplomacy, we joined Greece and nearly 200 nations in the most ambitious agreement ever to save our planet from climate change*”

Specific *topos* of Deliberative Speech / The benefit, the Intent, the Useful (utilitas). He proceeds to political recommendations towards the Greek people using their common interest as canon, moving around the target “*open markets combined with democracy and human rights*”.

Dispositio

The speech hover sat the brink of deliberative and epideictic speech and that is why the trifold pattern is followed: prologue, main body of speech, epilogue [33]:

Prologue / Exordium

Barack Obama begins the prologue with an introduction narrative, according to Richard Whately in *Elements of Rhetoric*, talking about human History throughout the centuries following a chronic order; he begins from the starting point of Ancient Greece, goes on to medieval times - they are denoted - and concludes with the Age of Enlightenment. In the conclusion of the prologue, the Age of Enlightenment is interrelated with Ancient Greece’s achievements and thus the speech acquires a circular composition before continuing to the main body of the speech, to “*Now*”.

From the first moments he strives to win the audience’s favour (*benivolum facere*), but also to elicit their attention (*attentum facere*), two of the basic goals of the prologue. [34] This fact is validated by his warm thanksgiving towards the audience, the acknowledgement of their “legendary” hospitality, his greeting in Greek and the exaggerated use of Greek words “*giasas* (=hello), *kalispera*

(=good afternoon), *floxenia* (=hospitality), *fustanella* (=traditional kilt), *ouzo* (=traditional drink), *spanakopita* (=spinach pie)” and words with cultural-political meaning “*demos, kratos* etc.”. The positive reaction of the audience with applause every time the Greek words are being used, suggests the accomplishment of *captatio benevolentiae*.

Let us also add that Obama chose to greet in Greek both in the collective press conference with Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras and during his response in the official dinner that happened in honor of himself. This is a steady tactic of the outgoing American President, who enjoys saluting in the language of the country that hosts him during his travels. There are about fifty speech salutations recorded in each hosting country’s linguistic code during the time of the travels that he carried out throughout his eight year term, a strategy in is political communication in order to create from the beginning a familiar ambiance.

Docilem facere, the introduction of the audience to the topic, is not distinct. Its goal is to make observations/recommendations of political appliance –deliberative speech- or praise the democratic ideology -epideictic speech-. However, one more goal is latent even from the beginning of his speech; the connection/identification between the Greek and American people. It is pursued at a lexical level by the use of the pronoun “*our*”, by the short narrative “Chicago and Greek homogeneity”, from the common significance of religious faith and the deductive trio “Ancient Athens – The Enlightenment-Founding Fathers of the United States” as defenders of democratic ideology.

Body of the speech / Narratio

The main part of the speech is investigated mainly from the aspect of theme and frame of the content, as the structured argumentation has been analyzed in the *probationes artificiales* of the speech. In his words, President B. Obama followed some axis, without a specific pattern, something that creates some form of confusion. However, his topic covers all areas of life touching upon the ethical, humanitarian, economic, political, climatic, and in a smaller degree the educational and religious side.

- **Democracy:** The whole speech is constructed based on this notion, giving once more an epideictic character to the speech. The word is repeated about 45 times throughout the speech. The notion of democracy in the Prologue is associated with law establishment as well as the establishment of political rights and obligations (i). Next, in the main part, democracy develops as the inclination of self-determination worldwide (ii) and as a parameter for the prosperity of a society through technological and economic development. In another paragraph democracy is being perceived as the peaceful conflict

resolution between nations with its weapon being diplomacy (iv), but as a foundation for the flourishing of scientific dialogue as well (v). In another place, democracy is identified cumulatively with free press, freedom of religion, separation of powers and the right to elect and be elected (vi). After, it is interdependently associated with the economic system of a country (vii) but is also presented as a precondition for multiculturalism (viii).

- **NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization):** NATO is characterized as “the supreme alliance between democracies”, as a precondition for national safety. The speaker with his constant repetition of the commitment of the USA in order to sustain the transatlantic alliance of NATO, latently refers to enemy Trump, who, before the time of the elections mentioned that the USA will not stand up for the allies who do not contribute enough to the alliance’s cost.

- **Globalization:** Globalization is mentioned as one of the causes of the obstruction of Democracy. Worldwide trade, the dissemination of the internet, technological development and automation, changes in the workplace, the outburst of the inequalities between and within nations are presented as components of this effect. It is perceived as an inalterable reality, and the speaker implies that any attempt of change it flees towards retrogression and totalitarian views (implication towards the electoral slogan of Trump “*Make America Great Again*” but the example of North Korea as well).

- **Governance accomplishments:** B. Obama lists certain practices of his internal and external governance. The extended reference aims towards shaping the significant knowledge of the audience about the country’s image, silencing though its “cognitive”, as Boulding states. [35] More specifically, there is a reference to the extinguishment of the nuclear weapon program in Iran, to the pause of mercantile and diplomatic exclusion with Cuba and the agreement for climatic change. At an internal politic level, he states the establishment of rights for frail social groups (women, indigenous people, disabled people, homosexuals) and the rewarding of corporate innovation. At the same time, it underlines the tax reformation in order to relieve the middle class, the economic rebirth during a recession period, the securing of the automobile industry, the support of new students, the creation of new working positions and the inequality alleviation. It is not random that the theme section is completed with a reference to the reformation of the healthcare system, to the climatic change agreement (theme repetition) and the conclusion of Corporate relationship, as they are considered measures of approval of the American government. Totally, the emphasis intensifies

with the switching “epifora” “*we know that [...]*” and “*we have to [...]*”.

- **Climate Change:** It’s a theme pattern of B. Obama’s speeches as it is considered innovative in his political acts. The emphatic repetition, except from self-praising, except from being foreshadowing of what is going to be discussed in Berlin, is also an implication against Donald Trump. More specifically, the American government had come in contact – which had ceased though, for a year- with France about facing climate change and reducing the greenhouse effect, which Donald Trump had been stating before the elections that he would stop.

- **Technology:** The speaker, repeatedly refers to the technological and internet accomplishments, to the contemporary time of Information. His examples are repeated slightly twisted striving to persuade the audience that they do in fact, know what is happening around them.

- **Terrorism / neo-nationalism:** As it has been mentioned in another part of the speech, it would be inconceivable for the American President not to use the “*war on terror*” rhetoric strategy. The speech deliberately turns towards ISIS (attack on the opponent’s morale = positive image of the USA), while an implication is made about the outburst of the ultraconservative wings in the European countries.

- **Refugee crisis ≤ Multiculturalism:** The refugee crisis, as a wave from Greece’s borders to the prosperous European countries, falls into a more general dialectic of Pain and Ethics in speech. The refugee effect is analyzed as existing reality and the attention is turned towards the Greek peoples’ reaction - Solidary character, empathy, generosity. At no point immigration is faced as the outcome of a specific war (cause). Multiculturalism, through the triple reintroduction “*multi-, multi-, multi-*”, on the other hand, is sealed with the worldwide known slogan of the American nation “*E pluri-bus unum*”, meaning, “From the many, one”.

- **Religious faith and Race:** B. Obama always remains loyal to references of religious content and racial inheritance in his speech, following the model of Martin Luther King. Faith is considered a religious experience of the African-American culture. The alleviation of injustice, hope based on the creation of God and the prevail, in the end, of the just, are principles of the prophetic tradition, that’s why many times “it reminds of a preaching not political rhetoric”. [36]

- **European Union:** The concept of European integration towards the end of the central trunk is hotly debated. It is characterized, in fact, by the speaker as “*the most wonderful political and economic achievement in human*

history". Such an argument, moving to utopian limits, lacks argumentative power, if we consider that it is addressed to a people who two years ago had officially expressed through a referendum their desire to secede from the euro and, who have ideologically demystified the European ideal.

Peroratio

The aim of the Epilogue/Peroratio is mainly *pathopoiitikós*, to create *páthos* (*adfectibus*), rather than empirical (*inrebus*). [37] In other words, the speaker does not make a summary but a statement of the current situation; we are experiencing a period of borderline, a period of humanitarian crisis. And based on this context, he makes a call to pity (*conquestio*), or more specifically a call to the 'filótimo' [38] of the receiver. The content is built around the thematic axes of 'hope - future - new generation – citizenship', so it is no coincidence that each paragraph is completed in that way: "give us hope"; "better future"; "inspired me"; "give me hope"; "gives me hope"; "our futures will be bright".

This Rhetoric of Hope creates an obvious tension between idealism and reality; 'hope over fear' is the intended message to the audience's frame of mind, but the speaker completely silences 'the act over hope'. It may seem superficial that he exploits the historical conjuncture for the hope of a renewed world peace, but in reality he sets the 'moral' barriers to future international conflicts, indirectly transferring the responsibility to the ordinary citizen, to *demos*. [39]

Elocutio: Tone - Style

The language we use reflects the world we create around us. So here too, the verbal choices, the structure of the sentences and the stylistic performance are shaped by the rhetorical circumstance.

Tone

His tone on moral-humanitarian points is fervent, leaning towards epideictic oratory, and particularly complimenting and motivating towards the Greeks and the world community. It exudes a sense of optimism, excessive - we would say - in contrast to reality. He bases this optimism on the figure "hope over fear". Its rhythm is constant and tends to become sharp with the accompaniment of short phrases at points of admonition and in emotional passages with a moral / ideological coating. He does not resort to escalations of passion or stormy expression, but maintains a humble and measured style, shaping the image with which he wishes to seal his term. The tone of his voice combined with his general physical utterance exudes strength and confidence in his speech.

Style

The style moves within the medium style (*mediocris*), ensuring clarity and decency. [40] Stylistic alternations take place on a case-by-case basis, and so the complimentary tone (euphemisms for the ancestral Greek *acquis* / for the solidary attitude towards refugees etc.) in several places becomes self-complimenting; indirectly didactic towards Others (list of achievements during his governance), the incentive tone (practical advice for dealing with the financial crisis) becomes subtly motivating (attack on the morals of the opponent Donald Trump), but also accusatory (reference to Terrorism, social inequality, etc.), but to no point does it become apologetic and at the same time realistic. The image of America as a capitalist power with imperialist tactics is completely silenced and style also pursues this goal.

Memoria

Barack Obama seems very well prepared to deliver his speech, even if clearly, we do not have much to point out at this canon of Rhetoric Analysis, as a screen is placed opposite the speaker for the reading of the speech. Nevertheless, he is comfortable in his speech and does not cling to the screen or to any form of written notes. His speech is built around thematic axes, which through circular synthesis and repetition of ideas also contributes to the memorization of the speech. Many times, the topics to be discussed are examined at one point and come back to another, fact that indicates more intentional confusion than the inability of the speaker to activate the speech mnemonic.

Pronuntiatio

Hypocrisis (*Pronuntiatio* and *Actio*) refers to the expression of the orator that accompanies the presentation (*performance*) of a speech through paralingual elements. Indeed, even the body itself can be an argument. B. Obama is a charismatic politician in his speeches. He has an unusual naturalness, which is manifested by his body language, his sense of comfort (cool), his connection with the crowd. [41] His involvement in the American political arena, which attaches great importance to the debate and the rhetorical ability of the speakers, but also his pre-experience as a lawyer; are elements that lead to even more complete and convincing utterance of his speeches.

The fact that the 44th President of the United States initially wanted to deliver the speech from Pnyx with the Acropolis in the background is an indisputable element of theatricality (*actio*). He probably wanted to give a sense of public speaking referring to the ancient Greek agora.

He maintains a constant flow of speech and its pronunciation is characterized not by excessive formalities. His attire falls within the formal dress code of the

political rhetorical setting. His physicality suggests a didactic tone. He maintains eye contact with the entire audience, moving his gaze to all levels of the room. Discreet humor, a constant wide smile and a reaction to public outcry contribute to Obama's consistent rhetorical strategies to win over the audience. He exudes confidence in his speech, something he has become familiar with throughout his term ("*I am confident*"; "*I truly believe*"; "*I know*", "*I firmly believe*", etc.).

Conclusion

In the light of the analysis, it can be argued that Barack Obama through his speech constructed and established the image of a "political celebrity" to public opinion, highlighting once again the importance of persuasion and presidential rhetoric within the US government in front of a diverse and multidimensional audience. [42]

Regarding Obama's intertextual eulogizing of Greece, he used his Athens speech to offer comforting words and moral support to Greeks as well as to offer indirect financial help to them via indirect advertisement of Greece. However, we should wonder if the Greek people as the direct target group of the speech seek more than an encouraging anthem in the Republic and in the greatness of ancient Greece, no matter how much such a world-wide recognition unquestionably arouses feelings of pride. The truth is that Obama constructs mostly his own personal style (historical knowledge and political skills) by drawing on and combining different elements pertinent to the birth and development of democracy in Greece. [43] More specifically, through his Athens speech Obama indexes his knowledge of Ancient Greek democratic culture and Modern Greek needs, as evident in his intertextual references to important personalities and ideas. [44]

Furthermore, he pointed out that he would urge Greece's creditors to support the country, but also investors to take advantage of the opportunities it offers; so that with the necessary structural reforms it can regain its lost competitiveness and start over with development steps. However, taking into account the social and political context of the country, we should wonder once more if the above practices provoke a greater sense of relief to the Greek government and its indirect constructed "image" than to the Greek citizens. We can assume that the Greek government, being a sub-team of the audience needs the public support of the President of the USA, as a resounding and alleviative criteria for the creation of a positive environment, in view of the forthcoming memorandum reforms.

His stylistic performance could be characterized as a multicultural context, in which relational links arise between concepts, themes and facts. On the one hand, he moves from his personal needs, aspirations, and dreams to his duties as

the President of the US; and on the other hand, he manages to connect phenomena and concepts, making them pertinent in unison both to Greek and American culture and civilization. [45]

It can be argued that as a politician he has carefully and reflexively designed a political capital accumulation oriented speech [46] that is made recognizable to his audience. Especially, for the Greek politicians, Obama was as an exemplary personality of rhetorical acting, bringing an American debate note to the political arena. He showed that politics is the process and not the essence, and that rhetoric is not exclusively a means of exterminating the conflicting political faction in a parliamentary discourse. In America, Rhetoric is framed differently in the political arena. It is reminiscent of what Robert Rowland aptly states, “democracy can be understood as the rhetorical way of governing”. [47]

Barack Obama’s speech has undoubtedly been a legacy for the history of political oratory. His performance served as his consignment to the global political discourse through the connection with the established and highly respected democratic tradition. Persuasion, however, to the extent that it was achieved, should be examined as evident from a variety of factors: the occasional audience of the message, the consequence of his personality, the emotional impact of his speech, and the speech itself.

References

- [1] Aristotle, (1926). *The Art of Rhetoric*, 2-4.
- [2] Selzer, J. (2003). *Rhetorical Analysis: Understanding How Texts Persuade Readers*, 281.
- [3] Egglezou, G. F. (2015). *The Teaching of Argumentation in Primary Education: From Oral to Written language: Theory and practice*, 8-10.
- [4] Windt, T. (1986). *Presidential Rhetoric: Definition of a Field of Study*, 102.
- [5] Neustadt, E. R. (1960). *Presidential Power The Politics of Leadership*, 10.
- [6] Windt, T. (1986). *Presidential Rhetoric: Definition of a Field of Study*, 102.
- [7] Neustadt, E. R. (1960). *Presidential Power The Politics of Leadership*, 10.
- [8] Selzer, J. (2003). *Rhetorical Analysis: Understanding How Texts Persuade Readers*, 283.
- [9] Foss, S. K. (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and Practice*. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press, 29.
- [10] Brock, Scott, & Chesebro, 1990 in Saenla, S., & Rojjanaprapayon, R. (2015). *A Neo-Aristotelian Criticism of Barack Obama’s Rhetoric in The State of the Union Addresses of 2010-2014*, 40-41.
- [11] Cicero (1949). *De Inventione. De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, 21.
- [12] Foss, S. K. (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and Practice*. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press, 32-36.
- [13] Herrick, J. A. (1998). *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: an Introduction*, 10.

- [14] Benjamin, 1997 in Saenla, S., & Rojjanaprapayon, R. (2015). *A Neo-Aristotelian Criticism of Barack Obama's Rhetoric in The State of the Union Addresses of 2010-2014*. 41.
- [15] Foss, S. K. (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and Practice*. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press, 33.
- [16] Herrick, J. A. (1998). *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: an Introduction*, 11.
- [17] Bormann, E. G. (1985). *The Force of Fantasy: Restoring the American dream*, 5.
- [18] Foss, S. K. (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and Practice*. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press, 105.
- [19] Lacopoulos, G. (2016). Obama: Lesson in Politics or lesson for Politicians? *Capital.gr*. <https://bit.ly/358jKKI>. Retrieved on 10.10.2020.
- [20] Biography.com Editors, The Biography.com website. *Barack Obama Biography*.
- [21] Pernot, L. (2005). *Rhetorics in Ancient Greece*, 333.
- [22] Selzer, J. (2003). *Rhetorical Analysis: Understanding How Texts Persuade Readers*, 286.
- [23] Catherine Steel in Manuwald, G. (2015). *Cicero. Understanding Classics*, 157.
- [24] Crowley, Sh. & Hawhee D. (2004). *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*, 11.
- [25] Zarefsky, D. (2004). Presidential Rhetoric and the Power of Definition. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 34(3): 607.
- [26] Iqbal, N. (2013). *The Rhetoric of Obama: An Analysis of Rhetoric and Genre Characteristics of President Barack Obama's 2013 Inaugural Address*, 28-29.
- [27] Takuya, K. (2012). *A Critical Analysis of Barack Obama's Rhetorical Strategies: Rethinking the Rhetorical Presidency*, 46-49.
- [28] Bormann, E. G. (1972). Fantasy and rhetorical vision: The rhetorical criticism of social reality. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 398.
- [29] Williamson, J. (2015). Barack Obama and the Rhetoric of Hope. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 748.
- [30] Cantwell, J. (2006). The Logic of Dominance Reasoning. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 35(1): 41.
- [31] Cicero (1954). *Rhetorica ad Herennium. De Ratione Dicend [M.Tulli Ciceronis ad Herennium Libri VI]*, 107-113.
- [32] Kienpointner, M. (1997). On the Art of Finding Arguments: What Ancient and Modern Masters of Invention Have to Tell us About the 'ArsInveniendi'. *Argumentation II*, 225-236.
- [33] Pernot, L. (2005). *Rhetorics in Antiquity*, (Ks. Tselenti, Trans.), 333.
- [34] Pernot, L. (2005). *Rhetorics in Antiquity*, (Ks. Tselenti, Trans.), 334.
- [35] Samaras, Ath. (2009). The Media and the Image of States. The Case of the USA in the Post-11/9 Era. In *The role of the UN in the 21st century* (Ch. Giallouridis Ed., G. Paleogiannis Trans.). 1st edition, 456.
- [36] Frank, A. D. (2009). The Prophetic Voice and the Face of the Other in Barack Obama's "A More Perfect Union". *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 168-169.
- [37] Edgar, D. (2013). 'Yes we can' – Barack Obama's lesson in American rhetoric. *The Guardian*.

- [38] Pernot, L. (2005). *Rhetorics in Antiquity*. (Ks. Tselenti, Trans.), 335.
- [39] Greek word used for the description of the dignity, diligence of the people or a person.
- [40] Reeves, J. & May S. M. (2013). The Peace Rhetoric of a War President: Barack Obama and the Just War Legacy. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 639-640.
- [41] Guiraud, P. (1975). *La Stylistique*.
- [42] Coupland, N., & Mortensen, J. (2017). Style as a Unifying Perspective for the Sociolinguistics of Talking Media. In *Style, mediation, and change: sociolinguistic perspectives on talking media*, 255.
- [43] Theodoropoulou, I. (2020). Speech Style as Political Capital: Barack Obama's Athens speech. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 336.
- [44] Theodoropoulou, I. (2020). Speech Style as Political Capital: Barack Obama's Athens speech. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 337.
- [45] Casey (2008). *Speech Style as Political Capital: Barack Obama's Athens speech*, In Theodoropoulou, I. (2020). Speech Style as Political Capital: Barack Obama's Athens speech. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 335.
- [46] Kienpointner, M. (2013). Strategic Maneuvering in the Political Rhetoric of Barack Obama. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 359.
- [47] Rowland, R. C. (2008). *Analyzing rhetoric: A handbook for the informed citizen in a new millennium* (3rd ed.), 2.

Bibliography

- Aristotle, (1926). *The Art of Rhetoric*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Bormann, E. G. (1972). Fantasy and rhetorical vision: The rhetorical criticism of social reality. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58(4): 396-408.
- Bormann, E. G. (1985). *The force of fantasy: Restoring the American dream*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Cantwell, J. (2006). The Logic of Dominance Reasoning. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 35(1), 41-63. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30226858>. Retrieved on 23.06.2021.
- Casey (2008). *Speech Style as Political Capital: Barack Obama's Athens speech*, In Theodoropoulou, I. (2020). Speech Style as Political Capital: Barack Obama's Athens speech. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 335.
- Cicero (1949). *De Inventione. De Optimo Genere Oratorum*. Topica. London: W. Heinemann.
- Cicero (1954). *Rhetorica ad Herennium. De Ratione Dicend* [M.Tulli Ciceronis ad Herennium Libri VI]. London: W. Heinemann.
- Coupland, N., & Mortensen, J. (2017). Style as a Unifying Perspective for the Sociolinguistics of Talking Media. *Style, mediation, and change: sociolinguistic perspectives on talking media*, ed. J. Mortensen, N. Coupland, & J. Thøgersen, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 251-61.
- Crowley, Sh. & Hawhee D. (2004). *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students* (3rd Ed). New York: Pearson/Longman.
- Egglezou, G. F. (2015). *The Teaching of Argumentation in Primary Education: From*

- Oral to Written language: Theory and practice*. Athens: Grigoris Publications. [in Greek]
- Foss, S. K. (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and Practice*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Frank, A. D. (2009). The Prophetic Voice and the Face of the Other in Barack Obama's "A More Perfect Union". *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 12(2): 167-194. doi: 10.1353/rap.0.0101.
- Guiraud, P. (1975). *La Stylistique*. Paris: Presses Universitaire de France.
- Herrick, J. A. (1998). *The History and theory of rhetoric: an introduction*. Needham Heights, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Iqbal, N. (May 2013). *The Rhetoric of Obama: An Analysis of Rhetoric and Genre Characteristics of President Barack Obama's 2013 Inaugural Address*. Master of Science (Communication) Thesis. University of Gothenburg Department of Applied Information Technology Gothenburg, Sweden, https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/33899/1/gupea_2077_33899_1.pdf. Retrieved on 03.05.2021.
- Kienpointner, M. (2013). Strategic Maneuvering in the Political Rhetoric of Barack Obama. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 12 (3): 357–377. doi:10.1075/jlp.12.3.03kie.
- Kienpointner, M. (1997). On the Art of Finding Arguments: What Ancient and Modern Masters of Invention Have to Tell us About the 'ArsInveniendi', *Argumentation*, 11, 225-236. doi: 10.1023/A:1007738732374.
- Manuwald, G. (2015). *Cicero. Understanding Classics*. London/New York: I. B. Tauris.
- Neustadt, E. R. (1960). *Presidential Power The Politics of Leadership*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Zarefsky, D. (2004). Presidential Rhetoric and the Power of Definition. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 34(3): 607-619.
- Pernot, L. (2005). *Rhetorics in Antiquity*. (Ks. Tselenti, Trans.). Athens: Daidalos. [in Greek]
- Rowland, R. C. (2008). *Analyzing rhetoric: A handbook for the informed citizen in a new millennium* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Saenla, S. & Rojjanaprayon, R. (2015). *A Neo-Aristotelian Criticism of Barack Obama's Rhetoric in The State of the Union Addresses of 2010-2014*. shorturl.at/uIRV0. Retrieved on 10.05.2021.
- Samaras, Ath. (2009). The Media and the Image of States. The Case of the USA in the Post-11/9 Era. In *The role of the UN in the 21st century* (Ch. Giallouridis Ed., G. Paleogiannis Trans.). 1st edition. Athens: European Cultural Center of Delphi: AA Livani Publishing House, 455-480. [in Greek]
- Selzer, J. (2003). Rhetorical Analysis: Understanding How Texts Persuade Readers In What Writing. In Bazerman, Ch. & Prior, *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*, (pp. 279-307). Erlbaum: London.
- Takuya K. (2012). *A Critical Analysis of Barack Obama's Rhetorical Strategies: Rethinking the Rhetorical Presidency*.

- Theodoropoulou, I. (2020). Speech Style as Political Capital: Barack Obama's Athens speech. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 15(3): 325–339. doi: 10.1080/17447143.2020.1800715.
- Williamson, J. (2015). Barack Obama and the Rhetoric of Hope. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 18(4), 748-750. doi:10.14321/rhetpublaffa.18.4.0748.
- Windt, T. (1986). Presidential Rhetoric: Definition of a Field of Study. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 16(1), 102-116. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27550314>. Retrieved on 23.06.2021.

Electronic resources

- The White House, *President Barack Obama*. <https://bit.ly/2IfPpB6>. Retrieved on 05.02.2017.
- Stavros Niarchos Foundation. *16 November 2016: Speech of the President of USA, Barack Obama, at SNFCC*. <https://bit.ly/2JPGwPi>. Retrieved on 05.02.2017. [in Greek]
- Biography.com Editors, The Biography.com website. *Barack Obama Biography*. <https://bit.ly/3paqgss>. Retrieved on 05.02.2017.
- Edgar, D. (2013, November 4). 'Yes we can' – Barack Obama's Lesson in American Rhetoric. *The Guardian*. <https://bit.ly/2Ih23j0>. Retrieved on 05.02.2017.
- Higgins, Ch. (2008, November 26). Barack Obama: The new Cicero. *The Guardian*. <https://bit.ly/3kbGsWr>. Retrieved on 05.02.2017.
- Lacopoulos, G. (2016, November 18). Obama: Lesson in Politics or lesson for Politicians? *Capital.gr*. <https://bit.ly/358jKKI>. Retrieved on 05.02.2017. [in Greek]

Manuscript was submitted: 10.01.2021.

Double Blind Peer Reviews: from 10.06.2021 till 27.06.2021.

Accepted: 28.06.2021.

Брой 48 на сп. „Реторика и комуникации“, юли 2021 г. се издава с финансовата помощ на Фонд научни изследвания, договор № КП-06-НП2/41 от 07 декември 2020 г.

Issue 48 of the Rhetoric and Communications Journal (July 2021) is published with the financial support of the Scientific Research Fund, Contract No. KP-06-NP2/41 of December 07, 2020.