



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT/ MASTER THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit/ Title of the Master Thesis

“Discourse analysis of Barack Obama’s
commemorative speeches on genocide”

Verfasst von/ submitted by

Artsvik Hakhverdyan

angestrebter akademischer Grad/ in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2017/ Vienna 2017

Studienkennzahl It. Studienblatt/
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

A066 812

Studienrichtung It. Studienblatt/
Degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium
English Language and Linguistics
UG2002

Betreut von/ Supervisor:

Univ. Prof. em. Dr. habil. Barbara Kryk -
Kastovsky

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank Prof. Kryk – Kastovsky for her kind supervision. I would also like to express my most sincere gratitude to my parents, especially my mother, who gave me an incredible amount of love, support and encouragement throughout my whole Master study. Next, I want to thank my dearest friend Connie for all the emotional support and valuable advice she gave me when I was going through a hard period in my life. Finally, I would like to give thanks to all the people who were with me throughout my journey of accomplishing my Master thesis.

Tables

Table 1: Keywords in the GC grouped into thematic categories	p. 27
Table 2: Spatial – motion and force group of image schemas	p. 45
Table 3: Clusters of the pronoun <i>we</i>	p. 64
Table 4: Clusters of the pronoun <i>our</i>	p. 66
Table 5: Clusters of the pronoun <i>I</i>	p. 69
Table 6: Clusters of the pronoun <i>my</i>	p. 71
Table 7: Clusters of the pronoun <i>they</i>	p. 71
Table 8: Clusters of the pronoun <i>their</i>	p. 73

List of abbreviations

CS(s) – commemorative speech(es)
GC – Genocide Corpus
CDA – Critical Discourse Analysis
CDS – Critical Discourse Studies
CL – Corpus Linguistics
DA – Discourse Analysis
IDF – Ideological Discursive Formation
PES – pre – electoral statement on the <i>Importance of the US – Armenia Relations</i>
I – WE – inclusive <i>we</i>
E – WE – exclusive <i>we</i>
y.u. – year unknown

Names of the speeches in the paper

Ar_2009 – 2016 : commemorative speeches of the Armenian Genocide from 2009 – 2016
Hl_2009 – 2016 : commemorative speeches of the Holocaust from 2009 – 2016
Rw_2009 – 2016 : commemorative speeches of the Rwandan Genocide from 2009 – 2016
Sr_2010 – 2016 : commemorative speeches of the Srebrenica Genocide from 2010 - 2016

Table of contents

Tables

List of Abbreviations

Names of the speeches in the paper

1. Introduction	1
2. Discourse Analysis	3
2.1. Discourse as text	4
2.2. Socially – oriented view of discourse	4
3. Politics and political discourse	6
3.1. The language of politics	9
3.2. Political Rhetoric	11
4. Critical Discourse Analysis	13
4.1. Discourse – historical approach to CDA	14
4.2. Fairclough’s view of CDA	15
4.3. Van Dijk’s view of CDA	16
5. The types of corpora and their use in Discourse Analysis	17
5.1. General and specialized corpora.....	17
5.2. Compiling a corpus	18
5.3. Advantages and limitations of corpora use	19
5.4. Compilation of the corpus in the thesis	19
5.5. Corpus analysis with the AntConc tool	20
5.5.1. Wordlists	21
5.5.2. Keywords	21
5.5.3. Concordances	22
5.5.4. Collocations	22
5.5.5. Clusters	22
5.6. Criticism of the corpus use	23
5.7. Combining Corpus Linguistics and CDA	23
6. Framework for the analysis	25

6.1. Keyword list analysis	25
6.2. The keywords in the GC grouped into thematic categories	26
6.3. The main themes in the speeches	29
6.3.1. Commemoration and honoring of the victims	30
6.3.2. Emphasis on the number of the victims	31
6.3.3. Juxtaposition of the past and the present/future	33
6.3.4. The progress of the countries after the genocide	35
6.3.5. Creation of an ‘international community’	36
6.3.6. The USA as a friend/partner	36
6.4. Conceptual metaphors	38
6.4.1. Metaphorical mapping	39
6.4.2. Types of metaphors	40
6.4.2.1. Orientational metaphors	40
6.4.2.2. Ontological metaphors	42
6.4.2.3. Personification	43
6.4.3. Image schema	44
6.4.3.1. Spatial – motion group of schemas	45
6.4.3.2. Force group of schemas	46
6.5. Conceptual metaphors in the speeches	47
6.5.1. Metaphors of <i>construction</i>	48
6.5.1.1. Conceptual metaphors of PATH and CONTAINER	48
6.5.1.1.1. Conceptual metaphors of PATH	48
6.5.1.1.2. Conceptual metaphors of CONTAINER	51
6.5.1.2. Conceptual metaphors of FUTURE	52
6.5.2. Metaphors of <i>destruction</i>	55
6.5.2.1. Personification of genocide	55
6.5.2.2. Conceptual metaphors of <i>history</i>	58
6.6. Repetition	59

6.7. The pronouns in politics	62
6.7.1. The personal pronouns	62
6.7.2. The analysis of the pronominal clusters	64
6.7.2.1. The clusters of the pronoun <i>we</i>	64
6.7.2.2. The clusters of the pronoun <i>our</i>	66
6.7.2.3. The clusters of the pronouns <i>I</i> and <i>my</i>	69
6.7.2.4. The clusters of the pronoun <i>they</i>	71
6.7.2.5. The clusters of the pronoun <i>their</i>	73
7. The ideological beliefs in the CSs of genocide	76
7.1. The definition, properties and function of ideologies	76
7.2. The prevention of mass atrocities and the punishment of the crime of genocide.....	78
8. Recognition of the Armenian Genocide	82
8.1. The concept of genocide	83
8.2. The lexical meaning of the word ‘genocide’ and its synonyms.....	84
8.3. Obama’s view and language choice on the recognition of the Armenian Genocide ...	86
8.3.1. Obama’s language choice before his presidency	86
8.3.2. Obama’s language choice during his presidency	87
9. Conclusion	92
10. References	93
11. Appendices	100
Abstract	108
Zusammenfassung	108

1. Introduction

The speeches chosen for the analysis of the current research belong to the epideictic or ceremonial genre of oratory. Three types of oratory can be distinguished in classical rhetoric: the judicial (*genus iudiciale*), the deliberative (*genus deliberativum*) and epideictic (*genus demonstrativum*). Among the three genres of classic oratory, identified by Aristotle, epideictic genre seems to be the least analyzed. Hence, firstly, my motivation behind the choice of commemorative speeches was the lack of previous research on this type of speech. I was interested in exploring, whether there is only commemoration of people, events in the above - mentioned type of public oratory, or whether there are also ideologies, personal views or policies of the speaker behind the commemoration.

Secondly, the speeches are delivered by a prominent public speaker of our times – the former U.S. President Barack Obama. Obama is well - known for his inspiring way of public speaking and great oratory skills. Hence, it is not surprising, that his speeches have been the focus of interest in the academic area in recent years (e.g. Kulo 2009; Savoy 2009; Hämmerle 2011; Matić 2012). What appeared interesting to me was the non - occurrence of the word *genocide* in the commemorative speeches of the Armenian Genocide. Therefore, I am motivated to reveal the possible reasons behind Obama's language choices in the commemorative speeches.

The objective of this thesis is to conduct a discourse analysis of commemorative speeches on genocide by the former President of the United States Barack Obama. The commemorative speeches are devoted to the four genocides of the 20th century: the Armenian Genocide, the Holocaust, the Rwandan Genocide, and the Srebrenica Genocide.

The paper has two main goals. Firstly, the main themes, conceptual metaphors, repetitions and pronominal clusters will be analyzed by combining Corpus Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis, and the purpose of their use as well as the images and ideological beliefs, they may create in the speeches, will be critically evaluated. Secondly, Obama's language choice concerning the recognition of the Armenian Genocide will be compared before and during his presidency. The comparison will be made between the language choice in his pre – electoral speech on the *Importance of the US – Armenia Relations* and the annual commemorative speeches of the Armenian Genocide during his presidency since 2009 – 2016.

To begin with, the 2nd section provides two major views on discourse – textually and socially oriented views. The 3rd section gives the definition of politics and indicates its main features, the

characteristics of political language as well as the three types of political rhetorics. The sections 4 and 5 present main views on Critical Discourse Analysis, main types of corpora, the advantages and limitations of the corpora use in discourse analysis as well as the advantages of combining Corpus Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. The paper continues with the analysis of the main themes, conceptual metaphors, repetitions and pronominal clusters in the section 6. The section 7 presents the main ideological belief(s) in the speeches, and the section 8 analyzes Obama's language choice with regard to the recognition of the Armenian Genocide before and during his presidential years. Finally, the paper aims to indicate some contrast between the ideological beliefs, created by Obama in the speeches, and the lack of manifestations of those beliefs in his political actions in relation to the recognition of the Armenian Genocide.

2. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis studies language above the word, phrase, clause, and sentence. Moreover, it examines the relationship between texts and the socio – cultural contexts in which they occur. Furthermore, discourse analysis investigates the ways the use of language represents diverse worldviews and understandings as well as how it influences the relationship between social identities. Discourse analysis also highlights the ways people interact and communicate their ideas and beliefs within different groups, cultures, and societies when they use language (Paltridge 2006: 9). Additionally, it studies how the worldviews and identities are shaped through the use of discourse (Paltridge 2006: 2).

There seem to be no clear - cut definitions on the nature of discourse. Being the focus of interest both in linguistics and social sciences, discourse has been ascribed different meanings. It has been defined not only as a theoretical tool for meaning - making but also as an output of social procedures and activities (Rogers 2011 [2004]: 6). Therefore, taking into account different discourse features, it can be defined “from language use to statements that assign meanings to an institution, to social identities, relationships, practices, and categories” (Rogers 2011 [2004]: 6). To put it simply, discourse is “the language above the sentence or above the clause” (Stubbs 1983: 1).

Gee (1996: 23, quoted in Rogers 2011 [2004]: 6 - 7) suggests two types of discourse definition by distinguishing between the so-called “big ‘D’ and ‘small ‘d’” discourses:

I use the term “Discourse” with a capital “D” (so-called “big ‘D’ Discourses”). I use this term because such groups continue through time - for the most part, they were here before we arrived on the earth and will be here after we leave - and we can see them as communicating (discoursing) with each other through time and history, using us as their temporary mouthpieces. I use the term “discourse,” with a little “d,” to mean language in use or stretches of oral or written language in use (“texts”).

This quote suggests that the discourse with lowercase ‘d’ is restricted to the structural level of texts, focusing mainly on the formal aspects of language. On the contrary, the big ‘D’ discourse involves the social performance of language through representational, evaluative and belief systems. For that reason, it is important to note, that the language form and function are interconnected.

Two major views of discourse analysis can be distinguished: textually - oriented view and socially - oriented view. Textually - oriented views focus on the language characteristics of texts,

whereas socially - oriented views analyze the role and the function of the texts in social and cultural contexts (Paltridge 2006: 1).

2.1. Discourse as text

Given one of the views on discourse, it can refer to “authentic texts used in multilayered environments to perform social functions” (Wodak 2009a: 124). According to Kress (2014: 36), “text [...] is the material site of emergence of immaterial discourse(s)”. Texts are assumed to be written or spoken and are attributed by their coherence. They are coherent when the semiotic means that constitute the texts make them comprehensible both on internal (the relation between textual components) and external (the relationship between the components and the setting they reside) levels of texts (e.g. Halliday & Hasan 1976). As Kress (2014: 36) states, the composition of texts is a process of “‘weaving’ together differing ‘threads’ [...] into a coherent whole”. These ‘threads’ imply different material modes (gestures, pictures, sounds, etc.) that constitute a complex, multi-layered semiotic unit. Hence, it can be argued, that texts (yet discourse in this case) should be viewed as multidimensional semiotic units, since not only structural features of texts but the whole range of modes, which constitute them, are to be taken into consideration.

2.2. Socially - oriented view of discourse

As stated above, the notion of discourse cannot be narrowed down to texts alone. It is also important to consider the role, the communicative purpose in social settings where they are produced, as well as the ways they are interpreted. The so - called view of discourse as the ‘social construction of reality’ regards texts as communicative units rooted in social and cultural practices (Johnstone 2002, cited in Paltridge 2006: 9). Texts – both written and spoken – are formed by these practices. This social – constructivist view highlights the interconnectedness of texts, language, and discourse. According to this view, discourse creates the surrounding world, yet it is also created by the world around. People use language and discourse to make meaning of the surrounding world. People are regularly involved in meaning - making processes in their daily lives through different representational systems such as language, gestures or any other communicative means. Hence, it can be claimed that not only discourse is shaped by language and by the people who use it but it also shapes the language people use (Johnstone 2002, cited in

Paltridge 2006: 9). It should be noted, that people make meaning not only from an individual perspective but rather as group members or as a part of society, which establishes the rules and norms of a language and its use in a particular community (Gee & Handford 2014: 5). Moreover, according to Gunther Kress, who is a supporter of multimodal social semiotic approach, meaning - making is a complex social process, where not only language is used as a sign system of producing meaning but also different other ways and methods, which can equally serve for representative purposes. Thus, he argues, that different meanings, for instance, can be created, when different body senses are involved. Thus, the production of meaning through visual or audial senses is not the same as the one being created through touch, smell or taste senses. Hence, all of them evenly matter for meaning - making (Kress in Rogers 2011 [2004]: 8). Therefore, it is essential to understand that “discourse alone is not sufficient to provide a full account of meaning in social situations and practices in the texts that are produced there” (Kress 2014: 37). This means that people use different representational systems towards the accomplishment of their goals of creating a social identity, social relations as well as constructing viewpoints (Rogers 2011[2004]: 5).

It should be noticed that the textually and socially - oriented views of discourse can be well - compatible in discourse analysis. Cameron and Kulick (2003) argue that language patterns analyzed under the textually oriented view of discourse are settled in social contexts and therefore should be explained with regard to their social meaning and functions. Similarly, Fairclough (2003) supports an analysis of discourse with both linguistic and social theoretical orientation (cited in Paltridge 2006: 8).

To sum up the provided views, discourse is seen at the level of texts as well as at the level of language in use. Discourse analysis shows how people use language to make meaning of the world, how they communicate within socio – cultural settings, interact with other social participants and create social identities. In other words, discourse analysis is considered a multimodal, complex process, which intends to provide a whole range of tools not only for structural analysis of texts, but also for the purposes of the use of those texts in social settings, the interaction between social participants in social practices, as well as power relations involved in these practices.

3. Politics and political discourse

The speeches, presented in this research, perform a certain social function, namely commemoration. The social function they perform, fall into the field of politics. One of the earliest sources of the definition of politics comes from Aristotle. He views politics in terms of ethics and morals. The following quote by Aristotle (translated by Jowett 1999: 3) presents his view of politics, which assumes the search for the best model of government which can serve for the ‘highest good’:

Every state is a community of some kind, and every community is established with a view to some good; for mankind always act in order to obtain that which they think good. But, if all communities aim at some good, the state or political community, which is the highest of all, and which embraces all the rest, aims at good in a greater degree than any other, and at the highest good.

However, the perception of ‘good’ is questionable, since different communities may have contrasting views on value systems; i.e. what is good for one community, may be opposite to the other.

According to more recent definitions (Hay 2007: 61 - 62, quoted in Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 25 - 26), “politics is concerned with the distribution, exercise, and consequences of power”, or it can also be seen as a “process of public deliberation and scrutiny of matters of collective concern”. Moreover, politics can further be regarded as a “set of processes and rituals” in which citizens have their participation in political affairs (Hay 2007: 61 - 62). To provide a broader notion of politics, Hay (2007, cited in Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 26) determines four common features of it: *politics as a choice*, as a *capacity for agency*, as *deliberation* and as *social interaction* (emphasis added). With regard to *making choices* and decisions, politics is about responding accordingly to a particular situation. It is initially undetermined how the nature of a situation will be influenced by these choices. Hence, making choices in politics is characterized by uncertainty, since different political actors and agents make different interpretations of the given situation based on their interests, values, and intentions (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 26). Making differences and changes is based on the *capacity for agency* that implies strategy, i.e. the actors have the capability to change things in certain ways by employing different strategies (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 26).

As far as *deliberation* is concerned Aristotle views politics as an “action in pursuit of the highest good, based upon decisions, which arise out of deliberation” (quoted in Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 21). Hence, deliberation is an essential aspect of politics, which gives rise to choices, which eventually lead to actions. This view is also supported by Fairclough & Fairclough (2012), who focus on deliberation and practical argumentation in political discourse. In their new approach, political discourse is regarded, first and foremost, as ‘a form of argumentation’ particularly as ‘[p]ractical argumentation, argumentation for or against particular ways of acting, argumentation that can ground decision’ (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 1). They claim that practical argumentation underlies the adoption of ways and tactics in politics to act appropriately in particular situations for the achievement of their objectives (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 1). According to their approach then, practical argumentation is crucial in politics. It is about answering a situation with a strategy, and each planned action must follow this strategy to bring about the desired goals. Additionally, Fairclough and Fairclough (2012: 3) claim, that practical argumentation primarily constitutes an important aspect of subjective decision - making and performance in specific situations. In their book, they provide an example of a political response to a financial - economic crisis, where the latter is addressed subjectively, i.e. the individual approaches or tactics of political actors are also taken into account in performing accordingly towards financial crisis (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 3). Fairclough and Fairclough (2012: 4) argue that in politics it is not only essential to structure understanding of the world through different representative means, but it is of more importance for political actors to gain approval for their chosen tactics and suggested actions. Hence, ‘decision-making’ and ‘action’ are viewed as crucial aspects in political discourse (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 17) (original emphasis).

Another view of political discourse to be discussed here is Chilton’s (2004) approach, which primarily focuses on the representative aspect of political discourse, as opposed to Fairclough and Fairclough’s view presented above. Chilton’s (2004) approach to political discourse analysis is grounded in cognitive linguistics. Moreover, political actions are presented as verbal actions performed by speech acts (cited to in Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 20). Taking into account the speaker’s ‘performance’ by speech acts Chilton (2004) brings about the question of interdependence of speaker’s intention and his/her ability (whether physical, mental, or psychological) to accomplish a goal. He assumes that the existence of the speaker’s ability does not mean there is also an intention, whereas the opposite might be quite reasonable. Thus, two of the felicity conditions in speech acts by Searle (1969) - the speaker’s intention and his/her belief

to have the ability to accomplish his/ her goal - seem appropriate in this case (Chilton 2004: 31). For example, the capacity of a political actor is supposed to be present in the speech act of promising, though as Chilton (2004: 32) puts it, politicians are believed to give ‘glib promises’ which eventually may not be fulfilled.

To sum up the two different views, deliberation, decision-making, and action are considered predominant in political discourse on the one hand, and on the other hand, the verbal aspect in political intercourse is prioritized, since political actors’ ability to act is not always obvious.

Among different views, one cannot simply disregard the social aspect of politics and political discourse. Indeed, social approaches view discourse in forms of *social action* and *interaction* (Atkinson & Heritage 1984; Boden & Zimmennan 1991; van Dijk 1998b). Hence, hence political discourse is above all viewed as a form of political action. Van Dijk (1998b: 12) primarily describes political discourse in terms of its actors or authors, namely politicians. According to his view, “political discourse is about the text and talk of professional politicians or political institutions, such as presidents and prime ministers and other members of government, parliament or political parties, both at the local, national and international levels” (van Dijk 1998b: 12). He further emphasizes that political discourse does not only apply to the spoken communication but to the written texts as well as writing texts in political processes (van Dijk 1998b: 20). Furthermore, he claims, that political discourse is not restricted to only politicians in terms of its participants in political activities. This means, that a full account of participation and role of other social members like “the public, the people, citizens, the ‘masses’, and other groups or categories” should also be taken into consideration in political discourse analysis (van Dijk 1998b: 13). However, van Dijk (1998b: 13) argues, that the restriction of the domain of politics itself gives rise to a difficulty with the term of political discourse analysis. As stated above, the field of politics is not limited to the professional politicians alone in terms of its participants in political processes: other social members or groups may also participate actively in political actions, such as being engaged in political elections or demonstrations. Therefore, “[a] broad definition of politics implies a vast extension of the scope of the term ‘political discourse’ if we identify such practices by all participants in the political process” (van Dijk 1998b: 13).

3.1. The language of politics

Discourse types are institutionally identified since they are practiced within those institutions, as, classroom, workplace or university type of discourse. The reason why Fairclough (1995: 37) highlights the significant role of social institutions in discourse analysis is that even child's socialization with other individuals and later integration in society begins in his/her family, school or friend circles.

Social institutions provide their participants with a 'frame for action' within which they have to act and which restricts their actions at the same time. Furthermore, any institutional frame possesses a range of ideological conceptions, institutionalized ways of communication and action (Fairclough 1995: 38).

Social institutions are also regarded as a 'speech community' which encompasses its own speech events, purposes, community members and their defined roles within the institution (Fairclough 1995: 38). According to Fairclough (1995: 27), social institutions are composed of various 'ideological discursive formations' (IDFs), each of which is regarded as a 'speech community' with its discursive and ideological norms. The subjects of the institutions are shaped by norms of IDFs. The dominance of an IDF is expressed in the capacity of 'naturalizing' ideologies, i.e. depriving of the ideological meaning and being reasonably accepted (Fairclough 1995: 27). According to this claim, political institutions can be regarded as institutions with their language particularities, ideologies and discourse structures typical to political domain. One distinctive feature of political discourse or political language is that it is predominantly persuasive and manipulative. By using certain language strategies, lexical stylistic or rhetorical devices politicians can manipulate and persuade their audiences of their good intentions.

The most frequently used lexical items in politics are metaphors, pronouns, euphemisms, repetitions, etc. These powerful stylistic/rhetoric devices, if used properly, can bring about the desired effect that politicians aim to evoke on the listeners. Politicians can use these tools for such manipulative purposes as positive self – presentation or negative other – presentation, 'face-threatening' acts or for the justification of their political decisions and actions. For example, personal pronouns can serve to create a politician and his/her political party's good public image, and his/her opponent's bad image in political discourse. Hence, pronominal choices can significantly affect peoples' general perception of politics, political actors and their conveyed messages. Moreover, pronouns can create ambiguity thanks to fuzzy reference. Therefore,

politicians can use a vague reference to join or distance themselves from the listener, show commitment or avoid responsibility. As Wilson (1990: 20) puts it, political language is ‘implicational’, which means it tends to create assumptions and guide the listeners’ perceptions.

Not only the lexical choice of words and structures but also the syntax style plays a major role in political discourse. Syntactic categories like word order, active or passive constructions, nominalizations, etc., can reveal the meanings conveyed by syntax structure. For instance, “Active sentences will associate responsible agency with (topical) syntactic subjects, whereas passive sentences will focus on objects (e.g. victims) of such actions and defocus responsible agency by putting agents last prepositional phrases, or leaving it implicit [...]” (van Dijk 1998b: 34).

Political discourse analysis becomes like any other kind of discourse analysis once the discourse structures and strategies – syntax, phonology, meaning and style, speech acts, etc.- used in it are politically contextualized. Once put in political context discourse characteristics can be given political aspects. For instance, as van Dijk (1998b: 24) puts it, metaphors in classroom discourse would be used in educational context. Meanwhile, they would be used differently in political discourse as “in the attack on political opponents, the presentation of policies or the legitimization of political power”.

For the achievement of desired political goals, the choice of the adequate discourse structures in political discourse is of high importance. By the right choice of words, lexical items, discourse strategies, politicians can enhance their opinions and political ideologies, can manipulate the public opinion, can persuade the listener into joining their parties by gaining their trust, can speak in their favor or in opposition to their political opponents by the relevant use of speech acts or pronominal choices (van Dijk 1998b: 25).

Although the primary topics of political discourse analysis are about politics – political institutions, systems, actions, events, ideologies, political relations, policies – its topics can be associated with other areas of society, i.e. “a debate about immigration policies is not only about government policies, but also about immigration or minorities, and the same is true for political meetings, discussions, debates, speeches or propaganda about education, health care, drugs, crime, the economy, (un)employment, or foreign affairs” (van Dijk 1998b: 25 - 26).

3.2. Political Rhetoric

Classical rhetoric was traditionally practiced in the courts as well as for the persuasion in a political assembly. As a result, political discourse was performed under the definition of 'rhetoric'. Being defined under the label of 'rhetoric' political discourse was generally characterized as "verbose, hyperbolic, dishonest and immoral" (van Dijk 1998b: 34).

Classical rhetoric has been one of the old and valued practices in the social and political life of the Ancient Greece. Its use has been impressive and influential on the listeners to guide their attention towards particular activities (Freese 1926: vii). In its accurate sense, rhetoric can be identified as the study of the investigation of the ways of persuasion (Robert y.u.: 7).

According to Aristotle, there are three types of persuasion provided by the spoken language. The first one is achieved by the speaker's character; the second is to enclose listeners' minds into a particular framework; and the third is to provide clear evidence in the text of the speech (Roberts y.u.: 8). Persuasion can be accomplished when the speaker can convince the audience of his/her good personal characteristics and trustworthiness, as people are prone to believe speakers with good characters. Unlike some authors, who claim that personal characteristics of a public speaker play no role in his/her power of persuasion, Aristotle argues that the speaker's personality is in fact "the most effective means of persuasion he possesses" (Roberts y.u.: 8). The second type of persuasion can be achieved through stimulating listeners' positive emotions. Evoking positive emotions rather than negative ones will make it easier to gain trust towards the speaker. Hence many public speakers use this powerful technique in persuading their audience.

Rhetoric is divided into three branches based on the types of the listeners. The audience makes the final judgment of the subject which the speaker provides them. The types of listeners can be identified according to the place of the rhetorical practice. For instance, if rhetoric is practiced in the political assembly, an assembly member can judge about future events, and in a courtroom, a jury member can make judgments about past events. Meanwhile, observers are those who simply study the orator's skills. It follows, then, there are three types of oratory: 1) political, 2) forensic, and 3) the ceremonial oratory of display (Roberts y.u.: 15).

Political oratory "urges us either to do or not to do something" whereas forensic oratory "either attacks or defends somebody" (Roberts y.u.: 15). The ceremonial oratory deals with either praise or condemnation of someone. Additionally, the three types of oratory have different time references. As mentioned earlier, political speakers are concerned with future actions and events,

as they propose things to be done in future. The forensic oratory deals with things that happened in the past, as, for example, one person accusing the other and the other defending him/herself. Finally, the ceremonial oratory is mostly based on present events. The ceremonial public speaker praises or blames someone in the present moment of speaking making reference to past events or making predictions about the future (Roberts y.u.: 15).

Commemorative speeches which will be the focus of this research belong to the ceremonial type of oratory. They are public speeches delivered at ceremonial events to pay tribute or praise a person, an event or idea. Their main purpose is to praise or condemn (Reisigl 2008: 245). The rhetorical term epideictic embodies ceremonial type of public events, such as commemoration of victims of war, genocide, where the main focus of attention is given to the figurative and emotional part of the speaker's presentation (Slavíčková 2014: 227). The fundamental function of the epideictic genre is the stimulation of emotional reaction from the part of the audience via the usage of poetical language often through the mediation of visual and auditory means of performance (Slavíčková 2014: 229).

4. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis emerged from critical linguistics around the 1970s is a new area of research in which discourse is considered as “a form of social practice” (Fairclough & Wodak 1997: 258). Meyer (2001: 23) argues that CDA “in all of its various forms” is strongly theory – based. However, CDA draws not only from linguistic theory but also from a social one. Flowerdew (2008: 197) suggests that “CDA is not a theory *per se*, but it draws on a range of theories and uses a variety of methods” (original emphasis). For instance, Breeze (2011) sees CDA as a paradigm that explains how ideologies are performed through language as well as the relationship between language and social power.

CDA enables researchers not only to describe discourses in particular contexts but also to interpret the ways and reasons these discourses function in historical, political, social or cultural contexts. Different approaches have been applied to critical discourse analysis (van Leeuwen & Wodak 1999; Wodak 2001; van Dijk 1993b; Kress 1976; Fairclough 2003; Foucault 1972; Blommaert 2001, etc. cited in (Rogers 2011 [2004]: 2) among which three well – known ones will be presented in this chapter. The first one is the Viennese school with its discourse – historical approach (Wodak & Meyer 2009 [2001]) that can be viewed as an interdisciplinary, problem – oriented sociolinguistic study of language in which the fieldwork is often combined with ethnography. The second one is Fairclough’s (1995) analytical framework that studies discourse not only as texts but also as social practices. And the third one is van Dijk’s socio – cognitive approach to CDA that generally examines how social power and ideology is demonstrated in discourse, and how an intentional use of discourse can influence society and political conditions respectively (van Dijk 1998a).

As a linguistic reference, systemic functional linguistics (Halliday & Hasan 1976; Halliday 1978, cited in Rogers 2011 [2004]: 5) has probably been the mostly used theory of language in critical discourse studies. Systemic functional linguistics as a social semiotic theory analyses how meanings are created in various contexts of human interaction. As stated in the second chapter of this thesis, people are constantly involved in meaning - making about the social world around, and they can choose from different representational systems as means for meaning - making. Moreover, people establish and maintain interpersonal relations through these means. These two modes of meaning in discourse are called ‘ideational’ and ‘interpersonal’ metafunctions of language. These two metafunctions are arranged through the third mode of meaning, called

‘textual’ metafunction that operates on the creation of a coherent flow of discourse. Therefore, discourses function as a “set of consumptive, productive, distributive, and reproductive processes that exist in relation to the social world” (Rogers 2011 [2004]: 6).

4.1. Discourse – historical approach to CDA

The Viennese school with its discourse – historical approach (Wodak & Meyer 2009) can be viewed as an interdisciplinary, problem – oriented sociolinguistic study of language in which the fieldwork is often combined with ethnography. This approach provides an investigation of the historical context of discourse over a certain period of time, analyzes the interconnection between genres, texts, discourse and fields of action and is closely related to general social theory. Social theories state that except their personal experiences discourse participants primarily rely on collective social perceptions namely ‘social representations’ that are shared among a group of individuals rather than representing an entire society. Social representations thus can be viewed as a connection between personal, cognitive and social systems (Meyer 2001: 21).

Wodak states that instead of establishing standard social theories one should use individually developed conceptual tools for the solution of certain problems since each problem is unique (Meyer 2001: 22). Discourse historical approach predominantly studies the area of political discourse using linguistic theories to gain insights (Meyer 2001: 22). Wodak (2008: 297 – 298) emphasizes four important concepts to CDA practice. Firstly, the concept of critique can be interpreted as “having distance to the data, embedding the data in the social, making the political stance explicit, and having a focus on self – reflection as scholars undertaking research”. Secondly, the concept of power views language not as a powerful tool in itself. It becomes powerful when dominant authorities use it. The third concept is the concept of history that is central to the DHA, and finally, the concept of ideology shows that ideologies are used in CDA to demonstrate unequal power relations.

4.2. Fairclough's view of CDA

Norman Fairclough is one of the most eminent persons among the Lancaster school of linguists who has made significant contribution to Critical Discourse Analysis. It is viewed as an approach to investigate the relations between language and its use in social practices. As the term suggests, Critical Discourse Analysis aims to critically illustrate the possible reasons or effects of the certain use of discursive strategies in a social context (Fairclough 1995). As opposed to the linguistic view that discourse analysis is the analysis of text structure above the sentence (see, for example, Sinclair & Coulthard 1975), for Fairclough (1995) discourse analysis is the analysis of the ways texts are used in sociocultural practices. As he puts it, “[d]iscourse analysis is not a ‘level’ of analysis as, say, phonology or lexico - grammar, but an exploration of how ‘texts’ at all levels work within sociocultural practices” (Fairclough 1995: ix). During the years of 1983-1987, Fairclough cultivated an analytical framework of ‘critical discourse analysis’ (CDA) to investigate the relations between language, power, and ideology (Fairclough 1995: 23). He describes CDA as a ‘three-dimensional’ framework aiming to show the interconnectedness of three levels of analysis: “analysis of (spoken or written) language texts, analysis of discourse practice (processes of text production, distribution and consumption) and analysis of discursive events as instances of sociocultural practice” (Fairclough 1995: 2). To better understand the three levels of analysis and his view of CDA, it should be noted that Fairclough considers the meaning - making aspect of discourse as an ‘element of the social practice’ and calls it semiosis (Fairclough 2014: 11). Although Fairclough claims that social aspects – power relations, cultural values and beliefs, social institutions, etc. – are semiotic to a certain extent, they are not restricted to semiosis. It is where CDA comes to aid by focusing on the ‘relations between semiotic and other social elements’ (Fairclough 2014: 11).

As Fairclough supports the sociocultural aspect of discourse analysis, it is adequate to provide his view of social institutions. Fairclough regards a social institution, first and foremost, as a mechanism of ‘verbal interaction’ (Fairclough 1995: 38). He views verbal interactions as sort of social actions, which like other social actions are composed of their own “social structures, situational types, language codes, norms of language use”. Moreover, social actions are conditioned by the above - mentioned structures on the one hand, and on the other hand, those structures are the ‘products of action’, i.e. they are reproduced by actions (Fairclough 1995: 35). Fairclough (1995: 36 – 37) claims that it is important to create a framework that will research the relations between social institutions and discourses associated with them. He argues that such a

framework will facilitate the integration of the ‘macro’ and ‘micro’ levels of research. On the macro level, we view social institutions at the highest ranks of the social stratification, whereas the micro level of research deals with specific social events or norms that create behavioral patterns of individuals within a social institution.

4.3. Van Dijk’s view of CDA

The socio - cognitive approach claims that discourse – society relations are “cognitively mediated”, and shows role of mental representations of people in the production of discourse structures. Hence, discourse can be understood in terms of knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies of participants (Van Dijk 2009: 64).

According to Van Dijk (1998a), critical discourse analysis is a field analyzing texts to uncover the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality as well as considering the production, maintenance, and change of these sources within political, socio – cultural and historical contexts.

Van Dijk (2009) gives preference to the term Critical Discourse Studies instead of CDA claiming the former is not merely a critical approach to the discourse analysis that is usually being restricted to the textual level of analysis. Moreover, CDS can be viewed as “a critical perspective, position or attitude within the discipline of multidisciplinary Discourse Studies” since it includes not only critical analysis but also critical theory and critical applications (Van Dijk 2009: 63).

Van Dijk (1993b) views CDA as a multidisciplinary approach that explores the micro and macro levels of social order (Van Dijk 1993b). Linguistic features, such as verbal interaction, communication and discourse can be distinguished as micro level, whereas power, dominance, and inequality in cultural, social and political contexts are characterized as macro level.

Van Dijk (2001: 363) claims that there is still a gap between linguistically and socially – oriented approaches to the analysis of text and talk. While linguistically – oriented studies disregard the sociological and political theories on power abuse and inequality, social and political sciences usually avoid a meticulous analysis of discourse. As van Dijk claims (2001: 363) “the cognitive interface between discourse structures and those of the local and global social context is seldom made explicit, and appears usually only in terms of the notions of knowledge and ideology”.

Therefore, it is important to synthesize different approaches to achieve a satisfying form of multidisciplinary Critical Discourse Analysis. Moreover, CDA aims at filling the ‘gap’ between these two approaches (Van Dijk 2001: 354).

5. The types of corpora and their use in Discourse Analysis

Corpus Linguistics can be viewed as a “methodology with a wide range of applications across many areas and theories of linguistics” (McEnery *et al.* 2006: 7). Corpus Linguistics is a methodology that analyzes naturally occurring language by means of corpora. Corpora can be defined as “large bodies of naturally occurring language data stored on computers” (McEnery *et al.* 2006: 5). Hence, corpora can be operated with computers that allow a fast and easy access to the large database of corpora. One remarkable feature of a corpus is that it consists of authentic samples that represent a specific variety of language (McEnery *et al.* 2006: 5). The authenticity of samples is conditioned by their production in real life situations.

The purpose of a corpus, as defined by Sinclair (1991: 17), is to identify the main and typical features of a language. In the early corpus studies, corpora were primarily used in lexicography and grammar to analyze lexico - grammatical characteristics as well as functional differences in a number of contexts (Flowerdew 2008: 6). However, in recent years corpora have been applied frequently for discourse studies.

5.1. General and specialized corpora

As Hunston states (2002: 14), a “corpus is always designed for a particular purpose, and the type of corpus will depend on its purpose”. Corpora, thus, can be divided into two types – general and specialized. According to Reppen and Simpson (2002: 95; quoted in Paltridge 2006: 156), a general corpus “aims to represent language in its broadest sense and to serve as a widely available resource for baseline or comparative studies of general linguistic features”. A general corpus can contain various genres and consist of written or/and spoken language (Hunston 2002: 14). As Hunston (2002: 15) puts it, a large number of texts are required to represent a language variety adequately. Thus, general corpora can provide “sample data from which we can make generalizations about spoken and written discourse as a whole” (Paltridge 2006: 157).

Nonetheless, general corpora not always contain language of specific genres. For the analysis of the language of particular genres, a specialized corpus is required.

A specialized corpus, according to Hunston (2012: 14), is:

a corpus of texts of a particular type, such as newspaper editorials, geography textbooks, academic articles in a particular subject, lectures, casual conversations, essays written by students etc. It aims to be representative of a given type of text. It is used to investigate a particular type of language.

Examples of a specialized corpus use could be the examination of the hedges in casual conversations, or a study of a particular discourse feature of written academic discourse or specific academic genre, such as theses and dissertations (Paltridge 2006: 157).

The size of general corpora is usually larger than the size of specialized ones. General corpora can also be called reference corpora, and small specialized corpora can be compared to them. Usually, specialized corpora contain one type of genre or domain of discourse as opposed to general corpora (McEnery *et al.* 2006: 15).

5.2. Compiling a corpus

Several factors should be taken into account to construct a specialized corpus. First of all, it is the material or data to include in the corpus, i.e. the variety of the language or the genre or the type of texts, whether they are written or spoken. The second important factor is the size of the corpus and the number of the texts to be included in the corpus. The ideal size of a corpus has always been a concern to researchers. It should be noted, that the size of the self - compiled corpora may be determined by the research purpose. As Breyer (2011: 25) puts it, “the more particular the research question and the more limited the context, the smaller a corpus can be”. In addition, a small corpus can still be representative of a particular variety or genre and still be useful for the investigation of certain discourse traits. Other factors to also consider in constructing a corpus are “nationality, gender, age, occupation, education level, native language or dialect and the relationship between participants in the texts” (Paltridge 2006: 161).

5.3. Advantages and limitations of corpora use

General and self – compiled corpora can both have their advantages and limitations. One of the major advantages of corpus – based analyses is that corpora provide easy access to a large database of language. Furthermore, corpus provides systematic collection and sampling of data; hence generalizations of the outcomes can be made based on the data. Moreover, the collected data present instances of authentic language produced in real life contexts. In addition, most of the general corpora provide free access to researchers; hence there is no need to construct a new corpus (McEnery & Wilson 2001).

Self – constructed corpora can also be of great advantage. For instance, researchers can collect their own data and thus analyze genres that have not been widely studied. Since the data is collected by the researcher, they often can provide more contextual information about the research question (Connor and Upton 2004: 2). Self – built corpora can also minimize the researcher bias since the outcomes of the analysis will be based on real data calculated and demonstrated by the computer rather than on the researcher intuition and predictions about certain features of a linguistic item at question. It also should be noted that self – built corpora do not have to be extremely large. As Sinclair (2001) argues, small corpora can be useful to teach specific genres as well as to study learner needs (Paltridge 2006: 161).

5.4. Compilation of the corpus in the thesis

To apply corpus approach to the analysis of the CSs the corpus was compiled with the help of the AntConc computer software. For this paper the version 3.4.4w has been used. By means of this tool, the Corpus of the Commemorative Speeches on Genocide (hereafter Genocide Corpus) was composed. Furthermore, the sub - corpora of the four genocides were created respectively. Each of the speeches has been named with their respective year they were held (ex. Ar_2009; Rw_2010, etc.). Almost all the speeches were retrieved from the official website of the White House (www.whitehouse.gov). There were almost eight speeches for each genocide, except the Srebrenica genocide which had only three speeches commemorated by Obama, whereas the rest were held by other politicians. The number of the speeches corresponds to the years of Obama's presidency from 2009 - 2016. The total number of words in the Genocide Corpus is 8196. Although this number is relatively small for any quantitative analysis, it can still be enough to

qualitatively evaluate certain language features under investigation. As stated in the previous sub – section, small self – compiled corpora can still be useful and representative for certain types of texts, such as commemorative speeches in this paper.

5.5. Corpus analysis with the AntConc tool

AntConc is a free online software for linguistic analysis of texts created by Laurence Anthony. The software allows analysis of concordance, collocation, cluster, and keyword in the context. To create a keyword list or wordlists, it is necessary to use a reference corpus with AntConc. The software is compatible with the reference corpus of BROWN and the British and American corpora of BE06 and AME06 as well as with the reference corpus of BNC - British National Corpus. Since I analyze the speeches of the former American president, I use the wordlist of the AME06 as a reference corpus to create the wordlist of the GC. AM06 is a 1- million word corpus of general written American English. The reason why a written corpus is used is that commemorative speeches are initially written texts performed in public act of commemoration. The AME06 corpus includes ‘500 files of 2000 word samples taken from 15 genres of writing’. Most of the texts were published in 2006; hence it is called AME06.

The functions of AntConc enable to carry concordance analysis, generate word and keyword lists, as well as analyze concordances, clusters, and word collocations. A concordancer creates an alphabetical list of linguistic data in a given corpus which is afterward applied for further analysis. Thus the list indicates the use of a linguistic item in all the given contexts in the corpus. As regards the wordlists, they are the lists of all the linguistic data within a corpus ordered by frequency of occurrence. For the keyword calculation, statistical tests, like chi – square or log – likelihood are used to show whether the frequent words in the keyword list are statistically significant or not.

5.5.1. Wordlists

To create a keyword list in the AntConc, one should collect the wordlist of the study corpus. Wordlists present “all the types in a corpus together with the number of occurrences of each type” (Hunston 2002: 67). It is important to state the distinction between types and tokens. Tokens represent all the occurrences of every single word form (Nation 2001: 7) whereas types show that repeated word forms are counted only once (Hunston 2002: 17). Hence, the tokens always make a higher number than the types. Wordlists can be organized alphabetically or by frequency. The alphabetical order can help look for a precise item, while the frequency list can show the most frequent words in the given corpus.

5.5.2. Keywords

Keywords lists show the occurrence of the words with relatively high or low frequency in a text. As Scott (1997: 236) puts it, keywords are the “words which occur either with a significantly higher frequency (positive keywords) or with a significantly lower frequency (negative keywords) in a text or collection of texts, when they are compared to a reference corpus”. An important aspect about the keywords in a corpus is the keyness of the words. Keyness can be defined as “a quality words may have in a given text or set of texts, suggesting that they are important, they reflect what text is really about, avoiding trivia and insignificant detail” (Scott & Tribble (2006: 55). In other words, keyness is the high frequency of the words in the study corpus compared with the reference corpus. “The keyness of a keyword represents the value of log - likelihood or Chi-square statistics; in other words, it provides an indicator of a keyword’s importance as a content descriptor for the appeal” (Biber et al. 2007: 138). Positive keywords can usually serve as ‘the most significant patterns’ for a detailed analysis (Flowerdew & Forest 2009: 20). The comparison of the keywords of the study corpus with the reference corpus can reveal what is unique about the former one (Baker 2006: 147).

5.5.3. Concordances

Concordance tool is one of the mostly used functions of AntConc. The concordance list shows the “occurrences of a given word or phrase in a corpus” in all the contexts they are used (Scott 2001: 50). The search item, also called node word, can be preceded or followed by words ranging from one word to whole chunks of text (Hunston 2002: 40). Concordances are displayed in KWIC (KeyWord – In Context) format in a corpus and illustrate the behavior of the search word (Hunston 2002: 41). It should be noted that the data extracted from the concordance lists must be further analyzed since it cannot be explained adequately without “the insight and intuition of the observer” (Hunston 2002: 65). Hence, researchers have to qualitatively analyze the data to interpret the use of certain items in different contexts.

5.5.4. Collocations

Collocation analysis also provides important information about the words that have the most frequent co - occurrence with the word at issue. In other terms, collocation is “the tendency of two words to co – occur” (Hunston 2002: 68). Collocations can provide some useful information in the concordance lines. For example, if there are 10000 occurrences of a particular word, concordance program will usually allow examining only 500 lines, whereas collocation software can use all the occurrences of the word to provide more accurate information about the given word (Hunston 2002: 75).

5.5.5. Clusters

Unlike collocates, clusters are a group of words with frequent co - occurrence in the text and are displayed by their frequency and rank in the lists. Scott and Tribble (2006: 41) identify clusters as “repeated strings found most often” in concordance lines. Employing corpus software one can choose the size of the cluster and the position of the node either to the left or to the right of the cluster.

5.6. Criticism of the corpus use

One of the mostly criticized features of corpora is that they do not provide contextual information; hence they cannot be suitable for discourse analyses (Virtanen 2009; Widdowson 2000). Leech (2000: 678-680, quoted in Flowerdew 2014: 175) points out a ‘cultural divide’ between discourse analysis and corpus linguistics (original emphasis):

[w]hile DA emphasizes the integrity of the text, corpus linguistics tends to use representative samples; while DA is primarily qualitative, corpus linguistics is essentially quantitative; while DA focuses on the contents expressed by language, corpus linguistics is interested in language per se.

As Widdowson (2000: 4, quoted in Flowerdew 2014: 175) argues, “the computer can only cope with the material products of what people do when they use language. It can only analyze the textual traces of the processes whereby meaning is achieved”. Virtanen (2009: 62, quoted in Flowerdew 2014: 182) also points out that “the main problem on the road from discourse to corpora and back again remains the lack of contextual dynamism”. It follows then that corpora can only treat texts as products missing the social aspect of discourse. Similar to Widdowson (2000), Biber *et al.* (1998, cited in Flowerdew 2014: 175) claim that software tools provide limited information within the clause or semantic boundaries, thus being insufficient for discourse analysis. In a similar vein, Tribble (2002, cited in Paltridge 2006: 174 – 175) argues that language understanding expands beyond the knowledge of the language system, as it is also important to take into account the contextual aspects of the language use. He summarizes a range of contextual features of texts such as the social context and communicative purpose, the role of the participants and their shared knowledge of the texts. These features determine the contextual aspects of texts, which most of the corpora lack to produce.

5.7. Combining Corpus Linguistics and CDA

Despite the criticisms on the use of corpora in discourse studies, corpus software can still be useful when combined with the methodology of Critical Discourse Analysis. Mautner (2009: 123) emphasizes three contributions corpora can make in Critical Discourse studies. Firstly, it is the amount of the data that can be enlarged by means of a corpus. Secondly, a researcher bias can be reduced by accessing a large amount of authentic data that a corpus presents. Thirdly, software packages enable researchers to combine quantitative aspects of corpus and qualitative

aspects of critical discourse analysis to study the important patterns or functions of the discourse under investigation. In addition, the combination of quantitative features of corpora and more detailed critical analysis of texts can be a good way “to uncover the non – obvious meaning, unavailable to conscious awareness, in the discourse under investigation” (Flowerdew 2014: 179).

Although Corpus Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis can benefit from each other’s contributions, their use is still limited to analyses of lexico - grammatical features of language and general linguistic investigations. Such a study has been conducted by Partington (2003; 2007; cited in Flowerdew 2014: 179), who investigated the language strategies, metaphors and motifs journalists and spokespersons use in US press conferences as well as how their worldview is reflected by these features. Hardt – Mautner (1995: 2) states that because of this limited application it is not common yet “to harness the computer in the service of some form of ‘critical’ inquiry”.

6. Framework for the analysis

The first step of the analysis is to compile a researcher corpus with the computer software AntConc. The self – compiled corpus will be called Genocide Corpus (GC). Then, the keyword list will be generated in the corpus and almost all the top 100 keywords will be grouped into thematic categories. The most frequent keywords may give some insight of what the main themes in the speeches might be. However, they do not give a complete picture of all the possible main themes in the speeches. Hence the speeches will further be elaborated to identify all the main themes. Furthermore, the conceptual metaphors and repetitions will be identified and their purpose in the speeches will be critically evaluated. Following this, the most frequent clusters of the personal pronouns *I*, *we*, *they* and their possessive form *my*, *our* and *their* will be analyzed and their functions in the speeches will be identified. The last part of the paper compares Obama’s language choice concerning the recognition of the Armenian Genocide in his pre – electoral speech on the *Improvement of the Armenia – USA relations* and the commemorative speeches of the Armenian Genocide during his presidency.

6.1. Keyword list analysis

Keywords have been investigated in a number of studies (Berber-Sardinha 1999a, Berber-Sardinha 1999b, Berber – Sardinha 2000, etc.). Keyword lists can provide a good insight towards the unusual high/low occurrence of certain words in a given piece of text. Keyword list analysis is carried by comparing the word lists of two corpora - the study corpus and the reference corpus. A reference corpus “consists of a large corpus (usually consisting of millions of words from a wide range of texts which is representative of a particular language variety” (Baker 2006: 30). Moreover Baker (2006: 43) emphasizes that a reference corpus can represent “what is ‘normal’ in language”. Hence the comparison of the researcher data with the reference corpus can result in specific results in the study corpus.

Moreover, it is important to take into consideration the similarities and differences between both the corpora since the use of different properties of reference corpora may yield different results in the study corpus. With regard to the size of the reference corpus, it should be five times bigger than the study corpus to result in a higher number of keywords (Berber-Sardinha 2000).

The first step towards the keyword list analysis is to select a sample of keywords which the researcher wants to analyze. Generally, the sample makes around 100 or 200 keywords selected from the top of the list. The number can vary according to the goals of the research. So how does one choose an ‘ideal’ sample for the analysis? Berber-Sardinha (1999a) suggests two ways of selecting a ‘representative set’ of keywords for investigation. The first method implies simply choosing the half of the keywords in a keyword list and adding one. Usually, the default number of keywords in a corpus program is 500. For the analysis, the researcher divides this number into 2 and then adds one. So, in the end, he/she has 251 types for the analysis (Berber – Sardinha 1999a: 4 - 5). However, for this research, only the top 100 keywords will be chosen for the keyword analysis, since the data is relatively small. Moreover, any proper names, geographical names or non - words that have accidentally appeared in the keyword list will be disregarded, since they have no significance value for the analysis.

6.2. The keywords in the GC grouped into thematic categories

The wordlist of the AmE06 corpus has been used as a reference corpus for the keyword calculation. For the keyword calculation all the speeches of the Srebrenica Genocide have been used to have almost similar number of words in each section of the study corpus. Since the main themes found in the three speeches delivered by other politicians and the ones delivered by Obama are relatively similar, they cannot create any significant bias in the results. The commemorative speeches on the Srebrenica Genocide were delivered by the Secretary of State John Kerry in 2014 and 2016, and by Ambassador Ian Kelly in 2013. However, examples will be provided only from the speeches delivered by Obama. Furthermore, the keywords have been sorted by keyness in the list, i.e. by their significance value in the texts. The top 100 keywords have been grouped into possible thematic categories. However, not all the keywords among the top 100 results have been included in the analysis. The table below shows the groups of keywords. The keyword list indicates that the most frequent keywords that appear at the top of the results are proper names like ‘armenian’, ‘armenians’, ‘srebrenica’, ‘rwanda’, ‘herzegovina’, etc. Nevertheless, the proper names have been disregarded since they make no significance for the analysis. The different use of the word *genocide* can also be noticed among the top results - ‘genocide’, ‘meds yeghern’, ‘holocaust’. Moreover, the pronoun ‘we’ and its objective form ‘us’ as well as the objective form ‘their’ have one of the highest frequencies in the list. The next

group of words includes the category of *human*: ‘people’, ‘lives’, ‘human’, ‘humanity’, ‘nations’. It should be noted, however, that the keyword ‘people’ do not refer to humanity in general but to individual nations such as ‘the Armenian people’, ‘the Rwandan people’ or ‘the people of Bosnia’. Among other keywords having high keyness values are ‘victims’, ‘memory’ and ‘commemorate’. The high keyness value can be explained by the fact that the speeches belong to the commemorative genre; hence the keywords have higher keyness value. The category of *victim* can also be distinguished by words – ‘massacred’, ‘murdered’, ‘perished’, etc. - that can be used as synonyms to the word ‘victim’. The category of *time reference* shows the keywords ‘today’, ‘future’ and ‘never’. The high keyness value of the keyword ‘today’ can possibly explained by the time reference of the epideictic genre, that mostly focuses on the present. Nonetheless, the keyword ‘future’ also has significant value that will be later elaborated in the thesis.

As stated in the section 6.1, keywords can give some insight why certain words occur more frequently than the others. However, they need to be further analyzed in the context to provide relevant results for a certain feature. Based on the keywords of the GC as well as the scrutiny of the speeches, the main themes in the commemorative speeches will be presented in the sub – section 6.3.

Table 1.

	Rank	Frequency	Keyness
PRONOUNS			
We	1	200	457.390
our	8	83	189.120
those	10	65	165.475
their	29	84	94.727
ourselves	72	11	48.016
MASS ATROCITIES			
genocide	3	33	285.379
Meds Yeghern	12, 13	17	156.507, 164.215
atrocities	14	19	153.357
Holocaust	19	17	128.781
atrocities	51	7	61.606
tragedy	57	9	
evil	80	11	55.423
			43.300

HUMAN			
people	11	70	164.574
lives	17	34	144.600
survivors	44	12	68.205
nations	46	16	63.938
humanity	59	11	55.176
human	65	24	50.076

VICTIM			
victims	15	25	148.434
massacred	38	8	77.278
murdered	48	10	63.187
millions	52	13	59.298
lost	60	18	54.101
perished	67	7	49.769

COMMEMORATION			
memory	26	23	104.069
commemorate	31	10	89.911
remember	47	19	63.935
reflect	66	11	49.873
recall	91	9	40.841

TIME REFERENCE			
today	24	32	106.857
future	33	26	88.883
never	77	27	45.886

VALUES			
courage	27	15	99.710
dignity	40	12	72.991
commitment	50	14	62.098
courageous	58	8	55.176
justice	88	14	41.329

6.3. The main themes in the speeches

The keyword list has already shown the frequent use of certain words that can give some insight on the main topics in the speeches. Besides, a closer look at the speeches has indicated the following thematic lines: *commemoration and honoring of the victims, emphasis on the number of victims, family bond, contradiction of the past and present, condemnation and appraisal, progress of the nations after the genocide, creation of international 'community', the USA as a friend, prevention of mass atrocities, recognition of genocide*. The last two themes will be discussed in greater detail in the sections 7.2 and 8. Before introducing the themes, it is relevant to give a historical overview on each of the genocides.

1) The Armenian Genocide

The Armenian Genocide – the first mass atrocity of the 20th century – was an organized eradication of 1.5 million Armenians by the Ottoman Empire. The genocide started on the 24th of April 1915 by arresting more than 200 Armenian intellectuals and deporting them from Constantinople to Ankara, where most of them were assassinated. The Turkish government refuses to recognize the Armenian Genocide up to the present day despite the fact that 29 countries in the world have already recognized it as a systematic mass murder. The United States of America is not among the countries having recognized the genocide, but this will be discussed later in the thesis.

2) The Jewish Holocaust

Like the Armenian Genocide, the Holocaust was an organized mass slaughter carried by Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany during the Second World War against the Jews residing in Germany and Europe. During the Holocaust around six million Jews were murdered including another five million non - Jews who became victims of the Nazi severe regime. The so - called 'Final Solution' of the Nazi regime included the annihilation of Jewish people throughout Europe.

Unlike Turkey, Germany has already recognized the Jewish Holocaust. However, it is still denied sometimes, and is claimed that the historical facts have been exaggerated with regard to the annihilation of Jews in Europe or the number of the victims.

3) The Rwandan Genocide

The Rwandan Genocide – also called Tutsi genocide – was an ethnic slaughter of Tutsi population by the Hutu government. The massacre lasted around 100 days since April 7 to the middle of July in 1994 and resulted in the murder of more than 800,000 Rwandans. The background of the genocide was the Rwandan Civil War that was a growing conflict since 1990 between the Rwandan Armed Forces and the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF). The war first began in October 1990 with the intrusion of the Rwandan Patriotic Front from Uganda on the north east of the country. The war ended with the ceasefire of the Arusha Accords. However, the second phase of the war started in April 1994 resulting in the assassination of President Juvénal Habyarimana and the Rwandan Genocide.

4) The Srebrenica Genocide

The Srebrenica massacre was realized by the hands of the Army of Republica Srpska (VRS) instructed by General Ratko Mladic' after in July 1995 the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) failed to protect the besieged enclave of Srebrenica under UN protection from the abduction of the VRS. The genocide resulted in the death of more than 8000 Bosniak men and boys. The Bosnian Genocide case held at the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in 2006 was confirmed as genocide. Although Serbia was released from direct responsibility for the Srebrenica massacre, it was still blamed for failing to prevent the atrocity and holding the perpetrators accountable for the mass crime, herewith committing a breach of the Genocide Convention.

6.3.1. Commemoration and honoring of the victims

The purpose of the commemorative speeches is, first of all, to commemorate the victims; hence the speeches start with commemoration and honoring of those who lost their lives in the atrocities:

- (1) Today we commemorate the Meds Yeghern and **honor those who perished** in one of the worst atrocities of the 20th century (Ar_2013).

- (2) I join people here at home, in Israel, and around the world in commemorating Holocaust Remembrance Day and **in honoring the memory of all those who suffered, died and lost loved ones** in one of the most barbaric acts in human history (Hl_2011).
- (3) Today, we stand with the people of Rwanda **to commemorate the Rwandan genocide**. We honor the victims, and we express our solidarity with the survivors (Rw_2013).
- (4) We **honor their memories** and grieve with their families, as many of them are laid to rest here today (Sr_2010).

In some speeches not only the victims are honored, but also the people who survived the genocide:

- (5) [W]e remember the survivors and **the profound faith and courage they have embodied to build lives of purpose and meaning [...]** Let us honor them, and those we lost, by building a more peaceful, just and tolerant world (Hl_2011).
- (6) Today is a day to commemorate those who lost their lives, **to honor the courage of those who risked their lives to save others [...]** (Rw_2015).

As Aristotle states honor is paid to those who have done good things; yet it can also be paid for doing good in the future, since doing good can refer to ‘the preservation of life and the means of life, or to wealth, or to some other of the good things [...]’ (Roberts y.u.: 43). For that reason, Obama honors the courage of the people risking their own lives to save others. These acts are human, courageous and hence honorable.

6.3.2. Emphasis on the number of the victims

There are distinctive similarities in all the commemorative speeches of the four genocides. One of the apparent similarities among all the speeches is the emphasis on the number of the genocide victims. After paying tribute to the victims of the genocide, Obama recalls the number of the victims. The possible reason behind recalling the number is that he wants to give some information about the historical fact. Yet, I would argue that recalling of the massive number of

the victims in front of the international community is not simply a fact. It may evoke anger, resentment, fear, and hatred against the perpetrators who have committed the crime:

- (7) Today we solemnly reflect on the first mass atrocity of the 20th century - the Armenian Meds Yeghern - when **one and a half million Armenian people** were deported, massacred, and marched to their deaths in the final days of the Ottoman Empire (Ar_2016).
- (8) Today, with heavy hearts, we remember the **six million Jews and the millions of other victims** of Nazi brutality who were murdered during the Holocaust (Hl_2015).
- (9) We honor the memory of the more than **800,000 men, women and children** who were senselessly slaughtered simply because of who they were or what they believed (Rw_2014).
- (10) On July 11, we join people of all faiths and nationalities in commemorating the Srebrenica genocide. We mourn the loss of its more than **8,000 victims**, and we honor the memory of those only now being laid to rest, and all those still missing (Sr_2015).

To reinforce the feeling of anger, Obama even adds that the victims were a part of someone's family - a father, mother, brother or a friend:

- (11) On this day, we honor the memory of the millions of individuals – **the mothers and daughters, fathers and sons, friends and neighbors** – who lost their lives during a time of unparalleled depravity and inhumanity (Hl_2016).
- (12) [W]e pause to reflect with horror and sadness on the 100 days in 1994 when 800,000 people lost their lives. The specter of this slaughter of **mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters** haunts us still [...] (Rw_2012).
- (13) Twenty years ago, Srebrenica was overrun. In the genocide that followed, **brothers, sons, husbands, and fathers** were torn from their families (Sr_2015).

By emphasizing the male victims of the genocide, Obama probably tries to point out the destruction of many families, since traditionally men are considered the head of the family.

6.3.3. Juxtaposition of the past and the present/future

Mass murder is a horrible crime that takes numerous lives, and the memory of the painful past is never forgotten. But supposedly, time heals the pain and helps people move forward. This sub-section shows the language Obama uses to make a contrast between the past and the present/future:

(14) **Nothing can bring back those who were lost in the Meds Yeghern. But the contributions that Armenians have made** over the last ninety - four years stand as a testament to the talent, dynamism and resilience of the Armenian people, and as the ultimate rebuke to those who tried to destroy them (Ar_2009).

(15) **We mourn lives cut short and communities torn apart. Yet even on a day of solemn remembrance, there is room for hope.** For January 27th is also the day Auschwitz was liberated 69 years ago. The noble acts of courage performed by liberators, rescuers, and the Righteous Among Nations remind us that we are never powerless (Hl_2014).

(16) **While we remain haunted by the genocide, we also draw hope and inspiration from the people of Rwanda,** who are building a brighter future (Rw_2015).

The past and the future that Obama presents differ from each other. While the past is full of pain and sorrow, the present/future gives hope and inspiration for a brighter life. Obama's future-oriented ideology illustrates the belief in Western culture that future is always better than the past (or sometimes even the present). Hence, Obama wants to encourage his audiences to move on with their painful past and keep their hope for a better life.

By contrasting the past and the present Obama also praises the courage and determination of the survivors to move on and evolve:

(17) Even as **we confront the inhumanity of 1915, we also are inspired by the remarkable spirit of the Armenian people.** While nothing can bring back those who were killed in the Meds Yeghern, the contributions that Armenians have made around the world over the last ninety - five years stand a testament to the **strength, tenacity and courage to Armenian people. The indomitable spirit of the Armenian people is a lasting triumph** over those who set out to destroy

them. Many Armenians came to the United States as survivors of the horrors of 1915. Over the generations Americans of Armenian descent **have richened our communities, spurred our economy, and strengthened our democracy**. The strong traditions and culture of Armenians also became the foundation of a new republic which has become a part of the community of nations, partnering with the world community to build a better future (Ar_2010).

(18) On this day, we recall **the courage, spirit, and determination** of those who heroically resisted the Nazis, exemplifying the very best of humanity (Hl_2013).

(19) For just as **the Rwandan genocide exposed man's capacity for evil**, it also **revealed man's capacity for good – courageous Rwandans who risked their lives** to save friends and neighbors from the massacre (Rw_2011).

In these extracts, Obama praises the human virtues like courage, perseverance, strength. Those virtues serve the highest good to others, for prosperity, for great benefits in all kind of events. As Aristotle claims, courageous men are honored the most since “[c]ourage is the virtue that disposes men to do noble deeds in situations of danger, in accordance with the law in obedience to its commands” (Roberts y.u.: 38). Hence, noble things deserve to be remembered, especially after death, as they will be honored and recalled. Thus, people who acted courageously in times of genocide will be considered as virtuous and noble. Moreover, in the example (17) Obama also gives credit to the Armenians and the generations of the Armenian descent in the US, who have achieved tremendous success after the genocide. Aristotle emphasizes that it is a strong point to mention the success of a person if he/she has achieved it him/herself and not by luck (Roberts y.u.: 43).

Although praising the survivors is common in most of the speeches, it was not detected in the speeches of the Srebrenica Genocide. On the contrary, the emphasis is put more on the victims and condemnation of the perpetrators and bringing them to justice. Similarly, there is no juxtaposition of the past and the present/future in the speeches of the Srebrenica Genocide.

To sum up this section, it should be pointed out that Obama tries to evoke strong emotions by stating the official number of the victims or that they have been a part of someone's family. In contrast, he also emphasizes and praises the revival of the nations who suffered the massacre but continued making progress in their lives. Moreover, Obama symbolically ‘builds’ an international community thus offering solidarity and companionship. Besides, he speaks from the

name of his government stating that the USA is a friend and a partner who always stands by the countries being commemorated.

6.3.4. The progress of the countries after the genocide

The progress is one of the important topics in the CSs. It shows the improvements and developments the nation has made after the devastating mass murders. It illustrates the capacity of the nation to overcome the pain and reconstruct the country. The progress is an indication of hope and belief for better life and future. This is the reason why Obama constantly uses this topic in the speeches to give hope for improvements:

(20) Although the lives that were taken can never be returned, the legacy of the Armenian people is one of triumph. **Your faith, courage, and strength have enabled you to survive and prosper, establishing vibrant communities around the world [...].** Armenian-Americans have made manifold contributions to the vibrancy of the United States, as well as critical investments in a democratic, peaceful, and prosperous future for Armenia (Ar_2012).

(21) On this day, we recall the courage, spirit, and determination of those who heroically resisted the Nazis, exemplifying the very best of humanity (Hl_2013).

(22) And we salute the determination of the Rwandans **who have made important progress toward healing old wounds, unleashing the economic growth that lifts people from poverty, and contributing to peacekeeping missions around the world** to spare others the pain they have known (Rw_2014).

Once again, the revival and the progress of the nation are not indicated in the CSs of the Holocaust and Srebrenica genocide. It can be seen in the example (21) that Obama talks about the liberators and rescuers who acted courageously during the mass atrocities. Yet, it does not show clearly any progress, since Obama mostly emphasizes the importance of being vigilant and intolerant against anti-Semitism and prejudice against Jewish people.

6.3.5. Creation of the ‘international community’

Tragedies unite people since they share a common history. One can well understand the pain of others when they have experienced it themselves. Obama’s aim is to ‘create’ an international community – though symbolically – to enhance the sense of unity and community. No wonder, that the plural form of the pronoun *we* is among the top 10 keywords in the GC, as he constantly uses the plural pronoun to bring together all those who are gathered at the commemoration as well as many others in the world:

(23) We pause to reflect on the lives extinguished and remember the unspeakable suffering that occurred. In so doing, **we are joined by millions across the world** and in the United States, where it is solemnly commemorated by our states, institutions, communities, and families (Ar_2013).

(24) **The United States, along with the international community**, resolves to stand in the way of any tyrant or dictator who commits crimes against humanity and stay true to the principle of “Never Again” (Hl_2013).

(25) Embracing this spirit, **as nations and as individuals**, is how we can honor those who were lost two decades ago and build a future worthy of their lives (Rw_2014).

(26) On July 11, **we join people of all faiths and nationalities** in commemorating the Srebrenica genocide (Sr_2015).

By ‘creating an ‘international community’” Obama tries to evoke a sense of solidarity, partnership, and sympathy. Togetherness, unity, and support create a sense of strength and security. It helps heal ‘the old wounds’ and move forward.

6.3.6. The USA as a friend/ partner

In addition to the previous topic, this theme is also important since it suggests the friendship or partnership of the USA to the countries which suffered genocide. That is a powerful rhetorical strategy by Obama to develop the relations between the USA and the countries that are commemorated by offering friendship, compassion, and sympathy.

As far as the relations between Armenia and America are concerned, Obama points out the bilateral contributions that the countries have made towards each other in the examples (27) and (28):

(27) [T]he American and Armenian peoples came together in a bond of common humanity. **Ordinary American citizens raised millions of dollars to support suffering Armenian children, and the U.S. Congress chartered the Near East Relief organization, a pioneer in the field of international humanitarian relief. Thousands of Armenian refugees began new lives in the United States, where they formed a strong and vibrant community and became pillars of Armenian society** (Ar_2015).

(28) **The United States has deeply benefited from the significant contributions to our nation by Armenian Americans [...].** Americans of Armenian descent have strengthened our society and our communities with their rich culture and traditions (Ar_2011).

(29) The United States [...] resolves to stand in the way of any tyrant or dictator who commits crimes against humanity, and stay true to the principle of “Never Again” (HI_2013).

(30) The U.S. government and the American people will continue to **extend our friendship, partnership, and support to the Rwandan people [...]** (Rw_2012).

(31) Today **the United States stands committed to joining with our Balkan partners to continue helping heal the wounds of the past** (Sr_2015).

By announcing the commitment, support and partnership of his country Obama wants to show that the USA can be reliable. It can also be viewed as a good political strategy to indicate his country as a strong partner in the political area.

The last two themes – the *prevention of mass atrocities* and the *recognition of the genocide* – are one of the main themes in the speeches; hence they will be discussed in greater detail in the sections 7.2 and 8.

6.4. Conceptual metaphors

In the classical approach, metaphors are viewed as figurative devices in poetic language with mostly ornamental function. However, metaphors do not appear only in poetic or rhetorical speech. Johnson (1987: xx) refers to the term metaphor not simply as a figure of speech but rather as a “pervasive, indispensable structure of human understanding by means of which we figuratively comprehend our world”. Our everyday life is abundant with metaphors. We use metaphors to describe our emotions, beliefs or experiences. For instance, in the following example an abstract entity is described in terms of a physical feature:

(32) I had a **warm** welcome in their family.

The word *warm* shows a physical feature of temperature. Whereas in the sentence above, it is used metaphorically to describe the pleasant and kind features of the welcome towards the speaker.

One of the considerable achievements in the field of metaphors was the introduction of conceptual metaphor theory by Lakoff and Johnson in the book *Metaphors we live by* in 1980. As they claim, “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980a: 5). They also argue that “the human conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined”. Hence, it follows from their argument, that metaphors are not simply ornamental and rhetorical tools of language, but rather cognitive devices, rooted in our cognition. Metaphorical concepts shape our perception of the world, our actions, and relations towards other people, our daily experiences, thoughts, and realities. Hence, if the conceptual system is metaphorical, then our everyday life is broadly ‘a matter of metaphor’ (Lakoff & Johnson 1980a: 3).

According to the claim that human conceptual system is metaphorical in nature, Lakoff and Johnson (1980b: 454) argue that metaphors shape our perceptions, thoughts, and actions in daily life. However, people may not be aware of the extensive number of metaphors they are surrounded by in everyday life. To bring an example of conceptual metaphor, let us consider the concept of an ARGUMENT in the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. Different expressions of this metaphor can be found in everyday speech (Lakoff & Johnson 1980b: 454):

- (33) Your claims are *indefensible*.
- (34) He *attacked every weak point* in my argument.
- (35) His criticisms were *right on target*.
- (36) I *demolished* his argument.
- (37) I've never *won* an argument with him.
- (38) You disagree? Okay, *shoot*!
- (39) If you use that *strategy*, he'll *wipe you out*.
- (40) He *shot down* all my arguments.

The examples above show how rich in metaphors our speech can be. They illustrate that people can talk and think of ARGUMENTS in terms of WAR. In argumentation people can be perceived as 'enemies' or opponents, their positions may be 'targeted' and 'destroyed' by using certain strategies. Moreover, arguments can be 'won', 'shot down' or 'lost'. It can be seen that the different features and actions in an ARGUMENT can be described in terms of a physical WAR. This is because the way we use metaphors is also culturally conditioned. In western culture, arguments are perceived in terms of wars. Hence, the language used to describe arguments resembles the language we use to describe physical war. If in another culture arguments were perceived differently – as a dance for instance – then the metaphors would also be shaped differently. It follows then, that the use of metaphors is not conditioned by only words but rather 'according to the way we conceive of things' (Lakoff & Johnson 1980b: 456).

6.4.1. Metaphorical mapping

Conceptual metaphors consist of two conceptual domains – the source domain and the target domain - one of which is understood in terms of the other. In conceptual metaphors, target domains, which are abstract entities, are expressed by means of concrete, physical source domains. This means that abstract concepts, like LOVE, ARGUMENT or TIME can be expressed through physical or material concepts like JOURNEY, WAR or MONEY. Moreover, target domain is defined by source domain through metaphorical mapping, where the abstract target domain becomes cognitively available. According to Lakoff and Turner (1989: 63),

‘mapping’ is the process of ascribing characteristics of one cognitive domain to the other. As Johnson (1987: 113) claims metaphorical extensions are not arbitrary since the mapping cannot be random. Hence it is important to identify the structure of the source domain that is mapped onto the target domain. For example, if we want to understand the meaning of the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY, it is necessary to have a common understanding of the latter. A journey is an activity that involves travelers moving through miles, crossing various paths, arriving from one point to the other, visiting different places, etc. Hence, a person’s life can be compared with a journey, as he/she also ‘travels’ through his/her life path. Moreover, some unexpected problems may happen during a journey, as well as some troubles and difficulties may arise in one’s life. Similarly, another journey metaphor – LOVE IS A JOURNEY – can be described by the same features of journey, where lovers are travelers.

6.4.2. Types of metaphors

Lakoff & Johnson (1980b: 460) identify at least three main types of conceptual metaphors: *structural*, *orientational* and *physical*. They define *structural* metaphors as “cases where one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another” (e.g. LIFE structured in terms of JOURNEY) (Lakoff & Johnson 1980b: 461). The second type of conventional metaphors, called *physical* metaphors, includes “the projection of entity or substance status upon something that does not have that status inherently” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980b: 461). By using *physical* metaphors, one can refer to events, activities, emotions, etc., as entities with different goals such as categorizing, referring, quantifying, etc. *Orientational* metaphors are called so because of their relation to spatial orientation: UP -DOWN, FRONT - BACK, IN - OUT, DEEP - SHALLOW, CENTRAL - PERIPHERAL (Lakoff & Johnson 1980b: 461- 462).

6.4.2.1. Orientational metaphors

Orientational metaphors can serve as representative examples for understanding how metaphors are structured within different conceptual domains – physical, cultural, intellectual. Although orientational metaphors primarily have a physical basis, they also deal with cultural experience. For example, we use the prepositions of place when we talk about future, we can orient it *behind*

or *in front of* us. But as the cultures may vary, so does the use of orientational metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson 1980b: 462).

Oriental metaphors can also be used to express emotional state as in HAPPY IS UP and SAD IS DOWN (Lakoff & Johnson 1980b: 462):

(41) I feel so **down** today.

(42) She **fell** into depression after her husband's death.

(43) Mary was in **high** spirits on her birthday.

As said earlier, people are not aware of most of the conceptual metaphors surrounding them. The examples above also show the unconscious use of metaphors, since people associate the sad emotional state with low or downward position or falling, whereas happy emotions are expressed with upward posture. Taking into account the physical basis (humans lay down when they sleep and have a standing posture when they wake up), the awaken and sleep states of a person can also be expressed by spatial metaphors – CONSCIOUS IS UP vs. UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN (Lakoff & Johnson 1980b: 462):

(44) He **woke up** early the next day.

(45) She **fell asleep** immediately after taking the sleeping pills.

There are other domains – health, sickness, wealth, poverty, social status, mental and emotional state, etc. – that are widely expressed with orientational metaphors:

(46) She is **falling sick** (SICKNESS IS DOWN).

(47) His income has been **rising** considerably this year (WEALTH IS UP).

(48) My brother has a **high position** in this company (HIGH STATUS IS UP).

As can be seen from the examples above, spatial metaphors frequently occur in our everyday language. Hence, it can be claimed that they underlie our basic cognitive concepts.

6.4.2.2. Ontological metaphors

If orientational metaphors give an understanding of our fundamental concepts regarding spatial orientation, ontological metaphors provide us with further “understanding our experiences in terms of objects and substances” (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 25). According to them, it “allows us to pick out parts of our experience and treat them as discrete entities or substances of a uniform kind” (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 25). The identification of human experiences as entities or objects makes it possible to classify, group, measure and eventually make sense of them.

Like the spatial orientation of concepts, which shape orientational metaphors, human experiences with physical objects give rise to ontological metaphors – seeing various events, activities, ideas, etc. in terms of physical objects and entities.

Ontological metaphors can be divided into several groups. The main groups of ontological metaphors are container, entity and substance metaphors¹. In entity metaphors, abstract concepts are presented as physical objects. On the other hand, in substance metaphors abstractions – events, ideas, emotions, etc. – are shown as material. And finally, in container metaphors concepts are presented as containers having the capacity of holding objects.

Ontological metaphors can serve a number of purposes. The following examples (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 26 – 27) illustrate the main functions of ontological metaphors:

(49) We are working toward *peace* (referring).

(50) It will take *a lot of patience* to finish this book (quantifying).

(51) The *ugly side of his personality* comes out under pressure (identifying aspects).

(52) He did it *out of anger* (identifying causes).

(53) He went to New York to *seek fame and fortune* (setting goals).

These examples show that ontological metaphors have restricted functions like orientational metaphors. However, they can be further elaborated to show various aspects of the same entity. For instance, in these examples mind is presented from two different aspects – MIND IS A MACHINE and MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 27 – 28):

¹ Glossary of linguistic terms

(<http://www-01.sil.org/linguistics/glossaryoflinguisticterms/whatisanontologicalmetaphor.htm>) (17 December, 2016)

(54) My mind just isn't *operating* today.

(55) His mind *snapped*.

These two metaphors, however, do not indicate the same aspects of the mind. The first metaphor shows mind as a machine which has “[a]n on - off state, a level of efficiency, a productive capacity, an internal mechanism, a source of energy, and an operating condition” (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 28). On the contrary, MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT shows only one aspect of mental experience – the psychological strength (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 28).

6.4.2.3. Personification

Personification is a phenomenon, which allows describing non - human entities in terms of human characteristics, motivations, and activities. As Lakoff and Turner (1989: 72) put it, “[p]ersonification permits us to use our knowledge of ourselves to maximal effects”.

Here are a couple of example of personification taken from Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 33):

(56) This *fact argues* against the standard theories.

(57) *Life has cheated* me.

(58) *Inflation is eating up* our profits.

In these examples, each non - human entity is presented as a human. However, personification is not a generalized process, since it may carry different characteristics of a human being described in a specific context (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 33):

(59) Inflation *has attacked* the foundation of our economy.

(60) Our biggest *enemy* right now is inflation.

(61) The dollar *has been destroyed* by inflation.

(62) Inflation *has robbed* me of my savings.

In the examples above, inflation is personified as a human. Yet, INFLATION IS A HUMAN here would be too generalized. As it can be noticed, inflation is ascribed specific characteristics, which are attacking, destroying and robbing; hence a more specific metaphor would be

INFLATION IS AN ENEMY/ AVDERSARY/ VILLAIN. This particular description of inflation gives us an idea of how we think about it as an enemy that kills and destroys.

To sum up, personification is a category that allows us to make sense of non - human entities in the world in terms of human characteristics, motivations, aims, and actions.

6.4.3. Image schema

In this section Johnson's (1987) book '*The body in the mind*' will be used as a reference for the introduction and analysis of image schemas.

According to Johnson (1987: xiv), "an image schema is a recurring, dynamic pattern of our perceptual interactions and motor programs that gives coherence and structure to our experience". In other words, image schemas are pervasive, abstract patterns that identify an extensive number of experiences, perceptions for objects and events that are similarly constructed in the according ways (Johnson 1987: 28). Image schemas consist of parts and relations by means of which many perceptions, images, and events are structured. Thus, on the one hand, image schemas function "at a level of mental organization that falls between abstract propositional structures" and on the other hand, "particular concrete images" (Johnson 1987: 29). The parts of image schemas may include a set of entities like "people, props, events, states, sources, goals" whereas the relations consist of "causal relations, temporal sequences, part – whole patterns, relative locations, agent – patient structures, or instrumental relations" (Johnson 1987: 28). An example showing the interaction between 'parts' and 'relations' could be the schema FROM – TO or PATH (Johnson 1987: 28). The parts of this schema can be the start point, the end point and the vector between them. The relation is the force vector moving from the start point to the end point. Our daily life is full of PATH or FROM – TO schema. Going to work from home, punching someone, giving a present to somebody, the change of water from solid to liquid state can be examples of PATH schema (Johnson 1987: 28). Each of these examples contains the same basic parts and relations that "emerge chiefly at the level of our physical or bodily perception and movement" (Johnson 1987: 28).

The list below is taken from the main group of image schemata listed by Johnson (1987: 126). These two main groups have been presented below since they underlie the main conceptual metaphors in the speeches.

Table 2.

Spatial motion group	Force group
CONTAINMENT	COMPULSION
PATH	COUNTERFORCE
SOURCE – PATH – GOAL	DIVERSION
BLOCKAGE	REMOVAL OF RESTRAINT
CENTER – PERIPHERY	ENABLEMENT
CYCLE	ATTRACTION
CYCLIC CLIMAX	LINK
	SCALE

6.4.3.1. Spatial – motion group of schemas

Among the spatial – motion group of schemas in the table above, three main schemas will be presented in this section as they also underlie a large group of conceptual metaphors in the CSs.

- a) PATH (as well as SOURCE – PATH – GOAL) has a “recurring image – schematic pattern with a definite internal structure”. Mainly, there are three parts of the PATH schema: a) a source or a start point; b) a goal or an end point and c) a trajectory connecting the start and end points (Johnson 1987: 113). Paths can also have timelines mapped onto them, i.e. the start and the end point of the path begins and terminates at a specific time (Johnson 1987: 114).
- b) Although the SCALE schema is grouped into the force schemas, it can also belong to the spatial – motion group of schemas. For example, the conceptual metaphor MORE IS UP derives from the SCALE schema, as it shows verticality (Johnson 1987: 121). Moreover, SCALE schema underlies both quantitative and qualitative aspects of human experience. The quantitative aspect shows the increasing and decreasing amount of the objects and substances people experience in their lives, whereas the qualitative aspect shows the degree of intensity of experience (Johnson 1987: 122).
- c) CYCLE schema represents a temporal circle. It starts with an initial state, progresses through consecutive events and returns to its original state. Then the same pattern repeats (Johnson 1987: 119). Moreover, CYCLE schema represents a forward movement, so

once a phase in a cycle is finished, it cannot reoccur in the same cycle (Johnson 1987: 119).

6.4.3.2. Force group of schemas

Force schemas show physical or metaphorical causal interactions. Moreover, force schemas are always based on interaction (Johnson 1987: 43). This schema involves these main features (Johnson 1987: 42 – 44):

- a) Interactional character of the force
- b) Directionality of the force
- c) Path of motion of the force
- d) Origin or source of the force, being directional to the target
- e) Degree of power or intensity of force
- f) Structure or sequence of causality

In the case of the last feature, the sequence of causality can be performed by a living being with a certain purpose or by a physical object or event. In both cases, the potential forces are experienced as a sequence of casual interactions (Johnson 1987: 44).

The following seven schemas illustrate the main structures of force schema (Johnson 1987: 45 – 47):

1. *Compulsion* schema shows that the force comes from a specific source and moves towards a direction with a certain magnitude.
2. *Blockage* schema shows the obstacles that hinder or resist to the flow of the force.
3. *Counterforce* shows two forces directed at each other face – to face.
4. *Diversion* schema shows the collision of two forces that may change the direction of the force after colliding.
5. *Removal of restraint* schema shows the removal of the obstacle to free the path for the application of the force.
6. *Enablement* shows a potential force of action and absence of hindrances.
7. *Attraction* as the name suggests shows attraction by some force.

Although these image schemas have been classified as force group metaphors, it must be noted that certain image schemas can belong to more than one group of image schemas. Two examples

can be brought here. One of them is the image schema SCALE that is grouped into force group showing the intensity of force, yet it can also belong to the spatial – motion group of schemas indicating an increasing or decreasing amount of something. Similarly, the image schema BLOCKAGE can be classified among the spatial schemas being an obstacle among a way, and it can also be viewed as a force blocking the path. In the analysis of conceptual metaphors the CSs the possible image schemas will be indicated at the end of each example. Some examples may contain more than one image schema.

6.5. Conceptual metaphors in the speeches

Metaphors are powerful rhetoric devices commonly and widely used by politicians in their public speeches. The analysis of the metaphors used by politicians can illustrate what images and ideologies they want to arouse in their followers, what emotions and beliefs they try to evoke. Conceptual metaphors can also provide insights to why certain politicians succeed in convincing and manipulating their audience to take their side. Aristotle says that metaphors should be ‘fitting’, i.e. corresponding to what is signified and creating the harmony between two things (Roberts y.u: 141). In this section, main groups of conceptual metaphors will be identified, and the purpose of their use in the speeches will be discussed.

Four main types of conceptual metaphors can be identified in the speeches, namely FUTURE, PATH, GENOCIDE (and its synonyms) and HISTORY. These can further be grouped into the metaphors of *construction* and *destruction*. Among the four groups of metaphors FUTURE and PATH conceptual metaphors can be classified as metaphors of *construction* whereas GENOCIDE and HISTORY as *destruction* metaphors.

The two main groups of conceptual metaphors are the conceptual metaphors of CONSTRUCTION and DESTRUCTION. Obama constantly uses these metaphors in the speeches to describe the horrific consequences of the genocides and the path of construction which the survivors have taken for their future. The verbs used in the metaphorical expressions of construction and destruction are ‘to build’, ‘to rebuild’, ‘to destroy’, etc. The *construction* metaphors involve the FUTURE and PATH metaphors, whereas the *destruction* metaphors involve the GENOCIDE and HISTORY metaphors.

6.5.1. Metaphors of *construction*

The metaphors of construction are among the most frequently used metaphors in the speeches. The main topic of construction is creating a better, prosperous, democratic future for the generations to come. The verbs used in the metaphors are ‘build’, ‘rebuild’, ‘construct’, ‘create’. These verbs are also used with words ‘lives’ and ‘world’ in the speeches.

6.5.1.1. Conceptual metaphors of PATH and CONTAINER

This sub – section will examine two main image schemas of spatial – motion group that can be found repeatedly in political discourse. The two prominent schemas are the CONTAINER image schema and the PATH schema. While CONTAINER schema can be used to conceptualize various groups (from families to state), the PATH schema represents “policies, plans, national history and grand ideas like ‘progress’” in political discourse (Chilton: 2004: 204).

6.5.1.1.1. Conceptual metaphors of PATH

The progress, the countries have made, is a central topic in the speeches. It is represented as a path. It includes restoring what has been destroyed by genocide. Since progress is a forward movement, it shows positive changes like ‘healing old wounds’ or ‘lifting people out of poverty’. The image schemata used in the speeches is SOURCE - PATH – GOAL. The source is where everything started – the genocide that took the lives of many people. The path is the progress that the survivors have made and are still making towards improving their lives and creating ‘a better future’. Their final goal is to create a peaceful and prosperous country for all their citizens; hence the actions to be accomplished on the path are to boost the economy, to fight poverty and to contribute to peacekeeping missions around the world.

1. PROGRESS IS A PATH

The after - genocide progress of the nation is compared to a recovery path where the wounds are being healed:

(63) [W]e also recognize Rwanda's **progress in moving beyond this horrible tragedy**, the **strides it has taken** to improve the lives of its people [...] (Rw_2012) (SOURCE – PATH – GOAL).

(64) And we salute the **determination** of the Rwandans who **have made important progress** toward healing old wounds, unleashing the economic growth that **lifts people from poverty**, and contributing to peacekeeping missions around the world to spare others the pain they have known (Rw_2014) (ENABLEMENT; PATH; SCALE).

(65) We commend their **determination** to continue to **make important progress** toward healing old wounds and lifting people out of poverty (Rw_2015) (ENABLEMENT; SCALE).

(66) [W]e are **inspired by the progress** Rwanda has made in **moving beyond these horrible crimes** and in **building a more peaceful and prosperous future** for its citizens (Rw_2016) (SOURCE – PATH – GOAL).

As it can be observed from the examples, three image schemas underlie the conceptual metaphors. First of all, the example (63) shows that Rwanda has made progress after the genocide, and it has taken the steps of improvement for its citizens. The examples (64) and (65) indicate determination as a force that has enabled them to make progress. Moreover, this force has enabled them to come out of poverty and heal their wounds and build a better life. The image schema of SCALE shows the amount of progress Rwanda has achieved, as it indicates an upward movement. So, one can assume that to take a certain path we need a force that will enable to move forward. And the stronger the force, the higher the scale of achievement will be.

Although the use of PATH metaphor implies positive changes, it should be noted that the path is not always easy to pass because it needs certain 'efforts' to reach the destination:

2. MOVING FORWARD IS A DIFFICULT PATH

(67) [T]o address the facts of the past as a part of their **efforts to move forward** (Ar_2009) (ENABLEMENT; PATH).

(68) We are inspired by the spirit of the Rwandan people to **move forward** [...] (Rw_2010) (ENABLEMENT; PATH).

(69) We stand in awe of their families, who have **summoned the courage to carry on**, and the survivors, who **have worked through their wounds to rebuild their lives** (Rw_2014) (ENABLEMENT; CYCLE).

The examples illustrate that the survivors of the genocide have to have courage and strength in taking the path of restoring their lives. But as Obama implies, the recovery process is not easy – it requires courage and efforts. However, a forward movement implies positive changes, as it shows the forward motion of the path as opposed to a backward movement, which keeps us away from the progress:

(70) **Moving forward with the future** cannot be done without reckoning with the facts of the past (Ar_2012) (BLOCKAGE).

(71) We know that Srebrenica's future, and that of Bosnia and Herzegovina, will not be **held back** by its painful recent history (Sr_2012) (BLOCKAGE).

In the examples (70) and (71) Obama implies that history or the past can be an obstacle preventing the nation from moving forward to their prosperous future. These examples show the image schema of BLOCKAGE from the force group. It indicates that a forward movement or path may contain obstacles showing resistance to the motion.

6.5.1.1.2. Conceptual metaphors of CONTAINER

CONTAINER or CONTAINMENT image schema belongs to the spatial group of schemas. CONTAINER schema can be viewed as a space (mostly as a bounded mental space) from which something can be *in* and *out* (Johnson 1987: 39).

CONTAINER metaphors belong to the positive metaphors in the speeches. They show the good qualities of the entities that are presented as containers. One of the main container metaphors in the speeches is FUTURE IS A BUILDING/ ESTABLISHMENT presented as a place where future generations will live in peace and harmony. There are a few other container metaphors that will be provided below:

3. MEMORIES AND HEARTS ARE CONTAINERS

(72) The Meds Yeghern must live on **in our memories**, just as it lives on **in the hearts** of the Armenian people (Ar_2009).

(73) We must recommit ourselves [...] ensuring that they remain **a part of our collective memory** (Hl_2010).

4. THOUGHTS ARE CONTAINERS

(74) We commit ourselves to **keeping their memories alive in our thoughts** [...] (Hl_2012).

The use of memories and hearts as containers plays an important role here. Memories and hearts are ‘places’ where the victims can live safe and can be remembered for generations, so in this way, they will never ‘die’. Moreover, their remembrance and souls will give the survivors courage and power to fight for a better life and build a better future. Hence, the next two container metaphors show the quality of life Obama aims to create:

5. DIGNITY IS A CONTAINER/ LOCATION

(75) It means doing our part to ensure that survivors receive [...] the support they need to live out their lives **in dignity** (Hl_2014).

6. PEACE IS A CONTAINER/ LOCATION

(76) May we together honor the victims of Srebrenica and their loved ones by building a future in which all the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Balkans live together **in peace** (Sr_2015).

The container metaphors in the speeches indicate that one must preserve the values that may create a democratic country and a democratic world.

6.5.1.2. Conceptual metaphors of FUTURE

The creation of the future is one of the main themes in the CSs of genocide. Hence, the conceptual metaphor used here can be formed as a building, location or an establishment. Being a main theme in the speeches, future indicates a progress of a nation on the path that is yet to be achieved. Sometimes, the word ‘tomorrow’ is used as an alternative to ‘future’. The important thing for any establishment is to have a ‘solid foundation’ for the construction to grow. In the speeches, Obama indicates that it is important to ‘build a sturdy foundation’ for a prosperous and peaceful future existence by reckoning the past events and by commemorating the memories of the victims. Moreover, he compares the present and future state of the nation by implying that it is possible to create a ‘more peaceful and prosperous tomorrow’. One can assume that the present state of existence is not truly satisfactory, so there are things that can be achieved for a better life:

7. FUTURE IS A BUILDING/ESTABLISHMENT:

(77) [R]eckoning with the past lays a **sturdy foundation** for a peaceful and prosperous shared future (Ar_2011) (REMOVAL OF RESTRAINT).

(78) People [...] **build a foundation** for a more just and tolerant future [...] (Ar_2014)

(79) **Embracing this spirit**, as nations and as individuals, is how we can honor those who were lost two decades ago and **build a future worthy of their lives** (Rw_2014) (ENABLEMENT).

(80) Today, as the United States grieves with the Rwandan people at this moment of remembrance, we are **inspired by their spirit** as they **build a more peaceful and prosperous tomorrow** (Rw_2013) (ENABLEMENT; PATH – GOAL).

(81) May we together honor the victims of Srebrenica and their loved ones by **building a future in which all the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Balkans live together in peace** (Sr_2015) (CONTAINER).

According to the examples (77) and (78) any good construction needs a strong base. Moreover, the obstacles should be cleared off to form a solid foundation. Similarly, to build a firm basis for a ‘peaceful and prosperous’ future, it is important to reckon with the history. As in the case of PATH schema, the construction of future implies a driving force, which is the spirit and courage of people that inspire others, hence the use of the image schema ENABLEMENT. Since construction can be viewed as a vertical movement, and as any path involves movement towards a certain direction, the creation of future can also be perceived as a path with an end goal, as presented in the example (80).

In the examples above future is presented as an establishment that needs to be built so that future generations can live in prosperity and peace. Hence, in this case, the conceptual metaphor of FUTURE derives from the image schema CONTAINER. Another example of future as a container is

8. FUTURE IS A PROJECT

(82) Armenian - Americans have made [...] **critical investments in a democratic, peaceful and prosperous future** for Armenia (Ar_2012) (CONTAINER).

Here future can be understood as a project which requires investments for a democratic and prosperous life. The investments can be not only financial but also cultural, scientific, educational and so on. In these examples, future is a container, in which we should put democratic values and ideas so that it can prosper and in which we will feel happy and safe in contrast with the past.

In the SOURCE – PATH – GOAL image schema the GOAL is the achievement of a better life, hence the future lies ahead and should be ‘pursued’:

(83) As they reflect on this painful day, Rwandans must know that the United States will be their partner **in pursuit of the secure and peaceful future** that they and their children deserve (Rw_2011) (PATH – GOAL).

(84) **We look** with you **to the future** [...] (Rw_2013) (PATH).

Looking to the future may also mean we are attracted to it. Looking to the future may assume it is something beautiful and bright like a light. The following conceptual metaphor shows that future can be compared to light. Moreover, it has a degree of luminosity:

9. FUTURE IS A LIGHT

(85) [W]e stand alongside all Armenians in recalling the darkness of the Meds Yeghern and in committing to bringing a **brighter future** to the people of Armenia (Ar_2012).

In this example, future can be perceived as a source of light. Hence future can be measured by the intensity of light.

Along with the FUTURE metaphor, another construction metaphor should be identified. In the examples below, the abstract entity NATION is also represented as a construct like FUTURE that needs to be ‘built’:

10. NATION IS A CONSTRUCT

(86) [T]hey work toward **building a nation** that would make their ancestors proud [...] (Ar_2013).

(87) [T]hey work to **build a democratic, peaceful, and prosperous nation** (Ar_2014).

After being destroyed by the horrors of the genocides, it is important to give hope to the nation who suffered mass murders. Hence, Obama uses the conceptual metaphor of *creation* to give the hope for a better future. Thus, future can be described in terms of a building or establishment that the survivors have to build to live in.

6.5.2. Metaphors of *destruction*

Destruction metaphors in the speeches are represented as abstract entities that have destructive power. The damage they cause can be of an immense scale. The destructive force is so huge that it can annihilate and wipe out everything on its way. As mentioned before, the destruction metaphors in the speeches are GENOCIDE and HISTORY, which are both personified as destructive entities having the potential of destruction. This sub – section analyzes the destructive metaphors in the speeches, mostly comparing them with natural disasters.

6.5.2.1. Personification of genocide

GENOCIDE metaphors show the personification of genocide as highly powerful and destructive entity. Several names are used alternatively to ‘genocide’ – mass murder, horrific events, unspeakable horror, etc. – and all of them are represented as destructive entities in the speeches. For instance, in the example (88) below, genocide can be compared with a natural disaster:

(88) **Out of the ruins of genocide**, Rwandans have welcomed home refugees and former combatants and worked to **build a more peaceful, prosperous and democratic society** for all its citizens (Rw_2011) (CONTAINER; SCALE; GOAL).

In the example (88), genocide can be compared to an earthquake that has turned everything into ruins. The SCALE schema shows the amount of damage genocide has caused. The use of the CONTAINER schema indicates the way out of the ruins. In addition, this way leads to the creation of prosperous and democratic society.

11. GENOCIDE IS A DISASTER

(89) Nineteen years ago, Rwanda was **torn apart by a great evil** (Rw_2013) (COMPULSION).

(90) [T]he genocide that took the lives of so many innocents and which **shook the conscience of the world** (Rw_2014) (COMPULSION).

(91) We mourn **lives cut short** and **communities torn apart** (Hl_2014) (COMPULSION).

12. GENOCIDE IS A DESTRUCTIVE WAVE

(92) More than 800,000 men, women, and children were killed **in a wave of brutal violence** [...] (Rw_2013) (COMPULSION; SCALE).

(93) Twenty years ago, Srebrenica was **overrun** (Sr_2015) (COMPULSION).

In the example (93), the agent is not indicated, but the action of overrunning can still be compared with a phenomenon of a natural disaster. One of the definitions of ‘overrun’ in the Merriam - Webster dictionary is ‘to flow over’. For example, when a river overflows it can wipe away everything on its way and cause lots of damage.

The conceptual metaphors 11 and 12 compare the features of genocide with the destructive attributes of natural disasters. So, genocide can be compared with an earthquake, which has a power of shaking, destabilizing and destroying everything to ruins. Furthermore, genocide also has the power of wiping away lives and buildings, like a tsunami, hence people ‘were killed in a wave of brutal violence [...]’ (Rw_2013).

Further metaphors include the personification of genocide as a ghost and as an electrifying object:

13. GENOCIDE IS A GHOST

(94) While we remain **haunted by the genocide**, we also draw hope and inspiration from the people of Rwanda, who are building a brighter future (Rw_2015) (PATH; SCALE).

Genocide is presented as a ghost that haunts people to the present day. In legends, people get scared by ghosts whenever they see them; hence Obama says they ‘remain haunted’ when they think about the genocide. There can also be an assumption that Obama talks about the people murdered during the genocide, and they are haunted by their ghosts seeking justice for their mass murder.

14. GENOCIDE IS AN ELECTRIFYING OBJECT

(95) This atrocity */genocide/* **galvanized the international community** to act [...] (Sr_2010) (COMPULSION; SCALE) (my emphasis).

(96) [G]enocide that **shocked the world** [...] (Sr_2012) (COMPULSION).

Here genocide is compared with a strong electric power or a device that can cause damage of an electrifying manner. The SCALE schema shows that the intensity of the ‘electric power’ was so intense that it shocked the whole world.

Not only genocide is ascribed destructive attributes, but there are also certain phenomena primarily connected to it. For example, anti – Semitism – hostility, prejudice, and discrimination against the Jews – has been ascribed the same characteristics as the genocide itself:

15. ANTI - SEMITISM IS A DESTRUCTIVE POWER

(97) [I] bore witness to the **horrors of anti - Semitism** and the **capacity for evil** represented by the Nazis’ campaign (Hl_2010) (COMPULSION).

(98) We pledge to **stand strong [...] against the resurgence of anti - Semitism**, and **against hatred in all its forms** (Hl_2012) (COUNTERFORCE).

16. ANTI - SEMITISM IS A DESTRUCTIVE TIDE

(99) They remind us of our duty to **counter the rising tide of anti - Semitism**, bigotry and hatred that threaten the values we hold dear – pluralism, diversity, and the freedom of religion and expression (Hl_2016) (COUNTERFORCE).

Anti – Semitism is a part of the Holocaust that happened in the Second World War. Yet anti – Semitism is seen as a destructive entity that still exists in our reality. In the example (99) anti – Semitism can be compared with an immense water surface the ‘tide’ of which will cause an extensive amount of damage if it reaches its peak. The first destructive stream occurred during Second World War, but it can resurface again as shown in the example (98). Therefore, Obama urges to stay vigilant and stand against the resurfacing of anti – Semitism.

17. INTOLERANCE/ INJUSTICE/ INHUMANITY, etc. IS AN ANTAGONIST

(100) Even as we **confront the inhumanity** of 1915 [...] (Ar_2010) (COUNTERFORCE).

(101) And we must meet our sacred responsibility to honor all those [...] by **standing up against intolerance and injustice** (Hl_2011) (COUNTERFORCE).

(102) [W]e must commit ourselves to **resisting hate and persecution in all its forms** (Hl_2013) (COUNTERFORCE).

Similarly to anti – Semitism, intolerance, inhumanity or hate can be presented as negative forces. In this case, they can be viewed as antagonists. And again Obama emphasizes the obligation to confront the ‘antagonist’. The two main image schemas used with the GENOCIDE metaphors are COMPULSION and COUNTERFORCE. It can be concluded that when there is a destructive force, there can also be a counterforce that can sometimes be stronger than the original force.

6.5.2.2. Conceptual metaphors of *history*

History is one of the ‘villains’ in the speeches. Obama describes history from a negative perspective. When he speaks about history in the speeches, he refers to a specific time in history when the mass murders occurred. Hence, history is given all the features of mass killings. Evidently, history metaphors are also given dark, painful, destructive features:

18. (UNRESOLVED) HISTORY IS A BURDEN

(103) History, unresolved, can be a **heavy weight** (Ar_2009) (BLOCKAGE).

19. HISTORY IS A PAIN - CAUSING OBJECT

(104) I strongly support efforts by the Turkish and Armenian people to work through this **painful history** (Ar_2009) (REMOVAL OF RESTRAINT).

The two metaphors above show history as a heavy object that can cause pain. But the pain is rather emotional than physical. The example (103) is taken from a CS of the Armenian Genocide, which has an ‘unresolved history’. The Armenian Genocide has not been recognized by the present Turkish government; hence the pain of the past still lives in the hearts and memories of the Armenian people as a ‘heavy burden’. When you keep emotional burden for years, it can actually be painful, hence the comparison of the history with pain.

20. HISTORY IS A DESTRUCTIVE WEAPON

(105) Contested history **destabilizes** the present and **stains the memory** (Ar_2011) (COMPULSION).

21. HISTORY IS AN OBSCURE EVENT

(106) In that **dark moment of history**, 1.5 million Armenians were massacred or marched to their death [...] (Ar_2010) (PATH – GOAL).

22. HISTORY IS A BOOK OF TRAGEDY

(107) The Meds Yeghern is a **devastating chapter in the history of the Armenian people** [...] (Ar_2010) (CONTAINER).

(108) [W]e reaffirm the lessons of that **tragic chapter in history** (Rw_2011) (CONTAINER).

The last two examples show that history is compared to a book. This book has tragic chapters like the occurrence of the genocide. Every time, opening the book and seeing the tragic chapter will cause pain and ‘stain memories’, unless this history is recognized and a measure of justice is paid.

6.6. Repetition

Repetition is a cohesive device used in prose and poetry to make the meaning clearer and emphasize its significance by the repetition of the same words, phrases or even sentences. Not only repetitions make the sentences more beautiful and appealing, but also intriguing and dramatic.

Two types of repetitions have been identified in the speeches – anaphora and epistrophe.

Anaphora is the repetition of a word or a phrase at the beginning of adjacent sentences, whereas epistrophe is a repetition of a word at the end of every line of the sentence. Anaphora is one of the oldest stylistic devices dating back to religious texts in Bible. It is also one of the widely used devices in figurative speech, such as prose and poetry. As anaphora is used to make a speech impressive, its use is usually avoided in formal styles of writing.

Epistrophe has the function to give a strong emphasize to an idea or a thought. By general rhyme scheme, it makes the words impressive and noteworthy, thus making a strong emotional appeal.

This device is used to repeat the ‘core ideas’, i.e. to constantly emphasize certain political matters (Wilson 1990: 125). By repetition and emphasis politicians want to make certain that their most important ideas and messages can be understood by their audiences. Furthermore, the phrases or words used in repetitions are usually re – emphasized three times. This is, what Beard (2000: 28) calls the ‘list of three’, that gives fullness to the words, phrases or sometimes whole

sentences being repeated. Below, six core ideas will be presented, that are emphasized by the cohesive device of repetition:

1. Emphasizing commemoration and honoring

(109) Today is a day **to commemorate those who lost their lives, to honor the courage of those who risked their lives to save others, and to grieve with the Rwandan people** (Rw_2015).

2. Emphasizing contrast

(110) **From this tragedy we see** the cost of allowing hatred go unanswered in the world, **but from this justice we also see** the power of holding the perpetrators of genocide accountable (Hl_2011).

3. Emphasizing obligation

(111) **We have a sacred duty** to remember the cruelty that occurred here, and to prevent such atrocities from happening again. **We have an obligation** to victims and to their surviving family members. And **we have a responsibility** to future generations all over the globe to agree that we must refuse to be bystanders to evil [...] (Sr_2010).

(112) **We must heed the urgency to listen to and care** for the last living survivors, camp liberators and the witnesses to the Shoah. And **we must meet our sacred responsibility to honor** all those who perished by recalling their courage and dignity in the face of unspeakable atrocities, **by insisting that they never forget them, and by always standing up against intolerance and injustice** (Hl_2011).

4. Emphasizing the prevention of mass atrocities

(113) We look with you **to the future** and renew our commitment to human rights and the rule of law, **to the protection of the vulnerable, and to the prevention of atrocities** so that such evil is never repeated (Rw_2013).

5. Emphasizing the need to be compassionate

(114) **In the face of cruelty, we must** choose compassion. **In the face of intolerance and suffering, we must** never be indifferent (Rw_2014).

6. Emphasizing the need for the acknowledgment of genocide

(115) **Only by fully acknowledging** the past **can we achieve** a future of true and lasting reconciliation. **Only by holding the perpetrators of the genocide to account can we offer** some measure of justice to help heal their loved ones. And **only by calling evil by its name can we find** the strength to overcome it (Sr_2015).

A closer look can reveal that the core ideas emphasized by repetitions are also the main themes in the CSs. Obama emphasizes the need to be compassionate, commemorate, honor, and pay tribute to the victims of genocide. He also points out the obligation to protect the vulnerable and stay strong against any prejudice, hate, and injustice. Moreover, he claims the urgency to recognize the past by ‘calling evil by its name’, hold the perpetrators accountable for their inhuman acts, and also take measures to prevent mass atrocities from ever happening again.

6.7. The pronouns in politics

Pronouns make an important part of political speeches. The use of the pronouns has a great influence on the peoples' perceptions of politicians. The goal of politicians is to present themselves as strong leaders of their countries and capable of identifying and resolving the needs and problems of their audience (Beard 2000: 43). They can use the pronouns for persuasive and manipulative purposes to gain the trust and support of their audience. They also tend to use the pronouns to present themselves positively and their opponents negatively (Allen 2006: 2).

6.7.1. The personal pronouns

Personal pronouns are used to refer to people or things. In traditional grammar, they substitute the noun they refer to. Personal pronouns can be divided into subject personal pronouns and object personal pronouns. Subject personal pronouns function 'as a subject or a subject complement', whereas object pronouns function 'as object, prepositional complement, and sometimes as subject complement' (Quirk et al. 1985: 336). The subject personal pronouns are *I, you, he, she, it, we, you, they* and the objective form of these pronouns are *me, you, her, him, it, us* and *them*.

Prior to the analysis of the personal pronouns in the CSs, an overview of the personal pronouns *I, we, you, they* and their function in political speeches will be presented below.

a) The personal pronoun *I*

The pronoun *I* refers to the first person singular and presents the speaker or sender of the message. A politician may use *I* to convey his/her personal opinion and show subjectivity. The use of the first personal singular can also show authority and power, thus distancing him/her from the audience. It may indicate politician's personal involvement, and commitment in political matters as the speaker expresses his/her viewpoint on them. However, politicians tend to avoid the extensive use of *I* and share the responsibility with their fellow politicians (Penycook 1994).

b) The personal pronoun *we*

The pronoun *we* is probably the most ambiguous pronoun because of its vague referents. The problem with this personal pronoun is that it is never clear to whom it refers. The interpretation of the pronoun *we* is context - dependent and based on the 'mutual knowledge of the speaker and interpreter' (Wales 1996: 62 – 63).

Based on the context, the pronoun *we* can imply a sense of community, engagement, shared values, affection as well as it can express division and disengagement. Depending on the engagement or disengagement of the speaker from the group, there are two types of the pronoun *we* – the inclusive *we* (I-WE) and the exclusive *we* (E-WE).

In political discourse, *we* is used to indicate group membership. When politicians use the pronoun *we* they are aware of the inclusive/exclusive distinction (Wilson 1990: 52). Exclusive *we* usually tries to distance the speaker from the audience, whereas inclusive *we* creates personal involvement and solidarity with the audience.

c) The personal pronoun *you*

The use of the pronoun *you* can be ambiguous as it can usually have singular or plural referents. There is also the generic *you* that can be used to express generally accepted truth and hopefully gain the acceptance of the listeners (Allen 2006: 13 – 14). It is usually uncertain who the speaker refers to when he/she uses the indefinite *you*, since in this case, *you* can refer to anyone. When the speaker uses the indefinite *you* he/she can include or exclude him/herself from the group. Moreover, the audience can also decide whether it belongs to the group or not when the speaker uses the pronoun *you* (Allen 2006: 13 – 14). In political discourse, however, politicians try to avoid addressing the audience directly.

d) The personal pronoun *they*

The pronoun *they* is usually used in ideological polarization with *we* in political discourse to indicate the 'other', the 'third party' or the 'outsider' (Wales 1996: 60). The politicians can use *they* to create ideological differences between the in – group (which the speaker represents), and out – group (which represents the 'others'). In this way, the speaker distances the in – group from the out – group (Bramley 2001: 182 – 183). Additionally, the contrast between the in – group and out – group creates the image of *them* being inferior to *us*.

6.7.2. The analysis of the pronominal clusters

It was presented in the sub – section 6.2 that several pronouns occurred frequently in the CSs. The clusters of a word are the words occurring most frequently with the given word. The personal pronoun *we* and its possessive form *our*, as well as the possessive pronoun *their* appeared among the most frequent keywords. Hence, I decided to analyze the clusters of the most frequent pronouns and their possessive forms to identify their function in the speeches. Although the other personal pronouns (*I, my you, your, they*) were not detected in the top keyword list, they will also be analyzed to make comparison why certain pronouns appear frequently while the others do not. The personal pronoun *you* and its possessive form have been ignored since they have the smallest amount of types in the GC. For each pronoun, the top ten clusters will be analyzed. Some of the pronouns have limited number of types; hence the number of the clusters will be less than 10.

6.7.2.1. The clusters of the pronouns *we*

Here are the top 10 most frequently occurred clusters of the pronoun *we* in the GC:

Table 3.

1.	WE MUST 19
2.	WE HONOR 14
3.	WE STAND 13
4.	WE ALSO 12
5.	WE ARE 11
6.	WE RECALL 8
7.	WE REMEMBER 8
8.	WE COMMEMORATE 5
9.	WE HAVE 5
10.	WE PAUSE 5

As it can be seen, the most frequently used clusters are the ones showing honoring, remembrance, commemoration, compassion, and solidarity, which is typical of epideictic types of speeches. However, some of the clusters show obligation and commitment. For example, the most frequent cluster of the pronoun *we* is the modal verb ‘must’ which shows obligation. Talking about obligation is one of the main topics in the speeches that Obama emphasizes constantly. Among the WE MUST clusters, there are 7 hits in the speeches of the Rwandan

genocide and 7 hits in the Srebrenica Genocide. In these speeches, Obama speaks about the common obligation of remembering the past, choosing love and compassion, and refusing to tolerate any hate or bigotry against any nation:

(116) In the face of cruelty, **we must** choose compassion. In the face of intolerance and suffering, **we must** never be indifferent (Rw_2014).

(117) And we have a responsibility to future generations all over the globe to agree that **we must** refuse to be bystanders to evil; whenever and wherever it occurs, **we must** be prepared to stand up for human dignity (Sr_2010).

In this context, the obligation Obama mentions is vague. It is more like a global reminder to stand against any ethnic hate, prejudice and show love and compassion. This way, Obama tries to create a 'global community' with its duties and responsibilities, even if in reality the community cannot prevent global crime.

Another cluster of *we* that shows obligation and responsibility is WE HAVE. There are 4 hits of the cluster WE HAVE and all of them appear in the speeches of the Srebrenica Genocide. Here Obama uses the cohesive device of repetition reinforcing his ideas of obligation to protect the people from future atrocities:

(118) **We have a sacred duty** to remember the cruelty that occurred here [...] **We have an obligation** to victims and to their surviving family members. And **we have a responsibility** to future generations [...] (Sr_2010).

Another cluster worth mentioning is WE ARE. Here Obama speaks about drawing inspiration from the courage and spirit of the people, who stayed strong in the face of evil and who made great progress in their lives and their countries:

(119) **[W]e are inspired by the extraordinary courage and great resiliency** of the Armenian people in the face of such tremendous adversity and suffering (Ar_2014).

(120) The noble acts of courage performed by the liberators, rescuers, and the Righteous Among Nations remind us that **we are never powerless** (Hl_2014).

(121) **We are inspired by the progress** Rwanda has made in moving beyond these horrible crimes and in building a more peaceful and prosperous future for its citizens (Rw_2016).

Other frequent clusters of *we* appear with the words *recall* and *remember*. The cluster WE RECALL occurs 5 times in the speeches of the Armenian Genocide, and the cluster WE REMEMBER occurs 5 times in the speeches of the Holocaust. Obama holds a commemoration by remembering painful events and recalling the victims of the genocides. However, he also mentions the courage and humanity of people who showed help and compassion during the massacres, thus showing solidarity to them:

(122) **We recall** the horror of what happened ninety - nine years ago [...] (Ar_2014).

(123) On this day, **we recall** the courage, spirit, and determination of those who heroically resisted the Nazis, exemplifying the very best of humanity (Hl_2013).

(124) The United States grieves with Rwandan people, and **we remember** those whose lives were cut short (Rw_2012).

In the last example, it can be seen that Obama shows solidarity on behalf of the United States in, hence the use of *we* is inclusive, since he is a part of the government.

To sum up the sub - section, it should be noted that the clusters of the personal pronoun *we* mostly include commemoration, solidarity, remembrance, and obligation.

6.7.2.2. The clusters of the pronoun *our*

The most frequent clusters of the possessive form *our* are presented in the table 4 below:

Table 4.

1.	OUR COMMITMENT 7
2.	OUR INTERESTS 5
3.	OUR OWN 4
4.	OUR COMMUNITIES 3
5.	OUR ENDURING 3
6.	OUR FRIENDSHIP 3
7.	OUR OBLIGATION 3

8.	OUR SHARED 3
9.	OUR SOCIETY 3
10.	OUR THOUGHTS 3

The possessive form *our* shows possession. One of the main topics, the clusters of *our* show, is commitment. The most frequent use of the cluster OUR COMMITMENT occurs in the speeches of the Rwandan Genocide. Obama talks about the commitment to prevent the future mass atrocities and protecting the human rights by taking actions :

(125) The memory of these events also deepens **our commitment to act** when faced with genocide and work with partners around the world to prevent future atrocities (Rw_2009).

(126) We look with you to the future and renew **our commitment to human rights** and the rule of law, to the protection of the vulnerable, and to the prevention of atrocities so that such evil is never repeated (Rw_2013).

(127) The United States Government and the American people will continue to extend our friendship and partnership to Rwanda as we reconfirm **our commitment to protecting the vulnerable, to preventing mass atrocities [...]** (Rw_2016)

In the examples above, Obama speaks about a commitment to prevent mass atrocities. As it can be seen Obama mentions the commitment on the international governmental level, as the prevention of mass atrocities can be worked out by people of high authority. The last example shows that Obama involves the American government in protecting the vulnerable; hence it should be said that he uses inclusive *we*.

As far as the clusters OUR ENDURING and OUR SHARED are concerned, they also show obligation and commitment:

(128) [W]e recall the horror of the Meds Yeghern [...] and reaffirm **our enduring commitment** to the people of Armenia and to the principle that such atrocities must always be remembered if we are to prevent them from occurring ever again (Ar_2014).

(129) The specter of this slaughter of mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters haunts us still, and reminds the nations of the world of **our shared responsibility** to do all we can to protect civilians and to ensure that evil of this magnitude never happens again (Rw_2012).

In these examples, Obama again highlights the urge of prevention mass atrocities and of a shared responsibility of the international community to join them. However, the point of the reference is vague in these statements, as it is not clear whom he refers to when he speaks about the shared responsibility of the prevention of mass murders. Probably, in this way, Obama tries to distance himself from taking all the responsibility and sharing it with other world leaders.

Another way to show solidarity and compassion to other nations is sharing one's own tragic events in the history. The cluster OUR OWN shows that Obama knows this strategy well, when he uses it in the following example:

(130) History teaches us that our nations are stronger [...] when we appropriately recognize painful pasts and work to rebuild bridges of understanding toward a better tomorrow. The United States knows this lesson well from the dark chapters in **our own history** (Ar_2011).

Not only Obama tries to show solidarity, but he also mentions the ability of the American people to overcome a tragedy and move forward towards a better life. He tries to inspire the Armenian nation by showing the American spirit to overcome difficulties as an example. This statement, however, is taken from a CS of the Armenian Genocide, which involves a big political issue. The 'bridges of understanding' among the nations that Obama mentions in the extract, refers to the relations between Armenia and Turkey and the recognition of the Armenian Genocide by the Turkish government. This issue will be discussed in detail in the section 8.

In the clusters OUR COMMUNITIES and OUR SOCIETY *our* refers to the United States:

(131) The United States is stronger for the contributions Armenian - Americans have made to **our society, our culture, and our communities** (Ar_2013).

The Armenian - Americans referred in the extract, come from the Armenian descent survived the genocide of the 1915. Nowadays, one of the biggest Armenian diaspora lives in the United States. And, Obama wants to fasten the relationship between Armenia and the USA by talking about the contributions they have made towards America's progress.

The final cluster to be analyzed is OUR INTERESTS. It appears only in the commemorative speeches of the Armenian Genocide. This cluster occurs in the same phrase that Obama has been using in all 5 speeches of the Armenian Genocide.

(132) A full, frank, and just acknowledgment of the facts is **in all our interests**
(Ar_2011).

The ‘acknowledgment of the facts’ refers to the recognition of the Armenian Genocide by the Turkish government as well as by the United States. In this phrase, it is not clear who Obama refers to by saying ‘our interests’. Obama tries to avoid the responsibility of recognizing the genocide, hence creating vagueness by the use of the pronoun *our*.

As it could be seen, the personal pronoun *we* and the possessive form *our* were among the most frequent keywords. The analysis of the clusters of those pronouns showed that they are mostly used to show commemoration, honoring and solidarity. The clusters of the pronoun *we* were mostly used in the context of obligation towards protecting the civilians, remembering and drawing inspiration from the survivors and the progress they had made. Meanwhile, the clusters of *our* were mainly used to show commitment towards acting to prevent mass atrocities; solidarity, sharing and friendship with the United States and the countries mentioned.

6.7.2.3. The clusters of the pronoun *I* and *my*

In comparison with *we* and *our* there are few uses of the pronoun *I* and *my*. As it can be seen in the table 5, most of the top clusters occur only once in the corpus. It can be assumed that Obama avoids much personal involvement in the issues highlighted in the speeches.

Table 5.

1.	I HAVE 11
2.	I JOIN 5
3.	I BELIEVE 2
4.	I ALSO 1
5.	I APPLAUD 1
6.	I BORE 1
7.	I COMMEND 1
8.	I REMEMBER 1
9.	I SALUTE 1
10.	I STAND 1

The first cluster appears 9 times in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide. They make a part of the same statement Obama has said in all the speeches since 2009:

(133) **I have consistently stated my own view** of what occurred in 1915, and my view of that history has not changed. My interest remains the achievement of a full, frank and just acknowledgment of the facts (Ar_2009).

With this statement, Obama wants to show his personal view regarding the recognition of the Armenian Genocide. Even if he uses the personal pronoun *I* he states his view in an indirect manner. The possible reasons why he does it will be discussed in the section 8.

The personal pronoun *I* is predominantly used in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide. One can assume that he wants to show strong commitment and personal involvement in the issues.

Another cluster that shows strong commitment is I JOIN that occurs 3 times in the CSs of the Holocaust and 2 times in the CSs of the Srebrenica Genocide:

(134) **I join people here at home, in Israel**, and around the world in commemorating Holocaust Remembrance Day [...] (HI_2011).

(135) On this International Holocaust Remembrance Day, Michelle and **I join** the American people and **our friends in the State of Israel** and around the world as we reaffirm our obligation not just bear witness, but to act (HI_2014).

This statement indicates strong solidarity because Obama uses the pronoun *I* to show personal involvement. Moreover, he emphasizes his solidarity by telling that he is at home in Israel. This strategic move can improve the good relations between two countries or reinforce them.

Table 6.

1.	MY OWN 8
2.	MY VIEW 8
3.	MY VISIT 2
4.	MY INTEREST 1
5.	MY VOICE 1

There are only 5 clusters of *my* in the speeches. The most frequent of them occur in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide. The clusters MY OWN and MY VIEW again occur in the same statement in which Obama states his view on the recognition of the Armenian Genocide:

(136) I have consistently stated **my own view** of what occurred in 1915, and **my view** has not changed (Ar_2016).

To sum up the results of the clusters of *I* and *my*, it can be said that Obama shows less personal involvement in the political issues (compared to the use of *we* and *our*). The clusters of the pronoun *I* and *my* were predominantly used in the speeches of the Armenian Genocide, showing Obama's view of the recognition of the genocide. The cluster of I JOIN also indicated strong personal involvement and solidarity with the Israeli government.

6.7.2.4. The clusters of the pronoun *they*

Table 7 shows only four clusters of *they*. Since all the other types occur only once in the corpus they have not been chosen for the analysis.

Table 7.

1.	THEY WERE 5
2.	THEY HAVE 3
3.	THEY ACKNOWLEDGE 2
4.	THEY WORK 2

In political discourse, the pronoun *they* is usually used with the pronoun *we* to show polarity and division. It stands for the 'third party' considered as the antagonist or the outsider. However, in the CSs of genocide, *they* is not used to indicate 'the enemy' but it indicates 'the friend' instead. In the following instances, Obama uses *they* to refer to the victims of the genocides:

(137) **They were people who sought to live in peace and had relied on the promise of the international protection**, but in their hour of greatest need, **they were left to fend for themselves** (Sr_2010).

(138) **They were savagely murdered** in the largest massacre in Europe in a half-century (Sr_2015).

Usually, politicians use *they* to impose responsibility on their enemies or political opponents. Whereas in these examples, the referents are the victims of the genocide, hence they cannot bear any responsibility. On the contrary, the polarity is created by Obama using the pronoun *we* and talking about the responsibility the international community has to take to protect the world from future mass atrocities. Thus, Obama wants to create a good image of him by showing he and his government is ready to take the obligation for the protection of the civilians.

Another cluster of *they* to note is THEY ACKNOWLEDGE and THEY WORK. These clusters occur in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide, and they are used in a positive context. Obama uses the pronoun *they* to refer to the people who look for progress and improvement of their political relations:

(139) Together, Armenia and Turkey can forge a relationship that is peaceful, productive and prosperous. And together, the Armenian and Turkish people will be stronger as **they acknowledge their common history and recognize their common humanity** (Ar_2009).

(140) **[T]hey work toward building a nation that would make their ancestors proud**: one that cherishes democracy and respect for human liberty and dignity (Ar_2013).

It can be seen that the pronoun *they* is used to indicate the ‘friend’ in the speeches. It is depicted not only as a victim but also as a creator of better life.

6.7.2.5. The clusters of the pronoun *their*

The number of the *their* clusters is almost 2 times bigger than those of *they*.

Table 8.

1.	THEIR LIVES 13
2.	THEIR COMMON 5
3.	THEIR DEATHS 5
4.	THEIR FAMILIES 5
5.	THEIR MEMORIES 4
6.	THEIR OWN 4
7.	THEIR DEATH 3
8.	THEIR GOVERNMENTS 3
9.	THEIR COUNTRY 2
10.	THEIR EFFORTS 2

The most frequent cluster THEIR LIVES occurs 5 times in the CSs of the Holocaust and 8 times in the speeches of the Rwandan Genocide. First of all, Obama speaks about the people who risked their lives during the genocides to save their friends or co - citizens:

(141) As we draw inspiration from **the righteous gentiles who risked their lives** to save friends, neighbors, and even strangers, we pledge to continue the hard work of repairing the world (Hl_2012).

(142) The horrific events of those 100 days - when friend turned against friend, and neighbor against neighbor - compel us to resist our worst instincts, just as the courage of **those who risked their lives** to save others reminds us of our obligations to our fellow man (Rw_2014).

It can be seen that Obama praises the courage of those who risked their lives to save others and draws inspiration from it. He makes it an example for the rest of the humanity that man has a choice in the face of cruelty.

Secondly, Obama uses the cluster THEIR LIVES to describe those who survived the genocide and continued to live on:

(143) It means doing our part to ensure **that survivors** receive some measure of justice and the support they need to **live out their lives in dignity** (Hl_2014):

(144) We stand in owe of their families, who have summoned the courage to carry on, and **the survivors, who have worked through their wounds to rebuild their lives** (Rw_2014).

(145) Embracing this spirit, as nations and as individuals, is how we can honor all those who were lost two decades ago and build a future **worthy of their lives** (Rw_2014).

Once again, Obama wants to create an image of a friend who cares about his fellow man and wants to ensure that they will create a life full of dignity for those who survived the genocide.

Finally, Obama refers to the victims of the genocide using the cluster THEIR LIVES:

(146) On this day, we honor the memory of the millions of individuals - the mothers and daughters, fathers and sons, friends and neighbors - **who lost their lives** during a time of unparalleled depravity and inhumanity (Hl_2016).

(147) Today is a day to commemorate those **who lost their lives** [...] (Rw_2015).

To sum up, it should be said that the cluster THEIR LIVES has 3 referents in the above examples: the saviors, the survivors and the victims.

The clusters of THEIR DEATHS and its lexeme DEATH appear only in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide. Obama speaks of the victims of the genocide who were ‘marched to their deaths’:

(148) Each year, we pause to remember the 1.5 million Armenians who were subsequently **massacred or marched to their death** in the final days of the Ottoman Empire (Ar_2009).

(149) Ninety-eight years ago, 1.5 million Armenians were **massacred or marched to their deaths** [...] (Ar_2013).

The clusters THEIR COMMON and THEIR GOVERNMENTS again occur in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide:

(150) Together, Armenia and Turkey can forge a relationship that is peaceful, productive and prosperous. And together, the Armenian and Turkish people will

be stronger as they acknowledge **their common history** and recognize **their common humanity** (Ar_2009).

(151) We recognize those courageous Armenians and Turks who have already taken this path, and encourage more to do so, **with the backing of their governments, and mine** (Ar_2013).

The pronoun *their* in these examples refers to the governments of Armenia and Turkey. Here Obama talks about the steps the Armenian and Turkish governments have taken by recognizing the historical fact of the genocide and trying to improve their political relations.

The cluster THEIR MEMORIES has a dual nature; it can refer to the memories of the victims or memories their families have of them:

(152) We commit ourselves to **keeping their memories alive** not only in our thoughts but through our actions (HI_2012).

(153) More than 800,000 men, women, and children were killed and countless others continue **to live with the pain and trauma of their memories and their loss** (Rw_2010).

To sum up the results, it should be noted that the cluster types of *their* is two times bigger than those of *they*. The possible reason is that the pronoun *they* mainly refers to the victims of the genocides, whereas the possessive form has several referents in the speeches. Moreover, another reason of the lesser use of the pronoun *they* is that it refers to the victims who cannot be agents.

7. The ideological beliefs in the CSs of genocide

In this section, I will introduce an ideology or rather ideological belief that plays an important role in the CSs. This ideological belief is the ‘creation of better life and future’. As it could be seen in the sub – chapters 6.5.1.1 and 6.5.1.2, the conceptual metaphors of FUTURE and PATH/JOURNEY were among the mostly repeated ones. Hence, the ideology of ‘creating a better future’ will be discussed, and examples from the speeches will be provided. Meanwhile, before starting the analysis, I will give a short introduction to the definition of ideology, its main properties, and functions.

7.1. The definition, properties and functions of ideologies

According to Fairclough “[i]deology [...] involves the representation of ‘the world’ from the perspective of a particular interest, so that the relationship between proposition and fact is not transparent, but mediated by representational activity” (Fairclough 1995: 44).

Ideologies can be defined as fundamental social beliefs with fairly common and abstract nature. A cognitive function of an ideology is to make the beliefs of a group consistent and enhance their acknowledgment in everyday life (van Dijk 2006: 116). Ideologies can lose their ideological nature and make common sense when they become widely shared beliefs, views or attitudes by a whole community. For example, the protections of human rights or gender equality were once ideologies of feminism or socialism movements (van Dijk 2006: 117).

According to Watkins, ideologies arise from political extremes, defy the existing state of affairs and urge a sudden change in the political system. Furthermore, he claims that ideologies often have utopian objectives and show humanity’s great power to achieve happiness (Watkins 1969, cited in Baradat 2016 [2003]: 7). Similarly to Watkins (1969), Ingersoll claims that ideologies tend to assess the status quo and have utopian objectives. Moreover, they offer a vision of the future, which is very often expressed as a materialistic development over the present. Additionally, ideologies contain a plan for action towards the achievement of a better future (Ingersoll & Matthews 1991, cited in Baradat 2016 [2003]: 8).

Baradat (2016 [2003]: 9) identifies five main properties of an ideology:

- a) Ideology is primarily a political term
- b) Ideology holds a glimpse of the present and an outlook on the future
- c) Ideology is action - oriented
- d) Ideology is addressed to the masses
- e) The language of ideology is expressed in simple terms

Regarding the first property, ideology can also occur in other contexts even if it is primarily political. It can be assumed that ideologies are mainly political because very often they are introduced by prominent political leaders.

The second feature of ideology is that it holds a view of the present moment and gives an outlook on the future (Baradat 2016 [2003]: 9). Sometimes, the views on the present and the future can be contrasting. Since the future is always depicted as a ‘better place’, ‘better world’ or ‘better tomorrow’, the present or the past are shown as dissatisfying. Moreover, to enhance the wish to achieve the desired future politicians often give hope to their audience.

As it could be seen from the analysis of the stylistic devices, the orientation towards future makes a fundamental part in the CSs of genocide. Making a contrast between the pre- and the post - genocide state of the nations who suffered great losses, Obama wants to illustrate the progress and the path that continues and leads to the desired future in democracy, justice, and peace. One can also detect Obama’s famous concept of *change* which he presented in his pre - electoral campaign.

The third property is that ideology is action – oriented. Usually, it means that politicians not only illustrate the vision of the better future, but they also provide some guidance on the way of achieving the desired goal (Baradat 2016 [2003]: 9). I will discuss this property in great detail in the following chapter as it is connected with Obama’s political view on the recognition of genocide (particularly the Armenian Genocide).

The fourth and fifth properties of ideologies can be linked together. Since ideologies are addressed to the masses, they should be expressed in simple and understandable terms. Moreover, ideologies can be expressed in ‘motivational tone’ to make people believe in their power and to make actions towards changing for the better (Baradat 2016 [2003]: 9) (original emphasis).

Obama's CSs are first and foremost addressed to the nations that have been victims of genocide. However, as genocide is an international crime against humanity, Obama may also direct his speech to the international community when he talks about the prevention of mass atrocities or the punishment of the crime of genocide. One of the main topics in the sub – section 6.3 was the creation of the 'international community', which shows Obama's intention to spread his word worldwide.

7.2. The prevention of mass atrocities and the punishment of the crime of genocide

This sub – section will analyze the ways of 'taking actions' towards the achievement of the 'better future'. Since genocide is a crime against humanity, it distorts the ideals of democratic world in peace, equality, and harmony. Hence, the prevention and punishment of genocide should be an international concern. Therefore, one of the main themes Obama presents in the speeches is the prevention and punishment of mass atrocities. The desired democratic future might be achieved through preventing mass atrocities from ever happening again. Obama shows a strong commitment to preventing the mass atrocities and calls on the governments to take measures to punish the crime if it ever happens again:

(154) **Through our words and our deeds**, it is our obligation to keep the flame of memory of those who perished burning bright and to **ensure that such dark chapters of history are never repeated** (Ar_2012).

(155) The United States, along with the international community, resolves to **stand in the way of any tyrant or dictator** who commits crimes against humanity, and **stay true to the principle of "Never Again"** (Hl_2013).

(156) On this solemn day, we remind ourselves of our common humanity and shared commitment to **protecting civilians and ensuring that mass atrocities of this magnitude never happen again** (Rw_2016).

(157) **The United States calls on all governments to redouble their efforts to find those responsible**, to arrest them and to **bring them to justice**. In so doing, we will honor Srebrenica's victims and fulfill our moral and legal **commitment to end impunity for crimes of such awful magnitude** (Sr_2010).

Moreover, Obama emphasizes the participation and partnership of his country in fighting for human rights. Obama presents his country in a positive light. The U.S. is presented as a strong country supporting its international partners in achieving peace and reconciliation and an ideal future for every human being. The examples below illustrate the democratic ideals Obama seeks to achieve:

(158) When we recognize our interconnectedness and the fundamental dignity and equality of every human being, we help to build **a world that is more accepting, secure and free**. This is the best way to honor the legacy we recognize on Yom HaShoah and to fulfill our responsibilities to repair our world from generation to generation (Hl_2016).

(159) The U.S. government and the American people will continue to extend our friendship, partnership, and support to the Rwandan people as they seek to build a **peaceful and prosperous future** (Rw_2012).

The scrutiny of the CSs has shown that Obama offers three types of ‘actions’ to achieve the future he illustrates. I would argue, however, that actions do not necessarily assume to be physical. Firstly, the change towards a better life can be achieved by progress and evolvement. Secondly, by changing peoples’ attitude towards prejudice and hatred against other nationalities. And thirdly, only the recognition of the painful historical events will help move forward and build a democratic world.

Making progress is an important factor towards the achievement of any goal. Taking actions to construct their lives after the destructive genocide shows the strength and persistence of the human nature. Obama, hence, praises the path (the progress) the people have taken to rebuild their lives:

(160) Over the generations Americans of Armenian descent **have richened our communities, spurred our economy, and strengthened our democracy** (Ar_2010).

(161) Today we also reflect on Rwanda’s progress. Out of the ruins of genocide, Rwandans **have welcomed home refugees** and former combatants and **worked to build a more peaceful, prosperous and democratic society for all its citizens**. (Rw_2011)

(162) [W]e also recognize Rwanda's progress in moving beyond this horrible tragedy, **the strides it has taken to improve the lives of its people, and the contributions to protecting civilians from other nations in UN peacekeeping missions around the world.** (Rw_2012)

The progress is well - emphasized in the CSs of Rwandan as well as the Armenian Genocide.

The second way to a better, democratic world is showing respect, equality, and love towards other human beings. But life cannot get better if hate and prejudice towards other nations exist in the world. Obama criticizes the existence of resentment and bigotry and calls on standing against any kind of hatred and injustice:

(163) The memories of the victims serve as a constant reminder to honor their legacy by renewing our commitment to prevent genocide, and to **confront anti-Semitism and prejudice in all of its forms. We must never tolerate the hateful stereotypes and prejudice against the Jewish people** that tragically continues to this day. **We must work, instead, on behalf of a world of justice and peace, in which all nations and peoples value the humanity that we share, and the dignity inherent in every human being** (Hl_2010).

Obama believes in human courage and power. Unfortunately, the victims of the genocide slaughtered in the genocide had no choice of protecting themselves. Yet, those risking their lives to save others from the slaughter had the choice to do so. Moreover, Obama claims that in our time we also have the choice to confront the prejudice against the Jewish people and give them a measure of justice their ancestors could not have. As Obama claims, by confronting bigotry and anti - Semitism we will be able to hold the values like 'pluralism, diversity, and the freedom of religion and expression' (Hl_2016):

(164) **The noble acts of courage performed by liberators, rescuers, and the Righteous Among Nations** remind us that we are never powerless. In our lives, we always have choices. In our time, this means **choosing to confront bigotry and hatred in all of its forms**, especially anti-Semitism. It means condemning any attempts to deny the occurrence of the Holocaust. It means doing our part to ensure that survivors receive some measure of justice and the support they need to live out their lives in dignity [...] **[W]e reaffirm our obligation not just to bear witness, but to act** (Hl_2014).

(165) They remind us of our duty **to counter the rising tide of anti-Semitism, bigotry and hatred** that threaten the values we hold dear – pluralism, diversity, and the freedom of religion and expression (Hl_2016).

The third way to achieve a better future is the recognition of the historical past and the refusal to deny the occurrence of genocide:

(166) **Contested history destabilizes the present and stains the memory of those whose lives were taken, while reckoning with the past lays a sturdy foundation for a peaceful and prosperous shared future.** History teaches us that **our nations are stronger** and our cause is more just **when we appropriately recognize painful pasts and work to rebuild bridges of understanding toward a better tomorrow** (Ar_2011).

(167) **Moving forward with the future cannot be done without reckoning with the facts of the past** (Ar_2012).

It should be noted, that this ‘action’ specifically refers to the recognition of the Armenian Genocide as it remains an unresolved issue internationally. The Turkish government denies the occurrence of the Armenian Genocide committed by its ancestor – the Ottoman Empire. Obama emphasizes the urge to recognize the historical facts as it is the way to advance in life and build a strong ground for a peaceful future. By recognizing and accepting the mistakes of the past, nations grow stronger and develop understanding between each other. Although Obama does not address it directly, one can understand that his urge refers to Turkey to recognize the historical past. However, Obama’s word can also be directed to the world governments to address the issue of the recognition of the Armenian Genocide.

8. Recognition of the Armenian Genocide

Genocide is a grave crime that has ever happened to humanity. The recognition of genocide is an important political as well as legal achievement. Only with the full acknowledgment of the crime and punishment of the perpetrators it will be possible to achieve reconciliation and piece for the successors of the genocide victims.

The recognition of the Armenian Genocide has been and remains an open issue. Despite all the documentation evidence, historical study, testimonies of eyewitnesses and survivors of the crime, as well as international recognition of the genocide by over 30 countries in the world, the present day Turkish government absolutely refuses to recognize the crimes that its predecessor – the Ottoman Empire – has committed towards the Armenian nation at the height of the First World War. Turkey claims that either the genocide did not happen or it was outnumbered, and the total number of the victims composed around 300,000. Whereas according to the International Association of Genocide Scholars the number reached over one million². Moreover, Turkey has led and leads a threatening policy to freeze any diplomatic and political relations with the countries that will officially recognize the 1915 events as genocide³. For example, in 2006 a French parliamentary vote to punish the denial of the Armenian Genocide met Turkey's condemnation. Although the bill was not legalized, it resulted in the suspension of Turkey's military relations with France⁴. Similarly, Turkey disengaged its ambassador from Washington after the approval of the resolution by the House Foreign Affairs Committee to label the mass killings of the Armenians in 1915 as 'genocide'. Despite the committee's approval, Obama's administration demanded the resolution not to be affected by the whole Congress⁵.

Although I am not a political scientist and I cannot certainly expose the consequences of the genocide recognition by different countries, it can be assumed that Turkey's lobbying policy may be one of the reasons why many countries still remain silent towards the recognition of the Armenian Genocide. The United States is among the countries that have always led dubious tactics whenever the question of the recognition arises. It can especially be noticed in Obama's commemorative statements of the Armenian Genocide. One can obviously notice that Obama

² Q & A: Armenian genocide dispute (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/6045182.stm>) (29 May 2017)

³ Armenian Genocide denial (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Armenian_Genocide_denial#cite_note-bbc182-12) (15 June 2017)

⁴ Q & A: Armenian genocide dispute (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/6045182.stm>) (29 May 2017)

⁵ See the footnote 4

has never used the word ‘genocide’ in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide substituting the word with the Armenian equivalent ‘yeghern’ instead, and breaking his pre - electoral promise to recognize the Armenian Genocide. But prior to analyzing Obama’s language strategies towards the prevention and punishment of the mass atrocities as well as the recognition of the genocide, some background knowledge will be provided on the definition, international prosecution, origin of genocide as well as a comparison of the synonyms of the word ‘genocide’.

8.1. The concept of genocide

Along with the emergence of international protection of human rights after the First World War, genocide was first recognized as a ‘crime against humanity’ in May 24, 1915. Genocide included violent crimes and murder of ethnic, religious or national minorities. Since in history genocide was almost always committed by high authorities in power, it usually avoided punishment and prosecution on a State level (Schabas 2000: 14 – 15). In the post - First World War world an emergency arose for the international protection of human rights. This resulted in the occurrence of post - war peace treaties and even an endeavor to create an international criminal court with an intention to prosecute any individual or State if they committed mass murders within that State’s territory (Schabas 2000: 16).

The emergence of the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in 1948, yielded in the creation of an absolute norm (*jus cogens*) of international law which held the crime of genocide accountable to international justice (van der Vyver 1999: 287).

The term ‘genocide’ was first coined in 1944 by a Polish - Jewish lawyer named Raphael Lemkin. Initially, Lemkin’s definition of the crime of genocide against humanity was narrowed only to ‘national groups’ rather than groups in general:

[A] co - ordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objective of such a plan would be disintegration of the political and social institutions of culture, language, national feelings, religion, personal security, liberty, health, dignity and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group (Lemkin 1944: 79, quoted in Schabas 2000: 25).

Lemkin also claimed the importance of reconsidering the shortages of the Hague Regulation concerning the definition of genocide. Lemkin claimed that the regulations approached only the ‘technical’ aspects regarding occupation whereas “they are silent regarding the preservation of the integrity of people” (Lemkin 1944: 90).

According to the Article 2 of the UN Resolution of 1948 “any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethical, racial or religious group, as such: a) killing members of the group; b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of the life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group”⁶. In 1998 on June 15 – July 17 the United Nations Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries was conducted in Italy, Rome on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court (van der Vyver 1999: 287 – 288). In the conference the Statute of the International Criminal Court was approved which was prepared by the International Law Commission of the General Assembly of the United Nations (van der Vyver 1999: 288). The International Criminal Court was hereby authorized to bear punishment against genocide criminals, crimes against humanity and war crimes if the national courts of the respective countries failed to hold them responsible (van der Vyver 1999: 288).

8.2. The lexical meaning of the word ‘genocide’ and its synonyms

The semantic meaning of the word ‘genocide’ is the most comprehensive. As far as the semantic ‘globality’ of the word is concerned, the Webster’s Third New International Dictionary appears to suggest the most inclusive definition among the other monolingual English dictionaries: “the use of deliberate systematic measures/as killing, bodily or mental injury, unlivable conditions, prevention of birth/calculated to bring about the extermination of a racial, political, or cultural group, or to destroy the language, religion or culture of a group” (quoted in Gasparyan 2014: 171).

⁶ United Nations – Treaty Series (<https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/unts/volume%2078/volume-78-i-1021-english.pdf>) (4 July 2017)

In one of her studies on the Armenian Genocide, Gasparyan presents the view of the famous Norwegian linguist Sophus Bugge on the origin of the Armenian word ‘yeghern’. According to Bugge the words ‘yeghern’, ‘yegher’ or ‘yeghuk’ originate from the root *gel-* in the Indo-European protolanguage. Parallel comparisons can be made with the Old High German word ‘*quelan*’, Saxon word ‘*quellian*’ and the Old English word ‘*cwelan*’, all of which have the meaning to ‘kill’ or ‘commit a crime’ (Smirnitskij 1953: 160, cited in Gasparyan 2014: 169).

The explanations of the word ‘yeghern’ have been suggested in the Armenian – English dictionaries (See Kouyoumdjian 1970; Baratyan *et al* 2002) as: **crime** (ոճիր), **misdemeanor** (չար ընթացք, վատաբարոյություն), **offence** (անարգանք), **rascality** (ստորություն անըզգամություն), **slaughter** (սպանդ, նախնիր, կոտորած, ջարդ), **carnage** (նախնիր), **massacre** (կոտորած, ջարդ) and **genocide** (ցեղասպանություն) (Gasparyan 2014: 170).

However, Gasparyan states that the synonyms presented above can be close in meaning as well as different. For instance, in the Concise Oxford Dictionary, the word **crime** is defined as an act (a heavy crime) or an evil act condemned by law, whereas the word **misdemeanor** defines a less serious action condemned by law (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English) (Gasparyan 2014: 170). Furthermore, the semantic element of the word **crime** which underlies in the words *offence* /attacking aggressive action/ (Concise English Dictionary) and *rascality* /dishonest behavior/ (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English) is not always evident. Gasparyan (2014: 171) claims that aggression and untruthful behavior in an **offence** do not presuppose murder. Moreover, crime is a prevailing element in the semantic form of the words *slaughter* /the killing or slaying of people in large numbers (Concise English Dictionary); *carnage* / the slaughter of great number, especially of men, butchery, massacre (Concise English Dictionary); *massacre* /the indiscriminate, merciless killing of a number of human beings/ (Webster’s New World Dictionary). The last three words describe criminal acts ‘not conditioned by a lawful necessity’ (Gasparyan 2014: 171). These three synonyms seem to be the closest in meaning with the word ‘yeghern’. However, as Gasparyan puts it, the ‘global picture of the phenomenon’ is expressed by the word ‘genocide’ (Gasparyan 2014: 174). Also, she claims that it is important to take into account not only the semantic but also the stylistic and pragmatic aspects to achieve full equivalence between the source language and target language (Gasparyan 2014: 174).

8.3. Obama's language choice towards the recognition of the Armenian Genocide

8.3.1. Obama's view and language choice before his presidency

In this section Obama's language choice in his pre - electoral statement on the *Importance of the US – Armenia Relations* (hereafter PES) and the annual CSs of the Armenian Genocide during his presidency since 2009 – 2016 will be analyzed. The PES seemed promising towards the improvement of the political, commercial, military and cultural relations between Armenia and the USA. First of all, then - Senator Obama promised to promote security for Armenia by pursuing the termination of the closure of Armenia by Turkey and Azerbaijan. He also promised to work towards the resolution of the Nagorno Karabagh conflict:

(168) I will promote Armenian security by seeking an end to the Turkish and Azerbaijani blockades, and by working for a lasting and durable settlement of the Nagorno Karabagh conflict that is agreeable to all parties, and based upon America's founding commitment to the principles of democracy and self - determination.

The biggest promise (and probably the most important for the Armenians), however, Obama made, was the recognition of the Armenian genocide if he was elected a president:

(169) I also share with Armenian Americans – so many of whom are descended from genocide survivors - a principled **commitment to commemorating and ending genocide. That starts with acknowledging the tragic instances of genocide in world history. As a U.S. Senator, I have stood with the Armenian American community in calling for Turkey's acknowledgment of the Armenian Genocide.** Two years ago, I criticized the Secretary of State for the firing of U.S. Ambassador to Armenia, John Evans, after **he properly used the term “genocide” to describe Turkey's slaughter of thousands of Armenians starting in 1915.** I shared with Secretary Rice **my firmly held conviction that the Armenian Genocide is** not an allegation, a personal opinion, or a point of view, but rather **a widely documented fact supported by an overwhelming body of historical evidence. The facts are undeniable.** An official policy that calls on diplomats to distort the historical facts is an untenable policy. As a

senator, I strongly support passage of the Armenian Genocide Resolution (H.Res.106 and S.Res.106), and **as President I will recognize the Armenian Genocide.**

As it can be seen from the extract, Obama clearly states his opinion regarding the genocide. He claims that the genocide is a “documented fact supported by an overwhelming body of historical evidence”. Moreover, he criticizes the firing of U.S. Ambassador to Armenia, John Evans, who used the word ‘genocide’ in 2005 to describe Turkey’s slaughter of the Armenians. Furthermore, he also stands by the Armenian community in urging the Turkish government to recognize the historical facts. Hence one can assume that Obama supports the use of the word ‘genocide’ to describe the slaughter by the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, Obama makes a promise to recognize the Armenian Genocide once he is elected the President of the United States.

8.3.2. Obama’s language choice during his presidency

The previous sub – section showed how confirmative and promising Obama’s PES on the recognition of the Armenian genocide was. However, the promise to recognize the genocide after being elected The President remained a promise.

This section analyzes the differences of Obama’s language choice in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide before becoming a president and during his presidential years.

Firstly, it should be pointed out that Obama remains concerned with the acknowledgment of the genocide before and after being elected the president of the United States. It can be seen in all the commemorative speeches of the Armenian genocide since 2009 - 2016. The pronominal cluster ‘my view’ was also only found in the speeches of the Armenian Genocide:

(170) I have consistently stated my own view of what occurred in 1915, and my view of that history has not changed. It is in all of our interest to see the achievement of a full, frank and just acknowledgment of the facts (Ar_2010).

This extract occurs in all the CSs of the Armenian Genocide with minor differences in narration. The extract shows that Obama is concerned with the acknowledgment of the historical events. However, obvious differences can be observed in the language choice of the present extract and his PES. In comparison with his view on the recognition of the genocide in his pre – electoral

statement, where his attitude is direct and promising, in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide he states his view in a careful and indirect manner:

(171) As a U.S. Senator, I have stood with the Armenian American community in calling for Turkey's acknowledgment of the Armenian Genocide (PES_2008).

The examples (169) and (170) apparently demonstrate the differences of Obama's policy on the recognition of the Armenian Genocide as a U.S. Senator and as the President of the United States. Firstly, he shows his position by 'standing' with the Armenian community in urging Turkey to recognize the genocide. In contrast, he just calls for the acknowledgment of the facts in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide without mentioning Turkey. In addition, he states that the recognition of the genocide is in all of 'our interest'. The use of the plural pronoun 'our' is really vague and does not indicate the referent. This shows once again that Obama avoids showing his definite opinion which he was stating in his PES. It also should be noted that Obama uses the phrase 'my interest' only once in the CS of the Armenian Genocide in 2009. In all the other speeches he says 'our interest'. Hence, it can be claimed that Obama has shown less and less involvement and responsibility in the recognition of the genocide.

Secondly, another difference to note is that in the PES he utters the phrase the 'Armenian Genocide'. In addition, he strongly commits himself to become the president who will speak the truth for the Armenian Genocide:

(172) America deserves **a leader who speaks truthfully about the Armenian Genocide** and **responds forcefully to all genocides. I intend to be that President.**

However, the Senator who intended to 'speak truthfully' did not recognize the genocide officially. Moreover, in the CSs he never said the word 'genocide' in comparison with the PES. He has used the phrase 'Meds Yeghern' which is the Armenian equivalent of 'genocide'. This appeared evident to me that Obama changed his policy towards the recognition of the Armenian Genocide after his election. This change was also expressed in his language choice before and during his presidency. The fact that he avoided the use of the word 'genocide' in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide indicated that Obama failed to keep his pre - electoral promise. The fact Obama avoided the use of the word because of some political reasons; could apparently be seen in his language choice in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide.

To discover whether Obama uses the same strategies and language choice to state his view, I decided to compare his opinion on the recognition of mass atrocities in the CSs of the other genocides discussed in this paper.

In the CS of the Holocaust in 2011, Obama marks the 65th anniversary of the first Nuremberg trial which he calls ‘a defining moment in international justice’:

(173) [F]rom this justice we also see the power of holding the perpetrators of genocide accountable. Remembering these events only reinforces our solemn commitment **to confront those who tell lies about our history** and to stop the spread of hate in our own time (Hl_2011).

(174) As we remember all those who perished in camps from Auschwitz to Treblinka, Dachau to Sobibor, **we pledge to speak truth to those who deny the Holocaust** (Hl_2012).

In these extracts, Obama states the urge to speak the truth about the occurrence of the Holocaust and confront all those who deny it or ‘tell lies’ about the history. According to Obama’s statement, it is important to speak the truth about the genocide and hold the perpetrators accountable. Analogically, Turkey should be held accountable for denying the Armenian Genocide and telling lies about historical facts. However, in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide Obama does not directly urge Turkey to recognize the genocide. Instead, he urges the Turkish and Armenian governments to solve their historical issues themselves and improve their bilateral relations:

(175) The best way to advance that goal right now is for the Armenian and Turkish people **to address the facts of the past as a part of their efforts to move forward. I strongly support efforts by the Turkish and Armenian people to work through this painful history in a way that is honest, open, and constructive [...] I also strongly support the efforts by Turkey and Armenia to normalize their bilateral relations** (Ar_2009).

Instead of taking responsibility for the recognition of the genocide, Obama supports the improvement of the relations between two countries herewith avoiding responsibility.

Other extracts telling about Obama's view on the recognition of genocide can be found in two CSs of the Srebrenica Genocide. The interesting part in these extracts is how Obama defines genocide and how the perpetrators should be held accountable for the crime:

(176) **The United States rejects efforts to distort the scope of this atrocity, rationalize the motivations behind it, blame the victims, and deny the indisputable fact that it was genocide** (Sr_2012).

(177) **Justice must include a full accounting of the crimes that occurred, full identification and return of all those who were lost, and prosecution and punishment of those who carried out the genocide.** This includes Ratko Mladic, who presided over killings and remains at large. The United States calls on all governments to redouble their efforts to find those responsible, to arrest them, and to bring them to justice (Sr_2010).

(178) **Only by fully acknowledging the past** can we achieve a future of true and lasting reconciliation. **Only by holding the perpetrators of the genocide to account** can we offer some measure of justice to help heal their loved ones. And **only by calling evil by its name** can we find the strength to overcome it (Sr_2015).

In these examples, Obama speaks from the name of his government. In the example (176), he mentions the scope of the atrocity. The official number of the victims of the Srebrenica Genocide was around 8000. Moreover, he claims that it should not be denied that the atrocity happened to Srebrenica was genocide. A question that arises here is: "Why does Obama call the slaughter of 8000 people in Srebrenica 'genocide' but why does he not use the proper word to name the massacre of 1, 5 million victims of the Armenian Genocide as 'genocide'?"

This question may be answered after taking a closer look at the example (177) presented above. Obama calls for bringing to justice the perpetrators of the Srebrenica Genocide. According to Obama justice includes 'a full accounting of the crimes [...], full identification and return of all those who were lost, and prosecution and punishment of those who carried out the genocide'. It should be remarked that the Srebrenica Genocide was carried out by individuals within the country. When Obama speaks about the justice, he also mentions Ratko Mladic who was responsible for the massacre of Srebrenica. Hence, to answer the question above, I would argue that Obama utters the names of the perpetrators of the genocide when there are no grave consequences for diplomatic relations with the countries that were responsible for the crime. In

contrast, Obama avoids using the word ‘genocide’ in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide and directly addressing Turkey to recognize the genocide because of Turkey’s lobbying policy.

This section addressed the differences of Obama’s language choices on expressing his political view on the recognition of the Armenian Genocide before and during his presidency. It was demonstrated that Obama’s language choice on the recognition of the genocide has changed from direct and decisive to indirect and ambiguous. It was also indicated that Obama has used the word ‘genocide’ in the CSs of the other genocides while replacing the term with the Armenian equivalent ‘Meds Yeghern’. These examples prove that Obama contradicts himself regarding the recognition of the crime of genocide. He states that reconciliation can be achieved and a peaceful and prosperous future can be created if historical facts are recognized, and the perpetrators are held accountable. Whereas, he fails to keep his promise to become the president who would recognize the Armenian Genocide. By using specific vocabulary to create an image and ideological beliefs of an ‘ideal world’ or ‘ideal future’ and by emphasizing the urgency to take actions towards the achievement of this world, Obama contradicts himself, when he does not take the first step to acknowledge the genocide and call the things by their names. Hence, it shows the lack of manifestations of his beliefs in his political actions. It was attempted to reveal certain possible political reasons behind Obama’s language change and policy. However, the scope of this research is really small to give a complete analysis of the relationship between linguistics and politics. For that purpose, it would be necessary to study political science, to find the roots of political actions and issues. This only shows that politicians use language to create a desired effect, give promises to gain trust, whereas eventually, they do not fulfill their promises. And as it was claimed by Chilton, making a promise verbally does not necessarily assume that an action of fulfilling that promise will follow, which has been shown in this section.

9. Conclusion

This Master thesis attempted to analyze the main themes, conceptual metaphors, repetitions and pronominal clusters in the CSs on genocide and identify their purpose of use. The main themes emphasized by Obama in the speeches were the progress the four countries, surviving genocide, had made to reconstruct their lives. By juxtaposing the past and the present/future Obama praised the determination and courage of those who had achieved a huge success up to the present day. Obama also encouraged them continuing the progress towards achieving a better future. Obama also created an image of an ‘international community’ and presented his country as a strong partner always standing next to its political partners. The conceptual metaphors of PATH and FUTURE highlighted Obama’s future oriented ideology - the achievement of a better future and the democratic ideals of peace, harmony, equality and dignity. The repetitions and pronominal clusters mainly emphasized the urge and obligation of taking actions to prevent future mass atrocities. The last part of the paper analyzed Obama’s language choice before and during his presidency in relation to the recognition of the Armenian Genocide. The results revealed that although Obama’s political view regarding the recognition of the genocide had not changed, his language choice had altered, since he had never used the word in the CSs of the Armenian Genocide during his presidency. Hence, it showed the contrast between the ideological beliefs, highlighted in the speeches, and Obama’s actions to recognize the Armenian Genocide.

Thus, the thesis concludes that political language is highly strategic, and the language choice may be based on certain political reasons. This study shows the change of the language choice and the lack of manifestation of the ideological beliefs created by Obama. However, to expose the possible reasons behind the language choice, a detailed analysis in the domain of politics would be recommended, which is beyond the scope of this research.

10. References

- Allen, Wendy. 2006. *Australian political discourse: pronominal choice in campaign speeches*. Selected papers from the 2006 conference of the Australian linguistic society. (http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/eserv/UQ:12794/ALLEN_W_ALS2006.pdf). (17 August 2017).
- Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. (translated by Rhys Roberts). https://www.google.fr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwiHp_7D-NXVAhUrDsAKHYWUAksQFggoMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.bocc.ubi.pt%2Fpag%2FAristotle-rhetoric.pdf&usg=AFQjCNEZY0_cpuiPzGkina6tOhgEpjdNbQ (last visited 14 August 2017)
- Aristotle. 1926. *The art of rhetoric*. (translated by Freese, John Henry). New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Aristotle. 1999. *Politics*. (translated by Jowett, Benjamin). Kitchener: Batoche Books.
- Atkinson, J. Maxwell; Heritage, John (eds.). 1984. *Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Paul. 2006. *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Baradat, Leon P. 2016. *Political ideologies: their origins and impact*. (11th edition). New York: Routledge.
- Beard, Adrian. 2000. *The language of politics*. London: Routledge.
- Berber – Sardinha, Tony. 1999a. "Using keywords in text analysis: practical aspects". *DIRECT Papers*, 42. LAEL, Catholic University of Sao Paulo, Brazil. (<http://www2.lael.pucsp.br/direct/DirectPapers42.pdf>) (20 August 2017).
- Berber – Sardinha, Tony. 1999b. "Word sets, keywords, and text contents: an investigation of text topic on the computer". *Delta* 15, 141 – 149.
- Berber – Sardinha, Tony. 2000. "Comparing corpora with Wordsmith tools: how large must the reference corpus be?" In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Comparing Corpora*, 7-13.
- Biber, Douglas; Conrad, Susan.; Reppen, Randi. 1998. *Corpus linguistics: investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, Douglas; Connor, Ulla; Upton, Thomas A. 2007. *Discourse on the move: using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2001. "Context is/as critique". *Critique of Antropology* 21(1), 13 – 32.
- Boden, Deidre; Zimmerman, Don H. (eds.) 1991. *Talk and social structure: studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Bramley, Nicolette Ruth. 2001. "Pronouns of politics: the use of pronouns in the construction of 'self' and 'other' in political interviews". PhD thesis. The Australian National University.
- Breyer, Yvonne Alexandra. 2011. *Corpora in language teaching and learning: potential, evaluation, challenges*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Breeze, Ruth. 2011. "Critical discourse analysis and its critics". *Pragmatics* 21(4), 493 – 525.
- Cameron, Deborah; Kulick, Don. 2003. *Language and sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chilton, Paul. 2004. *Analyzing political discourse: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Connor, Ulla; Upton, Thomas. (eds.). 2004. *Discourse in the professions: perspectives from corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical discourse analysis: papers in the critical study of language*. New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman; Wodak, Ruth. 1997. "Critical discourse analysis". In van Dijk, Teun, A. (ed.). *Introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Routledge, 258 – 284.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analyzing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Isabela; Fairclough, Norman. 2012. *Political discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2014. "Critical discourse analysis". In Paul Gee, James; Handford, Michael (eds.). *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Routledge, 9 – 20.
- Flowerdew, Lynne. 2008. *Corpus – based analyses of the problem – solution pattern: a phraseological approach*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Flowerdew, John. 2008. "Critical discourse analysis and strategies of resistance". In Bhatia, K. Vijay; Flowerdew, John; Johnes, H. Rodney. *Advances in Discourse Studies*. London: Routledge, 195 – 209.
- Flowerdew, John; Forest, Richard W. 2009. "Schematic structure and lexico – grammatical realization in corpus – based genre analysis: the case of research in the PhD literature review". In Charles, Maggie; Pecorari, Diane; Hunston, Susan (eds.). *Academic writing: at the interface of corpus and discourse*. London: Continuum, 15 – 36.
- Flowerdew, Lynne. 2014. "Corpus – based discourse analysis". In Gee, James P; Handford, Michael (eds.). 2014 [2012]. *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gasparian, Seda. 2014. *The Armenian genocide: a linguocognitive perspective*. Yerevan: Yerevan University Press.
- Gee, James Paul. 1996. *Social linguistics and literacies: ideology in discourses*. (2nd edition). London: Taylor & Francis.

- Gee, James Paul; Handford, Michael (eds.). 2014 [2012]. *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood; Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. 1978. *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Hämmerle, Daniel. 2011. “Rhetorical devices used in political speeches: an analysis of metaphorical and pronominal devices in political speeches given by George Bush junior and Barack Obama from critical discourse analytical perspective”. Diploma thesis, Department of English, University of Vienna.
- Hardt – Mautner, Gerlinde. 1995. “Only connect: critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics”. <http://stig.lancs.ac.uk/papers/techpaper/vol6.pdf> (19 August 2017).
- Hay, Colin. 2007. *Why do we hate politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hunston, Susan. 2002. *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ingersoll, David E.; Matthews, Richard K. 1991. *The philosophic roots of modern ideology*. (2nd edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 2002. *Discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Johnson, Mark. 1987. *The body in the mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kress, Gunther. 1976. *Halliday: system and function in language*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, Gunther. 2014. “Multimodal discourse analysis”. In Paul Gee, James; Handford, Michael (eds.). *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Routledge, 35 – 50.
- Kulo, Lena. 2009. “Linguistic features in political speeches: how language can be used to impose certain moral or ethical values on people”. Bachelor thesis, Department of Language and Culture, Luleå University of Technology. <http://ltu.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:1028973/FULLTEXT01.pdf> (19 August 2017).
- Lakoff, George; Johnson, Mark. 1980a. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George; Johnson, Mark. 1980b. “Conceptual metaphor in everyday language”. *The Journal Philosophy* 77(8), 453 – 486.
- Lakoff, George; Turner, Mark. 1989. *More than cool reason: a field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George; Johnson, Mark. 2003. *Metaphors we live by*. London: The University of Chicago Press. (<http://shu.bg/tadmin/upload/storage/161.pdf>) (20 August 2017).
- Leech, Geoffrey. 2000. “Grammar of spoken English: new outcomes of corpus – oriented research”. *Language Learning* 50(4): 675 – 724.

- Lemkin, Raphael. 1944. *Axis rule in occupied Europe: laws of occupation, analysis of government, proposals for redress*. Washington: Rumford Press.
- Matić, Daniela. 2012. "Ideological discourse structures in political speeches". *Komunikacija I kultura online* 3(2), 54 – 78.
- Mautner, Gerlinde. 2009. "Checks and balances: how corpus linguistics can contribute to CDA". In Wodak, Ruth; Meyer, Michael (eds.). 2009 [2001]. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. (2nd edition). London: Sage, 122 – 143.
- McEnery, Tony; Wilson, Andrew. 2001. *Corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McEnery, Tony; Xiao, Richard; Tono, Yukio. 2006. *Corpus – based language studies: an advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Meyer, Michael. 2001. "Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA". In Wodak, Ruth; Meyer, Michael (eds.). *Methods in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, 14 – 31.
- Nation, Paul. 2001. *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paltridge, Brian. 2006. *Discourse analysis*. London: MPG Books Ltd.
- Partington, Alan. 2003. *The linguistics of political argument*. London: Routledge.
- Partington, Alan. 2007. "Irony and reversal of evaluation". *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 1547 – 1569.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 1994. "The politics of pronouns". *ELT Journal* 48(2), 173 – 178.
- Quirk, Randolph; Greenbaum, Sydney; Leech, Geoffrey; Svartvik, Jan (eds.). 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English Language (general grammar)*. London: Longman.
- Reisigl, Martin. 2008. "Rhetoric of political speeches". In Wodak, Ruth; Koller, Veronika (eds.). *Handbook of communication in the public sphere*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 243 – 270.
- Reppen, Randi; Simpson, Rita. 2002. "Corpus linguistics". In Schmitt, Norbert (ed.). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. London: Arnold, 92 – 111.
- Rogers, Rebecca (ed.). 2011 [2004]. *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. (2nd edition). Routledge: New York.
- Savoy, Jacques. 2009. "Lexical analysis of Obama's and McCain's speeches". University of Neuchatel. (<http://members.unine.ch/jacques.savoy/Papers/USspeeches.pdf>) (23 August 2017).
- Schabas, William A. 2000. *Genocide in international law: the crimes of crimes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, Mike. 1997. "The right word in the right place: key word associates in two languages". *AAA - Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 22(2): 239 – 252.

- Scott, Mike. 2001. "Comparing corpora and identifying key words". In Ghadessy, Mohsen; Henry, Alex; Roseberry, Robert L. (eds.). *Small corpus studies and ELT*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V., 47 – 67.
- Scott, Mike; Tribble, Christopher. 2006. *Textual patterns: key words and corpus analysis in language education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Searle, John. 1969. *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, John. 1991. *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, John; Coulthard, Malcolm. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Slavičková, Tess. 2014. "Oratorical style and performance in the epideictic speeches of American presidents". *Brno Studies in English* 40(1), 227 – 241.
- Smirnickij A. I. 1953. *Chrestomathy of the history of English language* [хрестоматия по истории английского языка]. Moscow: Literaturny na inostrannykh jazykakh Publ.
- Stubbs, Michael. 1983. *Discourse analysis: the sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Tribble, Christopher. 2002. "Corpora and corpus analysis: new windows on academic writing". In Flowerdew, John (ed.). *Academic discourse*. London: Longman, 131 – 149.
- Van der Viver, Johan D. 1999. "Prosecution and punishment of the crime of genocide". *Fordham International Law Journal* 23(2), 286 – 356.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1993a. *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1993b. "Principles of critical discourse analysis". *Discourse and Society* 4(2), 249 – 283.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1998a. *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage Publications.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 1998b. "What is political discourse analysis?" In: Blommaert, Jan; Bulcaen Chris (eds.). *Political linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 11 – 52.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2001. "Critical discourse analysis". In Schiffrin, Deborah; Tannen, Deborah; Hamilton, Heidi E. (eds.). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 352 – 371.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2006. "Ideology and discourse analysis". *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11(2), 115 – 140.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2009. "Critical discourse studies: a sociocognitive approach". In Wodak, Ruth; Meyer, Michael (eds.). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. (2nd edition). London, Sage, 62 – 86.

- Van Leeuwen, Theo; Wodak Ruth. 1999. "Legitimizing immigration control: a discourse – historical analysis". *Discourse Studies* 1(1), 83 – 118.
- Virtanen, Tuija. 2009. "Discourse linguistics meets corpus linguistics: theoretical and methodological issues in the troubled relationship". In Renouf, Antoinette.; Kehoe, Andrew (eds.). *Corpus linguistics: refinements and reassessments*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 49 – 65.
- Wales, Katie. 1996. *Personal pronouns in present – day English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watkins, Frederick M. 1969. *The age of ideology: political thought, 1950 to the present*. (2nd edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Widdowson, Henry. 2000. "The limitations of linguistics applied". *Applied Linguistics* 21(1): 3 – 25.
- Wilson, John. 1990. *Politically speaking*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2001. "The discourse – historical approach". In Wodak, Ruth; Meyer, Michael (eds.). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage, 63 – 95.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2008. "The contribution of critical linguistics to the analysis of discriminatory prejudices and stereotypes in the language of politics". In Koller, Veronika; Wodak, Ruth (eds.). *Handbook of communication in the public sphere*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 291 – 317.
- Wodak, Ruth; Meyer, Michael. (eds.). 2009 [2001]. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. (2nd edition). London: Sage.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2009a. *The discourse of politics in action: politics as usual*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2009b. "Language and politics". In Culpeper, Jonathan; Katamba, Francis; Kerswill, Paul; Wodak, Ruth; McEnery, Tony (eds.). *English language: description, variation and context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 576 – 593.

Dictionaries

- Baratyan, N. et al. 2002. *Armenian – English Dictionary* [հայերեն - անգլերեն բառարան]. Yerevan: Macmillan Armenia.
- Kouyoumdjian M. 1970. *A Comprehensive Dictionary: Armenian – English* [ընդարձակ բառարան հայերեն - անգլերեն]. Beirut: Atlas Press.
- Longman, Pearson. 1997. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (4th edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sykes, J. B.; Fowler, H. W.; Fowler F. G. 1976. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Webster's New World Dictionary. 1951. Cleveland & New York: The World Publishing Company.

List of the corpora in the speeches

AmE06. 2006. *The Corpus of General Written American English*. Director: Paul Baker. (<http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/>) (24 August 2017).

Anthony, Lawrence. 2014. *AntConc* (version 3.4.4). [Computer Program]. Tokyo, Japan, Waseda University. <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/> (19 August 2017).

BNC. 1994. *British National Corpus*. <https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/> (24 August 2017).

BE06. 2006. *The Corpus of General Written British English*. Director: Paul Baker. (<http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/>) (24 August 2017).

BROWN. 1964. *The Brown Corpus of Standard American English*. Directors: Nelson Francis; Henry Kucera.

11. Appendices

Appendix A

Titles, release date and word count of the CSs of the Armenian Genocide

The name of the speech in the paper	The title	The release date	Word count
Ar_2009	Statement of President Barack Obama on Armenian Remembrance Day	April 24 2009	389
Ar_2010	Statement of President Barack Obama on Armenian Remembrance Day	April 24 2010	373
Ar_2011	Statement of President Barack Obama on Armenian Remembrance Day	April 23 2011	348
Ar_2012	Statement of President Barack Obama on Armenian Remembrance Day	April 24 2012	360
Ar_2013	Statement of President Barack Obama on Armenian Remembrance Day	April 24 2013	320
Ar_2014	Statement of President Barack Obama on Armenian Remembrance Day	April 24 2014	387
Ar_2015	Statement of President Barack Obama on Armenian Remembrance Day	April 23 2015	375
Ar_2016	Statement of President Barack Obama on Armenian Remembrance Day	April 22 2016	403

Links for the CSs of the Armenian Genocide

2009	https://armenianweekly.com/2009/04/24/statement-of-president-barack-obama-on-armenian-remembrance-day/
2010	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/statement-president-barack-obama-armenian-remembrance-day
2011	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/04/23/statement-president-armenian-remembrance-day
2012	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/04/24/statement-president-armenian-remembrance-day
2013	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/04/24/statement-president-armenian-remembrance-day
2014	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/04/24/statement-president-armenian-remembrance-day
2015	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/04/23/statement-president-armenian-remembrance-day
2016	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/04/22/statement-president-armenian-remembrance-day

Barack Obama's speech on the *Importance of US – Armenia Relations* (19 January 2008)

I am proud of my strong record on issues of concern to the one and a half million Americans of Armenian heritage in the United States. I warmly welcome the support of this vibrant and politically active community as we change how our government works here at home, and restore American leadership abroad.

I am a strong supporter of a U.S.-Armenian relationship that advances our common security and strengthens Armenian democracy. As President, I will maintain our assistance to Armenia, which has been a reliable partner in the fight against terrorism and extremism. I will promote Armenian security by seeking an end to the Turkish and Azerbaijani blockades, and by working for a lasting and durable settlement of the Nagorno Karabagh conflict that is agreeable to all parties, and based upon America's founding commitment to the principles of democracy and self-determination. And my Administration will help foster Armenia's growth and development through expanded trade and targeted aid, and by strengthening the commercial, political, military, developmental, and cultural relationships between the U.S. and Armenian governments.

I also share with Armenian Americans – so many of whom are descended from genocide survivors - a principled commitment to commemorating and ending genocide. That starts with acknowledging the tragic instances of genocide in world history. As a U.S. Senator, I have stood with the Armenian American community in calling for Turkey's acknowledgement of the Armenian Genocide. Two years ago, I criticized the Secretary of State for the firing of U.S. Ambassador to Armenia, John Evans, after he properly used the term "genocide" to describe Turkey's slaughter of thousands of Armenians starting in 1915. I shared with Secretary Rice my firmly held conviction that the Armenian Genocide is not an allegation, a personal opinion, or a point of view, but rather a widely documented fact supported by an overwhelming body of historical evidence. The facts are undeniable. An official policy that calls on diplomats to distort the historical facts is an untenable policy. As a senator, I strongly support passage of the Armenian Genocide Resolution (H.Res.106 and S.Res.106), and as President I will recognize the Armenian Genocide.

Genocide, sadly, persists to this day, and threatens our common security and common humanity. Tragically, we are witnessing in Sudan many of the same brutal tactics - displacement, starvation, and mass slaughter - that were used by the Ottoman authorities against defenseless Armenians back in 1915. I have visited Darfurian refugee camps, pushed for the deployment of a robust multinational force for Darfur, and urged divestment from companies doing business in Sudan. America deserves a leader who speaks truthfully about the Armenian Genocide and responds forcefully to all genocides. I intend to be that President.

I look forward, as President, to continuing my active engagement with Armenian American leaders on the full range of issues of concern to the Armenian American community. Together, we will build, in new and exciting ways, upon the enduring ties and shared values that have bound together the American and Armenian peoples for more than a century.

(http://web.archive.org/web/20080228005208/http://www.barackobama.com/2008/01/19/barack_obama_on_the_importance.php) (15 June 2016).

Appendix B

Titles, release date and word count of the CSs of the Holocaust

The name of the speech in the paper	The title	The release date	Word count
HI_2010	Statement by the President on Holocaust Remembrance Day	April 11 2010	209
HI_2011	Statement by the President on Holocaust Remembrance Day	May 02 2011	249
HI_2012	Statement by the President on International Holocaust Remembrance Day	January 27 2012	174
HI_2013	Statement by the President on International Holocaust Remembrance Day	January 27 2013	194
HI_2014	Statement by the President on International Holocaust Remembrance Day	January 27 2014	220
HI_2015	Statement by the President on Holocaust Remembrance Day	April 16 2015	143
HI_2016	Statement by the President on Holocaust Remembrance Day	May 04 2016	340

Links for the CSs of the Holocaust

2010	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/statement-president-holocaust-remembrance-day
2011	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/05/02/statement-president-holocaust-remembrance-day
2012	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/01/27/statement-president-international-holocaust-remembrance-day
2013	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/01/27/statement-president-international-holocaust-remembrance-day
2014	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/01/27/statement-president-international-holocaust-remembrance-day
2015	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/04/16/statement-president-holocaust-remembrance-day
2016	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/05/04/statement-president-holocaust-remembrance-day

Appendix C

Titles, release date and word count of the CSs of the Rwandan Genocide

The title of the speech in the paper	The title	The release date	Word count
HI_2009	Statement by the President on the 15 th anniversary of the Genocide in Rwanda	April 07 2009	195
HI_2010	Statement by the President on the 16 th anniversary of the Genocide in Rwanda	April 07 2010	134
HI_2011	Statement by the President on the 17 th anniversary of the Genocide in Rwanda	April 07 2011	235
HI_2012	Statement by the President on the 18 th anniversary of the Genocide in Rwanda	April 06 2012	160
HI_2013	Statement by the President on the 19 th anniversary of the Genocide in Rwanda	April 07 2013	133
HI_2014	Statement by the President on the 20 th commemoration of the Genocide in Rwanda	April 06 2014	291
HI_2015	Statement by the President on the 21 th anniversary of the Genocide in Rwanda	April 07 2015	197
HI_2016	Statement by the President on the 22 th anniversary of the Genocide in Rwanda	April 07 2016	167

Links for the CSs of the Rwandan Genocide

2009	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/statement-president-15th-anniversary-genocide-rwanda
2010	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/statement-president-16th-anniversary-genocide-rwanda
2011	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/04/07/statement-president-17th-anniversary-genocide-rwanda
2012	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/04/06/statement-president-18th-anniversary-genocide-rwanda
2013	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/04/07/statement-president-19th-anniversary-genocide-rwanda
2014	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/04/06/statement-president-20th-commemoration-genocide-rwanda
2015	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/04/07/statement-president-21st-anniversary-genocide-rwanda
2016	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/04/07/statement-president-22nd-anniversary-genocide-rwanda

Appendix D

Titles, release date and word count of the CSs of the Srebrenica Genocide

The name of the speech in the paper	The title	The release date	Word count
Sr_2010	Statement by the President on the 15 th anniversary of the genocide at Srebrenica	July 11 2010	454
Sr_2012	Statement by the President on the 17 th Anniversary of the Srebrenica Genocide	July 10 2012	255
Sr_2013	Statement on the 18 th Anniversary of Srebrenica Genocide	July 11 2013	412
Sr_2014	19 th Anniversary of the Srebrenica Genocide	July 11 2014	283
Sr_2015	Statement by the President on the 20 th anniversary of the genocide at Srebrenica	July 10 2015	252
Sr_2016	21 st Anniversary of the Srebrenica Genocide	July 9 2016	221

Links for the CSs of the Srebrenica Genocide

2010	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/statement-president-15th-anniversary-genocide-srebrenica
2012	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/07/10/statement-president-17th-anniversary-srebrenica-genocide
2013	http://www.osce.org/pc/103708?download=true
2014	https://2009-2017.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2014/07/229178.htm
2015	https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/07/10/statement-president-20th-anniversary-srebrenica-genocide
2016	https://2009-2017.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2016/07/259498.htm

Appendix E

The top 100 keywords of the Genocide Corpus

Rank	Frequency	Keyness	Keyword
1	200	457.390	we
2	39	355.162	armenian
3	33	285.379	genocide
4	24	231.833	armenians
5	24	223.452	srebrenica
6	30	192.661	honor
7	83	189.120	our
8	21	184.817	rwanda
9	65	165.475	those
10	70	164.574	people
11	17	164.215	yeghern
12	17	156.507	meds
13	19	153.357	atrocities
14	25	148.434	victims
15	15	144.895	herzegovina
16	34	144.600	lives
17	16	138.029	remembrance
18	17	128.781	holocaust
19	15	128.723	bosnia
20	420	119.283	and
21	86	119.146	who
22	12	108.882	rwandan
23	32	106.857	today
24	11	106.257	armenia
25	23	104.069	memory
26	36	101.424	united
27	15	99.710	courage
28	22	95.680	th
29	84	94.727	their
30	10	89.911	commemorate
31	10	89.911	ottoman
32	26	88.883	future
33	36	88.688	states
34	21	88.305	stand
35	32	83.792	history
36	13	82.651	peaceful
37	8	77.278	massacred
38	8	77.278	reckoning
39	12	72.991	dignity
40	11	71.071	painful
41	387	70.082	of
42	9	68.768	solemn

43	12	68.205	survivors
44	12	64.253	memories
45	16	63.938	nations
46	19	63.935	remember
47	10	63.187	murdered
48	16	62.253	continue
49	14	62.098	commitment
50	7	61.606	atrocities
51	13	59.298	millions
52	9	57.379	prosperous
53	11	57.301	contributions
54	26	57.121	must
55	17	56.731	efforts
56	9	55.423	tragedy
57	8	55.225	courageous
58	11	55.176	humanity
59	18	54.101	lost
60	8	53.914	anniversary
61	8	52.707	marched
62	6	52.233	reaffirm
63	7	51.397	horrors
64	24	50.076	human
65	11	49.873	reflect
66	7	49.769	perished
67	10	49.485	stronger
68	6	48.993	turkish
69	9	48.649	horror
70	11	48.016	occurred
71	11	48.016	ourselves
72	12	47.033	communities
73	7	47.019	semitism
74	13	46.513	build
75	11	45.994	join
76	27	45.886	never
77	6	44.562	risked
78	8	43.452	remind
79	11	43.300	evil
80	6	42.880	horrific
81	10	42.315	facts
82	8	42.243	consistently
83	27	41.769	day
84	8	41.673	legacy
85	16	41.450	view
86	6	41.419	turks
87	14	41.329	justice
88	30	41.259	world
89	9	41.235	suffering

90	9	40.841	recall
91	7	40.337	commit
92	5	39.955	darkest
93	8	39.588	stated
94	4	38.639	auschwitz
95	4	38.639	bigotry
96	4	38.639	commemoration
97	4	38.639	grieves
98	4	38.639	resiliency
99	4	38.639	rwandans
100	4	38.259	pledge

Abstract

This Master thesis has two major purposes. Firstly, it aims to investigate Barack Obama's commemorative speeches on the four genocides of the 20th century by combining Corpus Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. The main themes, conceptual metaphors, repetitions and pronominal clusters are analyzed, and the purpose of their use, as well as images and ideological beliefs, they create, are identified. Secondly, the thesis attempts to demonstrate the change of Obama's language choice before and during his presidency regarding the recognition of the Armenian Genocide.

The results show that Obama's speeches are oriented towards progress and future in addition to emphasizing obligation and commitment to prevent the future mass atrocities. However, the comparison of his language choice before and during his presidency indicates some contrast and lack of manifestation of the ideological beliefs in his political actions with regard to the acknowledgment of the Armenian Genocide. The thesis concludes that the change of Obama's language choice is strategic and might be conditioned by certain political reasons.

Keywords: *genocide, commemorative speeches, Corpus Linguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis*

Zusammenfassung

Diese Masterarbeit hat zwei Hauptzwecke. Erstens, sie hat das Ziel die Gedenkrede von Barack Obama zu den vier Genoziden des 20. Jahrhunderts durch die Kombination von Korpuslinguistik und kritische Diskursanalyse zu untersuchen. Die Hauptthemen, die konzeptionellen Metaphern, die Wiederholungen und die Pronomen Gruppen werden analysiert und der Zweckes ihrer Verwendung sowie die Bilder und die ideologische Überzeugungen werden identifiziert. Zweitens, die Arbeit versucht den Wechsel von Obamas Sprachwahl über die Anerkennung des armenischen Völkermordes vor und während seiner Präsidentschaft zu zeigen.

Die Ergebnisse zeigen das Obamas Reden in Richtung Fortschritt und Zukunft orientiert sind und zusätzlich Verpflichtung und Engagement zur Verhütung künftiger Massengräueltaten hervorheben. Der Vergleich seiner Sprachwahl, vor und während seiner Präsidentschaft, zeigt einen Kontrast und Mangel an Manifestation zwischen den ideologischen Überzeugungen in seinen politischen Aktionen in Bezug auf die Anerkennung des armenischen Völkermords. Diese Arbeit kommt zu dem Schluss dass der Wechsel der politischen Sprache Obamas strategisch und möglicherweise von politischen Gründen motiviert ist.

Schlagwörter: *Völkermord, Gedenksreden, Korpuslinguistik, kritische Diskursanalyse*