

A STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE INAUGURAL SPEECH OF THE 46TH UNITED STATES PRESIDENT JOSEPH BIDEN ON 20/1/2021 AT CAPITOL HILL

EZEKIEL AUGUSTINE HAMMANGABDO

Department of English and Literary Studies

Taraba State University, Jalingo

Ezekielaugustine2018@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research work aims to stimulate interest in stylistics by looking at the cohesion and coherence in Joseph Biden's inaugural speech. A simple random sampling technique was employed by the researcher where some sentences in the speech were selected and critically studied. The researcher hinged his research work on Reader-Response/Transactional Theory and Functionalist Theory of Michael Alexander Kirkwood Holliday's systemic functional grammar as theoretical framework of the study. Coherence is defined as the quality of being logical, consistent and able to be understood. It is an analogical way of presenting discourses that deal with sense. Cohesion on the other hand refers to the act of forming a whole unit. It is effectively a subset of coherence. Linguists consider cohesion as the bricks and cement which make up the building. It can also be seen as a link between the lexical items in a construction. Therefore, the study analyses the different aspects of coherence and cohesion (lexically and grammatically). The study relies on data from the speech. The results indicate three reasons for the style of the speaker: DELIBERATIVE, FORENSIC, and EPIDICTIC. The researcher also observed that although Joseph Biden articulates a cynical commentary on American democracy, he marshals his creative energies to illuminate the political moment of his time.

Introduction

Language is a form of human communication. Most linguists would probably agree that, although many animals are able to communicate, they do not actually have 'language' in the sense that humans do. Birds may sing, cats meow and purr, dogs bark and growl, apes grunt, scream and even chatter, but they are not assumed to be using these sounds in the way we do. Language is therefore a major attribute distinguishing us from the rest of the animal kingdom. It also enables us to say things which we know to be false or to be lie. Bees are said to be able to convey some of this information in their 'dance', which they employ to pass on information about food sources. This means that there is generally no natural, inherent relationship between the signs (i. e. sounds or letters) we produce and their meaning. For this reason, different languages can use different signs to refer to one and the same thing. For example, a flower in English is "a Blume" in German or "une fleur" in French. The term 'language' can be used to refer to a variety of concepts/things, such as "the particular form of words and speech used by the people of a country, area or social group", or "the method of human communication using spoken or written words". In other words, we can talk about a specific language e. g. English, German, Swahili, etc. or about language as such. In linguistics, we are interested in both of these fields whereby General Linguistics will tend to concentrate on the latter topic and the individual language departments on their specific

language (for example, English linguistics). A further meaning of 'language' is "the style or types of words used by a person or group", which is a topic generally studied within sociolinguistics. Occasionally, we find examples of iconicity, where someone has tried to overtly create a resemblance between the sign and its meaning.

Stylistics is traditionally concerned with the study of style in language. Rouchota Verdon (4) defines it as the analysis of a distinctive expression and description of its purpose and effect. The partnership between both pragmatics and stylistics appears quite possible given the qualities that they share. Both are, for instance, interested in such features as are beyond the sentence boundary. The application of pragmatic and stylistic theories to text analysis indicates a clear departure from how texts were analysed when modern linguistics began to develop. In this respect, Dressier et al (16) inform us that the tradition at the inception of the evolution of modern linguistics was for analysts to confine the analysis of a text to the domain of sentence which was, then, regarded as the largest unit with an inherent structure. Stylistics, a yoking of style and linguistics, is a discipline which has been approached from many perspectives. Its meaning varies, based on the theory that is adopted. When we carry out the different activities that are connected to our area of business, either in spoken or written forms, we often use devices of thought and the rules of language, but there are variations so as to change meanings or say the same thing in different ways. This is what the concept of style is based upon: the use of language in different ways, all for the purpose of achieving a common goal - to negotiate meanings. These can be seen in the speech delivered by President Joseph Biden at the Capitol Hill in the United States of America.'

Pragmatic stylistics is part of the manifestation of linguistic stylistics. This variety of stylistics shows the meeting point between pragmatics and stylistics, that is, how pragmatic resources, such as performative and speech acts can be employed to achieve stylistic effects. Scholars have demonstrated that the objective of pragmatics is to show how users of any language can use the sentences obtainable in such a language to convey messages which are not directly or explicitly shown in the propositional content of the sentences. Pragmatics came round to fill the gap created by the truth-condition semantics. The latter is a semantic theory which holds the view that the truthfulness or the falsity of a sentence or an utterance is subject to the degree to which the propositional content of such a sentence or an utterance is verifiable from the world. Speakers and writers often use different devices to structure their discourse. These devices connect what they are saying to what they have said before, and to what they are going to say so that their overall message looks coherent and cohesive. These devices can take different forms. In spoken discourse, they are called discourse markers, because they mark out the beginning of a new 'instance' of discourse. These include *well, oh, so, anyway*, etc. In written text, cohesive devices are used to create cohesion. This helps the text stick together, linking previous ideas with subsequent ones so that they can flow naturally. Examples of such cohesive devices are the use of linking words (e. g. because, but, however, nevertheless, moreover, etc...)

The words 'cohesion' and 'coherence' are often used together with a similar meaning, which relates to how an academic text joins together to make a unified whole. Although they are similar, they are not the same. *Cohesion* relates to the *micro* level of the text, i. e., the words and sentences and how they join. *Coherence*, in contrast, relates to the organization and connection of ideas and whether they can be understood by the reader. As such, it is concerned with the *macro* level features of a text, such as topic sentences, thesis statement, the summary in the concluding paragraph (dealt with in the essay structure section), and other 'bigger' features, including headings

such as those used in reports. Coherence can be improved by using an outline before writing (or a *reverse outline*, which is an outline written after the writing is finished), to check that the ideas are logical and well organized. Asking a peer to check the writing to see if it makes sense, i. e. peer feedback, is another way to help improve coherence in your writing.

As a complete and whole discourse, a text should contain aspects of integrated and fused, which are cohesion and coherence. To create a discourse, it is required the ability to understand and use the right cohesion and coherence. If not, the information to be conveyed through the thesis would be obvious to the reader. However, not all of the text produced by individuals containing a good cohesion. There are also sentences that are not cohesive in a discuss. This is a serious concern, because the text may be a scientific one which requires the application of the rules of language and compliance aspects of the language as a condition of a good scientific writing and can be understood by the reader. Therefore, the study seeks to identify the cohesion and coherence in the inaugural speech presented by President Joseph Biden at the capitol of the United State of America.

Methodology

There are two issues that serve as the focus of this study. These are cohesion and coherence. The major point is to know whether they are properly used or there are errors in their usage. To solve this problem, data were collected randomly based on the speech presented by President Joseph Biden during his inaugural speech at the United States of America Capitol Hill. These were analysed based on their sentence formations. Halliday-Hasan distinguishes two types of cohesion; they are grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion can be classified into several categories, including reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunctions. Meanwhile, lexical cohesion is classified into two categories: namely, reiteration and collocation (9). In this study, it was found that all categories of cohesion markers are used by the author of the speech.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this research is built on the reader-response stylistics: an interaction between the structure of the text and the reader's response. The point is that the meaning of surface linguistic constructs is retrievable only in the deep structure. Also, since the primary concern of the present study is on the functional aspect of language, the researcher adopted M. A. K. Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), as his analytical model, in the sense that it focuses not only on the structure of language, but also on the properties of discourse and its functions in specific social and cultural situations. Specifically, the study adopts Halliday's three multifunction of language viz: ideational, interpersonal, and textual, for analysis. The ideational metafunction focuses on the subject matter or field of discourse, while the interpersonal metafunction refers to the tenor of discourse. That is, the social relationship that exists among participants in a given discourse situation, which has the potentials to influence or shape language use. The textual metafunction is particularly relevant to our study, as it focuses on the internal organization and communicative nature of a text. The pre-occupation of this study is to show how cohesion and coherence are used in Joseph Biden's inaugural speech on the 20th, January 2021, to identify aspects of meaning and aesthetics in the speech.

Cohesion from the Latin word for 'sticking together' is a term in functional grammar that relates to how texts (words and sentences) are held together lexically and grammatically as a whole. When we speak or write, we often use certain devices to create unity and relevance in what we

communicate. When we talk of cohesion and coherence in a piece of communication, we refer to the phenomenon of achieving unity and relevance. This is our focus in this unit. Both cohesion and coherence are essential features of a text which define its textuality and relevance or meaningfulness. As observed by scholars, coherence has to do with sense (Stern 21; Osisanwo 23). Therefore, when a text or discourse makes sense to a reader, the text is said to have coherence. A text that lacks cohesion will be fragmented and disjointed. The inaugural speech of Joe Biden can be said to be but cohesive and coherent.

As has already been mentioned earlier in this paper, the key element both writers and readers draw on in creating and interpreting these semantic relationships is their prior knowledge. The second important element in establishing clear semantic relationships is ordering ideas (propositions) in a logical sequence, which is an aspect of coherence that has been accentuated in many discussions of the notion of text coherence. For example, Bander describes paragraph coherence as a logical sequence of ideas that create a clear relationship of one sentence to the other (6). According to Dastjerdi and Talebinezhad, a text is coherent “when it hangs together, i.e., for every sentence in the text, there is a sequence of preceding and/or following sentences that provides a ‘context’ for it” (59). Along these lines, Lautamatti perceives cohesion as successful integration (10). Halliday and Hasan, among others, claim that a precondition to successful integration of ideas, i.e., establishing coherence is cohesion which refers to relations of meaning between specific surface linguistic features of a text (16, 85). In contrast, some scientists; Widows, Carrell, Brown and Yule, and Yeh hold the view that surface linguistic features are not critical in understanding a text (78, 82, 193, 24). Rather, they argue that it is the application of schemata and world knowledge or an interpretation of the illocutionary acts that play a fundamental role in inferring covert propositional connection relations between propositions. In spite of a difference of opinion between the experts, the existence of cohesive relations, achieved by using adequate lexical and grammatical cohesive devices, seems to make a text more coherent and facilitates its comprehension.

What follows is a brief whose findings have pointed to the significance of cohesive devices in a text and their influence on the evaluation of written production in a second language. In the study aimed at observing how Business Studies Spanish-speaking students use both cohesion and coherence in order to achieve a written assignment in the English language, Palmer analysed the following aspects in students’ texts: overall length of the text use of paragraphs to divide information in a coherent way, lexical reiteration and pronominalisation as a cohesive device (99). Prior to the writing assignment, students were divided into two groups group A and group B. The main difference between the two groups was that the group A students had been acquainted with the term textual coherence whereas the group B students had not received any explanation about the concept. Thus, an additional aim of the study was to see whether students had naturally acquired the ability to create coherent texts in a second language. The results of the study pointed to the conclusion that the use of different cohesive devices implies coherence in students’ compositions. The students instructed in textual coherence used more pronouns as cohesive devices, either anaphorically or cataphorically, in an attempt to avoid repetition of the terms already used, whereas students in the uninstructed group resorted more often to the use of lexical reiteration. This reported on the relative importance of grammatical and discourse features in the evaluation of second and foreign language writing samples. In the first study, three native-speaking instructors of French evaluated 172 essays written by second language learners of French, and in the second study, 15 natives speaking professors of English and 15 Chinese professors of

English evaluated 60 essays written by students of English as a foreign language at a university in Taiwan. In both studies, the essays were evaluated using a scale that contained four areas of evaluation: morphology, syntax, cohesion and coherence. Each area was described by several grammatical/discourse features. The results in both studies indicated that ratters based their perception of “overall quality” primarily on cohesion and coherence, whereby cohesion turned out to be the best predictor of writing quality of all the four areas of evaluation. the effects of the deletion procedure in a cloze test on text coherence in terms of the chain interaction phenomenon. Two groups of students were given a two-form cloze test, one with a deletion of every procedure called “chain-preserving deletion” and the other with the del fifth word. The analysis showed the superior performance of test-takers in the “chain-preserving deletion” condition, where the coherence and chain interaction schema of the text were preserved, thus pointing to the importance of coherence for the test-takers’ successful comprehension and production of texts.

Biden was sworn in as the 46th president of the United States on January 20, 2021.

"This is America’s day. This is democracy’s day. A day of history and hope. Of renewal and resolve. Through a crucible for the ages America has been tested anew and America has risen to the challenge. Today, we celebrate the triumph not of a candidate, but of a cause, the cause of democracy. The will of the people has been heard and the will of the people has been heeded. We have learned again that democracy is precious. Democracy is fragile. And at this hour, my friends, democracy has prevailed..."

He said in the opening of his inaugural address. It is a speech of seven pages, twenty Paragraphs, two hundred and nine sentences, over seven hundred and sixty-eight phrases with two thousand three hundred and eighty-four words that form part of the graphological content. it is lexically well form as well as grammatically presented. In this study, the researcher will focus only on the cohesion and coherence that can be found within the speech in other to identify the style of the speaker.

Lexical Cohesion

This refers to the meaningful relations between sentence elements. This involves the repetition of the same word or use of a synonym, hyponym, meronym, or antonym. Here are some of the lexical cohesion and their interpretation that can be found within speech:

Repetition

This is repeating the same syntactic pattern/ structure. Some of the Examples from the speech include the following:

“**Much** to repair. (23), **Much** to restore. (24), **Much** to heal. (25)”. Here, the SP (Subject, Predicator) pattern is repeated. Others are **much** to build. (26), and **much** to gain. (27)

“There CSP (Complement, Subject, Predicator) pattern repeated. Some of the examples used by the speaker in the speech include the following: With unity **we can** do great things. Important things. (53), **we can** see **each other** not as adversaries but as neighbours. (72), we **can** treat **each other** with dignity and respect. (73), My fellow Americans, in the work ahead of us, **we will need** each other. (136), **we will need** all our strength to persevere through this dark winter. (137)”

The speech also presented a pattern of repeating the same word or words at the beginning of the succeeding sentences:

We can right wrongs. (54)

We can put people to work in good jobs. (55)

We can teach our children in safe schools. (56)

We can overcome this deadly virus. (58)

We can reward work, rebuild the middle class, and make health care secure for all. (59)

We can deliver racial justice. (60)

We can make America, once again, the leading force for good in the world. (61)

Let us listen to **one another**. (84)

Hear **one another**. (85)

See **one another**. (86)

Show respect to **one another**. (87)

My fellow **Americans**, we have to be different than this. (91)

America has to be better than this. (92)

And, I believe **America** is better than this. (93)

That did not **happen**. (103)

It will never **happen**. (104)

Not today. (105)

Not tomorrow. (106)

Not ever. (107)

We are entering what may well be the toughest and deadliest period of the virus. (138)

We must set aside the politics and finally face this pandemic as one nation. (139)

We will lead not merely by the example of our power but by the power of our example. (146)

We will be a strong and trusted partner for peace, progress, and security. (147)

We have been through so much in this nation. (148)

What shall be our legacy? (175)

What will our children say...? (176)

I will always level with you. (185)

I will defend the Constitution. (186)

I will defend our democracy. (187)

I will defend America. (188)

I will give my all in your service thinking not of power, but of possibilities. (189)

In the sentences above, the speaker repeated “**I will, what, we will, we, not, happen, America, one another, we can**” in communicating to his audience.

Synonyms

This can simply be referred to as using words with similar meanings. It can also be appearances of words in a construction that are closer in meaning which is sometimes referred to as near synonyms. Some of the examples in the speech are:

“There are **some days** when we need a hand. (132), There are **other days** when we’re called on to lend one. (133), An American story of **decency** and **dignity**. (194), of **love** and of **healing**. (195), of **greatness** and of **goodness**. (196), May this be the story that **guides us**. (197), the story that **inspires us**. (198), the story that **tells ages** yet to come that we answered the call of history. (199), we met the moment. (200)”

Hyponyms

This is the use of words that involve the generality of others or things. It simply refers to meaning in inclusions. The researcher noted an ample use of hyponyms in the speech. These are:

I thank my **predecessors** of both parties for their presence here. (**Predecessors** includes all the former presidents of the United States of America) (13)

I thank **them** from the bottom of my heart. (**Them** includes all the former presidents of the United States of America) (14)

You know the resilience of our **Constitution** and the strength of our **nation**. (**Constitution** and **nation** includes all the act of governance in the United States of America) (15)

This is a great **nation** and we are a good **people**. (**Nation** and **people** include all the citizens of the United States of America) (20)

And each of us has a duty and **responsibility**, as **citizens**, as **Americans**, and especially as **leaders**; leaders who have pledged to honor our Constitution and protect our **nation** to defend the truth and to defeat the lies. (**Responsibility, citizens, Americans, leaders** and **nation** have inclusiveness with all the citizens of the United States of America) (130)

America (**America** includes all the activities and citizens of the United States of America) (187)
America I gave my best to **you**. (**You** include all the activities and citizens of the United States of America) (188)

Let us add our own work and prayers to the unfolding story of our **nation**. (**Nation** includes all the activities and citizens of the United States of America) (189)

My fellow **Americans**, I close today where I began, with a sacred oath. (**Americans** includes all the citizens of the United States of America) (193)

I will defend **America**. (**America** includes all the activities, act of governance and citizens of the United States of America) (198)

That **democracy** and **hope**, **truth** and **justice**, did not die on our watch but thrived. (**Democracy**, **hope**, **truth** and **justice** are hyponymy in nature) (211)

That our **America** secured liberty at **home** and stood once again as a beacon to the **world**. (212), so, with purpose and resolve we turn to the tasks of our time. (214), Sustained by faith. (215), Driven by conviction. (216), and, devoted to one another and to this country we love with all our hearts. (217) (**America**, **home** and **world** are hyponymy in nature)

May God bless **America** and may God protect our **troops**. (**America** includes all the activities, act of governance and citizens of the United States of America while **troops** include all the military, police, and security agencies) (218)

Antonyms

This can be defined as using words with opposite meanings. They can either be direct opposite in meaning or indirectly. Some of the examples are:

The battle is perennial. (66)

Victory is **never assured**. (67)

We can join **forces**, stop the **shouting**, and **lower** the **temperature**. (74)

For without **unity**, there is no **peace**, only **bitterness** and **fury**. (75)

No **progress**, only **exhausting outrage**. (76)

No **nation**, only a **state of chaos**. (77)

There is **truth** and there are **lies**. (120)

Lies told for **power** and for **profit**. (121)

We must end this uncivil war that pits **red** against **blue**, **rural** versus **urban**, **conservative** versus **liberal**. (127)

Not of personal interest, but of the public good. (190)

And together, we shall write an American story of **hope**, not **fear**. (191)

Of unity, not division. (192)

Of **light**, not **darkness**. (193)

The sentences above have clearly showed the antonyms of the word used by the speaker in each of the construction. Example **light** is an opposite of **darkness**, **unity** is an opposite of **division**, **hope** is an opposite of **fear**, **personal interest** is an opposite of **public interest**, **truth** is an opposite of **lies**. Etc.

Grammatical Cohesion

This is related to the grammatical relations between text elements. Here are some examples:

Anaphora

This means using pronouns or determiners to refer to the known nouns in a text. Backward referencing is known as anaphoric reference examples are below:

This is America's **day**. (1)

This is democracy's **day**. (2)

I thank my predecessors of both parties for their presence here. (13)

I thank them from the bottom of my heart. (14)

Unity. (40)

Unity. (41)

With unity **we can** do great things. Important things. (53)

We can right wrongs. (54)

We can put people to work in good jobs. (55)

We can teach our children in safe schools. (56)

We can overcome this deadly virus. (58)

We can reward work, rebuild the middle class, and make health care secure for all. (59)

We can deliver racial justice. (60)

We can make America, once again, the leading force for good in the world. (61)

That did not **happen**. (103)

It will never **happen**. (104)

Not today. (105)

Not tomorrow. (106)

Not ever. (107)

My fellow Americans, in the work ahead of us, **we will need** each other. (136)

We will need all our strength to persevere through this dark winter. (137)

We are entering what may well be the toughest and deadliest period of the virus. (138)

We must set aside the politics and finally face this pandemic as one nation. (139)

We will lead not merely by the example of our power but by the power of our example. (146)

We will be a strong and trusted partner for peace, progress, and security. (147)

We have been through so much in this nation. (148)

We will be judged, you and I, for how we resolve the cascading crises of our era. (166)

Will we rise to the occasion? (167)

Will we master this rare and difficult hour? (168)

Will we meet our obligations and pass along a new and better world for our children? (169)

I will always level with you. (185)

I will defend the Constitution. (186)

I will defend our democracy. (187)

I will defend America. (188)

I will give my all in your service thinking not of power, but of possibilities. (189)

Ellipsis

Ellipsis denotes a kind of substitution by zero. It deals with the omission of word(s) while, simultaneously, relying on the readers' minds to deduce and fill in the missing bits from what they have read (or heard before). It is used in discourse to avoid repetition and redundancy. In the following text, the words and expressions you can omit are indicated with (...)

A day of history and hope. (3), ...Of renewal and resolve. (4)

And now, **a rise** in political extremism ...white supremacy ...domestic terrorism that we must confront and we will defeat. (37)

Let us listen to one another. (84) ...Hear one another. (85), ...See one another. (86)
...Show respect to one another. (87) Not to meet yesterday's **challenges**, but today's... and tomorrow's... (145)

Substitution

This denotes replacing a linguistic item with another. Examples can be seen in the sentences below as presented by the speaker in the speech:

In another **January** in Washington, **on New Year's Day** 1863, Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation. (**January** is substituted with **on New Year's Day**) (42)

When **he** put pen to paper, the President said, "If **my** name ever goes down into history it will be for this act and **my** whole soul is in it." (**He** substituted **Abraham Lincoln** and **my** substituted the name of the speaker- **Joseph Biden**) (43)

My whole soul is in it. (**My** substituted the name of the speaker- **Joseph Biden**) (44)

Today, on this **January day**, my whole soul is in this: (**January day** substituted with **Today**) (45)

I understand that many Americans view the future with some fear and trepidation. (123), **I understand** they worry about their jobs, about taking care of their families, about what comes next. (124), **I get it.** (125) (The word **I understand** in 123 and 124 is substituted with **I get it** in 125)

Conjunctions

This comprises the use of core conjunctions, basically involving the three coordinators, "AND", "BUT", "OR" and conjuncts which are of various kinds. Some of the examples used by the speaker are presented below:

Over the centuries through storm **and** strife, in peace and in war, we have come so far.

But we still have far to go. ("and, but" are used to connect the phrases and clauses in the sentence) (21)

We will press forward with speed **and** urgency, for we have much to do in this winter of peril and possibility. ("And" is used to connect the phrases urgency and clause -we will press forward with speed- in the sentence) (22)

And so today, at this time **and** in this place, let us start afresh. ("And" is used to connect the phrases in the sentence) (82)

Every disagreement doesn't have to be a cause for total war. (89)

And, we must reject a culture in which facts themselves are manipulated **and** even manufactured. ("and" is used to connect the sentence "89 and 90) (90)

Yet we endured **and** we prevailed ("yet, and" are used to connect the sentence "89 and 90 as well as the phrases in sentence 96). (96)

Today, we mark the swearing-in of the first woman in American history elected to national office – Vice President Kamala Harris ("**Today**" is a subordinate conjunction that connects the preceding and the succeeding sentence). (99)

And here we stand, just days after a riotous mob thought they could use violence to silence the will of the people, to stop the work of our democracy, **and** to drive us from this sacred ground. ("And" is used to connect the clauses in the sentence). (102)

To all those who supported our campaign I am humbled by the faith you have placed in us (“**To all those who**” is a subordinate conjunction that connect the preceding and the succeeding sentence). (108)

To all those who did not support us, let me say this: Hear me out as **we** move forward. Take a measure of me and my heart (“**To all those who**” is a subordinate conjunction that connect the preceding and the succeeding sentence). (109)

From the data presented above, both coordinative and subordinative conjunctions were used by the speaker in his speech.

Referential Cohesion

This means using pronouns or determiners to refer to the known nouns in a text. Backward referencing is known as anaphoric reference while forward referencing is called cataphoric reference. In the following sentences, the instances of each referential cohesion are identify as presented by the speaker in the speech:

I thank my predecessors of both parties for **their** presence here. (“**their**” refers anaphorically to predecessors). (13)

I thank **them** from the bottom of my heart. (“**Them**” refers anaphorically to predecessors) (14)

On “We the People” **who** seek a more perfect Union. (“**Who**” refers anaphorically to ‘we the people’) (19)

They did their duty. (“**They**” refers anaphorically to predecessors) (182)

They healed a broken land. (“**They**” refers anaphorically to predecessors) (183)

The above examples from the lines presented shows that “**their, them, who, and they**” are used by the speaker to anaphorically refers to the predecessors of the office of the president of the United States of America.

Coherence in the Speech

Coherence manifests in discourse by the extent to which a particular instance of language use matches a shared knowledge of conventions as to how illocutionary acts are related to form large units of discourse Widdowson, (78). Unlike cohesion which is regarded as a linguistic means of establishing connectivity across sentences or utterances by what Widdowson refers to as formal syntactic and semantic signals, that is, cohesive ties, coherence establishes some relationship between utterances through an interpretation of illocutionary acts. The following constructed conversation explains the manifestations of coherence in discourse:

Few periods in our nation’s history have been more challenging or difficult than the one we’re in now. (28)

A once-in-a-century virus silently stalks the country. (29)

It’s taken as many lives in one year as America lost in all of World War II. (30)

Millions of jobs have been lost. (31)

Hundreds of thousands of businesses closed. (32)

A cry for racial justice some 400 years in the making moves us. (33)

The dream of justice for all will be deferred no longer. (34)

A cry for survival comes from the planet itself. (35)

A cry that can't be any more desperate or any clearer. (36)

I know speaking of unity can sound to some like a foolish fantasy. (62)

I know the forces that divide us are deep and they are real. (63)

But I also know they are not new. (64)

Our history has been a constant struggle between the American ideal that we are all created equal and the harsh, ugly reality that racism, nativism, fear, and demonization have long torn us apart. (65)

I promise you this: as the Bible says weeping may endure for a night but joy cometh in the morning. (140)

We will get through this, together (141)

The world is watching today. (142)

So here is my message to those beyond our borders: America has been tested and we have come out stronger for it. (143)

We will repair our alliances and engage with the world once again. (144)

Amen. (153)

This is a time of testing. (154)

We face an attack on democracy and on truth. (155)

A raging virus. Growing inequity. (156)

The sting of systemic racism. (157)

A climate in crisis. (158)

America's role in the world. (159)

Any one of these would be enough to challenge us in profound ways. (160)

But the fact is we face them all at once, presenting this nation with the gravest of responsibilities. (161)

I believe we must and I believe we will. (170)

And when we do, we will write the next chapter in the American story. (171)

It's a story that might sound something like a song that means a lot to me. (172)

It's called "American Anthem" and there is one verse stands out for me: (173)

"The work and prayers of centuries have brought us to this day (174)

The above-constructed discourse can be interpreted vis-à-vis the social conventions of interaction which are identified as a reminder or a call for sober reflection on the series of the unfortunate events that have bedeviled America as a nation and the world. It is very obvious that there are no cohesive features of utterance in the discourse featured above; hence, it's not being analyzable from the perspective of cohesion. The cues needed to identify coherence in the discourse above are conventional structure of interaction and the knowledge of the world.

Discussion of Findings

While reading or listening to some pieces of language, one normally aims not only to understand what the words mean, but what the writer or speaker intends to convey. In fact, distinct words in the lexical neutral environment of a dictionary have their literal meanings that may change substantially once they are used in real social interactions. This characteristic of language offers both innumerable research perspectives as well as tremendous possibilities in the ways meaning can be loaded in words. In the inaugural speech of Joe Biden of the United States of America, there are areas of cohesion used by the speaker as identified in the data collected. These can be seen below:

Referential cohesion means using pronouns or determiners to refer to the known nouns in a text. Backward referencing is known as anaphoric reference while forward referencing is called cataphoric reference. In the following lines the instances of each referential cohesion are itemized. "...I thank my predecessors of both parties for THEIR presence here. (13)", "...I thank THEM from the bottom of my heart. (14)" "... On "We the People" WHO seek a more perfect Union. (19)" "...THEY did their duty. (182)" "...THEY healed a broken land. (183)". The above examples are some of the referential cohesive devices found in the speech. Most of the words used in the speech are referential in nature because the speaker is referring to the happenings in America as well as the Americans who are actively involved in the game of democracy. This can be seen in the constant use of pronouns like: WE will..., WE shall..., WE can..., THEY..., OURS..., THEIR... Etc. The above examples can also be said not as referential cohesive devices. This can be seen in the constant use of pronouns as mentioned above.

At the level of Conjunctive Cohesion, the speaker made use of core conjunctions, basically involving the three coordinators, "AND", "BUT", "OR" and conjuncts which are of various kinds. For example; "Democracy is fragile. (9) AND at this hour, my friends, democracy has prevailed (10)". "...Much to build. (27) AND much to gain (28)". "...We can reward work, rebuild the middle class, AND make health care secure for all. (59)". "...No progress, ONLY exhausting outrage. (76)". "...No nation, ONLY a state of chaos. (77)". In the sentence "We can reward work, rebuild the middle class. **and** make health care secure for all. (58 & 59)", the speaker used the two sentences to make a point which was linked by the conjunction AND. It is also applicable to most of the sentences. The researcher also observed the used of subordinate conjunctions in sentences 76 & 77 (No progress, ONLY exhausting outrage. No nation, ONLY a state of chaos). Generally, the researcher observed the copious use of coordinative conjunctions like; AND, BUT and correlative conjunctions ONLY, WHILE etc in order to link words to words, phrases to phrases, clauses to clauses, sentences to sentences and paragraph to paragraph in the speech.

Owing to the Elliptical Cohesion, the speaker uses a zero substitution method in his presentation. These Ellipses denotes a kind of substitution by zero. It deals with the omission of word(s) while, simultaneously, relying on the readers' minds to deduce and fill in the missing bits from what they have read (or heard before). It is used in discourse to avoid repetition and redundancy. In the following lines, the words and expressions you can omit are in the example below;

“And now, **a rise** in political extremism, white supremacy, ...domestic terrorism that we must confront and we will defeat. (38)”

The sentence number 38 above is a clear demonstration of elliptical cohesion where the ‘A RISE’ is simultaneously omitted. The phrase is omitted in the succeeding clauses. The sentences supposed to be A RISE in political extremism, A RISE in white supremacy, A RISE in domestic terrorism that we must confront and we will defeat. It is supported with Substitutive Cohesion. This denotes replacing a linguistic item with another like in: “...In another January in Washington, on New Year’s Day 1863, Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation (43)” “...Today, on this January day, my whole soul is in this (46)”.

There are also elements of Lexical cohesion. This means using words to achieve unity in a text. There are four varieties of lexical cohesion the researcher discovered in the speech; Repetition from the speech where the researcher observed some elements of repeating the same word or words by the speaker in other to communicate to his audience.

“This is America’s DAY. (1), This is democracy’s DAY. (2), A DAY of history and hope. (3)” “MUCH to restore. (24), MUCH to heal. (25), MUCH to build. (26), And MUCH to gain. (27)”, “UNITY. (41), UNITY. (42)”

Synonyms using words with similar meanings can also be seen in “Much to repair. (23), Much to **restore**. (24), much to **heal**. (25), Much to **build**. (26), And much to **gain**. (27)”. using words with similar meanings: example in line (122) “And each of us has a duty and responsibility, **as citizens, as Americans, and especially as leaders – leaders** who have pledged to honor our Constitution and protect our nation — to defend the truth and to defeat the lies”, the words like citizens, America, leaders to draw the attentions of his audiences that the work is a collective responsibility. Also in lines (24, 25, 26, & 27), the speaker used the words **restore, heal, build and much again** which they share almost the same semantics implications. With some **Antonyms**. Here **the** speaker also used words with opposite meanings:

“We can join forces, stop the shouting, and lower the temperature. (74), For without unity, there is no **peace**, only **bitterness and fury**. (75), No **progress**, only **exhausting outrage**. (76), No **nation**, only a **state of chaos**. (77).”

Most of the words used by the speaker in sentences 74, 75, 76, and 77 above are opposite in meaning to each other. This is simply called the use of antonyms. The researcher observed the Collocation used in the presentation. The speaker used words that go with each other: Some of the lines found within the text include:

“Uniting to fight the common foes we face: Anger, resentment, hatred. (51), Extremism, lawlessness, violence. (52), Disease, joblessness, hopelessness. (53)” “We look ahead in our uniquely American way – restless, bold, and optimistic – and set our sights on the nation we know we can be and we must be.” (12). Also in lines (24, 25, 26, & 27), the speaker used the words

restore, heal, build and much again which they can collocate together. Apart from collocation the speaker also used Cohesion through parallelism. This can be obtained when a syntactic structure/ pattern is repeated. It can be referred to repeating the same syntactic pattern/ structure. Some Examples in the speech are:

“**we will** be judged, you and I, for how we resolve the cascading crises of our era. (166), **will we** rise to the occasion? (167), **will we** master this rare and difficult hour? (168), **will we** meet our obligations and pass along a new and better world for our children? (169)”

This is an unnecessary regularity that can be found within a text. This obtains when a syntactic structure/ pattern is repeated. It is a process of repeating the same syntactic pattern/ structure. From the speech, the researcher observed some elements of repeating the same word or words by the speaker. Semantic relations such as synonymy, antonymy, polysemy, is the relationship of meaning of one item with another item/s in the text or discourse. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), “Cohesion refers to the relations of meaning that exist within the text, and is expressed through the stratal organization of the text... It occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the text is dependent on that of another” (4). Taboada (2004) defines cohesion as ‘the internal hanging together of the text’. To Yule (2008) ‘Cohesion is the tie and connection that exist within the text’. It is the part of the system of a language; a type of intra-sentence relation of an item with either the preceding or following item/s in the text. In communication process, cohesion gives insights into how the writer structures what he/she wants to convey.

Unlike cohesion which is regarded as a linguistic means of establishing connectivity across sentences or utterances by what Widdowson refers to as formal syntactic and semantic signals, that is, cohesive ties, coherence establishes some relationship between utterances through an interpretation of illocutionary acts. Coherence manifests in discourse by the extent to which a particular instance of language use matches a shared knowledge of conventions as to how illocutionary acts are related to form large units of discourse (Widdowson 1978). The following constructed conversation explains the manifestations of coherence in discourse. Therefore, the observed over irregularities in the used of cohesive devices by the speaker although it was deliberate to make emphasis and to reawaken the spirit of patriotism among the Americans.

Conclusion

The terms cohesion and coherence are related to making the sense of language in the text/discourse analysis. Cohesion and coherence have significant role in the interpretation of message, and in the negotiation of meaning in the discourse. A good academic writing requires a good combination of cohesive ties and coherent features in the text. The results indicate three reasons for the style of the speaker: DELIBERATIVE, FORENSIC, and EPIDICTIC. The researcher also noted that the speech is both cohesive and coherent. The analysis above, attempt to introduce cohesion and coherence, and their role in communicating messages in the speech presented by the 46th United States President Joseph Biden above.

In conclusion, one should note that while coherence deals with sense, cohesion relates to unity. The concept of sense relates to the notion of meaningfulness or relevance. When human beings communicate, they create certain lexical and grammatical ties that bind their writing or speech together. Any piece of communication that is logical will be coherent. Watch for logicity in any piece of text you analyse stylistically. In order to undertake an effective stylistic analysis of any

speech, one must pay attention to cohesion and coherence in the text. In doing this, one must have a good knowledge of the context of the text as well as its lexical and grammatical features. Creating relevance and unity in texts makes communication more meaningful and logical. And that is what is demonstrated by the 46th president of the United States of America Joseph Biden. The speech is cohesive and coherent at the same time.

References

- Abochol, S.I. *Language and Society, an introduction*. Abuja Nigeria. Chattered Graphic Press, (2011).
- ...*Basic Semantics*. Abuja Nigeria. Chattered Graphic Press, (2013).
- Recanati, F. *Direct Reference: From Language to Thought*, Blackwell, Oxford-Cambridge USA. (1993)
- ... The alleged priority of literal interpretation. *Cognitive Science*. (1995)
- Richards, C. Inferential pragmatics and the literary text, *Journal of Pragmatics* 92/3: 261-85. (1985)
- Rouchota, V. On the referential/attributional distinction, *Lingua* 87: 137-167. (1992)
- Ruhl, C. *On Monosemy: A Study in Linguistic Semantics*, State University of New York Press. (1989)
- Sperber, D. Rudiments de rhetorique cognitive, *Poetique* 23: 389-415. (1975)
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. *Draft of Relevance*. University College London ms. (1983)
- ... *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, Blackwell, Oxford. (1986/21995)
- ... Rhetoric and relevance, in J. Bender & D. Wellbery (eds.) *The Ends of Rhetoric*, Stanford University Press, pp.140-155. (1990)
- Sweetser, E. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural of Semantic Structure*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. (1990)